DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

13-14 GEORGE V, 1923

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1025 **Volume II: Pages 1027-2045**

Volume III: Pages 2047-3044 **Volume IV: Pages 3045-4005**

Volume V: Pages 4007-4756

VOLUME CLVII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF APRIL TO THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF MAY, 1923, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1923

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

DOMINION OF CANADA

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Friday, April 20, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

MINES AND MINERALS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the name of Mr. Kennedy (Edmonton) be substituted for that of Mr. Shaw as a member of the select standing committee on Mines and Minerals.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 113 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jean Elizabeth Burgess.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 114 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Wesley Scott.—Mr. Chew.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend subsection one of section six of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, chapter seventy-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as enacted by section one of chapter seven of the statutes of 1922, and to provide that the words "two hundred dollars for each head of cattle" in the eighteenth line thereof be stricken out and be replaced by the words "one hundred and fifty dollars for each head of cattle"; to further provide that this act come into operation on the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, and that the minister may order compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered on or after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-two, but which had been valued and ordered to be slaughtered prior to that date, at the rates authorized by statute before the coming into force of said chapter seven; also to provide that the minister may order compensation for animals which may be slaughtered on or after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, but valued and ordered to be slaughtered from the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-two to the thirtieth June, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, both dates inclusive, at the rates authorized by chapter seven of the statutes of 1922.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the usual resolution which precedes a money bill and while it was discussed incidentally a few weeks ago I think it is well to go into it further at this time. The main feature of the resolution proposes to reduce the indemnity for slaughtered animals, that is pure breds, from $200 for each head to $150. Our reason for doing that is to conform to the general reduction of values in live stock, both commercial and pure bred. The first amount is the rate that was given for compensation during the war, but we now think we have come to pre-war prices both in regard to pure bred and commercial animals. Therefore, we are restoring the rate that prevailed immediately before the war. I may say that the estimates for this year are based upon this lower valuation.

The effect of the balance of the resolution is this: Last year when we made a similar reduction in the amount of compensation for slaughtered animals, the law being brought into force on the first of July, it was found that a great injustice was done to the owners of those animals that were appraised before that date. For instance a farmer, we will call him Jones if you like, had his animals appraised, say, on the 20th June by the government inspector. He might have had a dozen animals and a valuation was agreed upon between the inspector and the owner of the animals under which he expected, we will say, a compensation of $2,000 for the entire number. The inspector went away and the farmer returned home feeling that that was what he was entitled to. The new law came into force on the first of July before any of Jones animals were slaughtered and then the new scale of compensation came into force. Consequently if the government and the government inspectors are to keep faith with that farmer his compensation must be based upon the valuation which took place any time before the first of July. I may say that when I was in Edmonton last summer I met a number of farmers who found they were exactly in this position: They had the certificate of the government inspector assuring them that they would get compensation based upon the act in force prior to last July. Then the new act

came into effect and the compensation was lowered. They said that was not fair and I believe they were right. Hence the second part of this resolution makes provision for such cases amounting in all to $4,000. I have the names of the farmers that are affected by this provision if the committee would like to have them. They are located in Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta, but principally in Alberta where there happened to be a large amount of slaughtering in the last few days of June.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 115, to amend The Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read a second time?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Now.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the consent of the House, bill read the second time.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the number of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN: There is no number on it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the bill has not been distributed, we cannot very well go ahead with it. However, the provisions of the bill are identical with the explanation I have just given to the House. The resolution is the embodiment of the bill, and the bill is in effect couched in the same language as the resolution.

Mr. HANSON: What is the idea of railroading it through at this rate?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We want to get some work before the Senate.

Mr. HANSON: It is not because the minister wants to send out the cheques to-morrow.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have no desire to railroad it through.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is a very important matter, and I think we had better have the bill printed and distributed.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INSURANCE OF MORTGAGED PREMISES

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution.

Resolved, that the Governor in Council may from time to time cause an agreement or agreements to be executed by or on behalf of His Majesty the King, undertaking or guaranteeing that any company mentioned or referred to in chapter thirteen of the statutes of 1919 (first session), entitled: An Act to incorporate Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways, and in chapter thirteen of the statutes of 1920, entitled: An act to confirm the agreement dated the eighth day of March, 1920, between His Majesty the King and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the acquisition of the capital stock of the said Grand Trunk Railway Company, except the four per cent guaranteed stock, will restore or make good all loss or damage to the mortgaged premises comprised in any mortgage or deed of trust (hereinafter called "such mortgage") at any time executed by any such company occasioned by fire or other casualty against which such company covenanted in such mortgage to insure, and indemnifying the trustee or trustees of any such mortgage against any consequences arising from any failure—(a) on the part of such company to comply with such covenant to insure, and (b) on the part of such trustee or trustees to take any action in respect thereof. The times and manner of the giving of any such agreement or agreements, and the form and terms thereof and the person who may sign the same on behalf of His Majesty shall be such as the Governor in Council may from time to time approve or direct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM: The object of this resolution is simply this: The Canadian National Railway Board, with the consent of the government, has decided to carry its own insurance. In the mortgages given a covenant was included that insurance should be carried for the protection of—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps we can shorten it a little. The resolution is rather a long one. If the minister says that all the resolution does is to enable the government to carry the insurance, we have no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is all it does.

Mr. HANSON: What about the bond holders? They have some rights.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter will be fully explained in committee, I presume.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister should give the committee some information as to the experience of the company with its insurance. What has been the result of the insurance that has been carried by the Canadian National Railways through these years? I understand they have had one system of insurance applicable to their densely populated or densely trafficked areas, and another system with differing rates for other

areas, and I believe some area not insured, in which they carry their own insurance the intention of the insurance, of course, being to provide for cases where, if a loss occurred by fire in the densely trafficked section, the money would be at hand to pay the loss. The property would have to be repaired at once. It could not be allowed to stand, and there would be no money to do it with, if they had no insurance fund. The minister is providing some other way whereby there will be authority to pay the money out of the treasury. I would like if the minister would tell the House what has been the result of that insurance. Has it been a loss to the company? Has the company been recouped by those with whom it insured against these losses, equal to, or nearly equal, to the amount of premiums paid, does that differ in each of the areas, and has the minister any comment to make on the rate of insurance the company was able to obtain, whether it was fair and reasonable, low, or too high?

Mr. GRAHAM: The experience of the company in insuring its property has been that a large profit has accrued to the insurance companies. I forget the exact figures; but I think the amount of insurance all told is three hundred and some odd million dollars, and if we were to include the Intercolonial railway, that has not been insured, the total would approximate $400,000,000. Those in charge of the insurance have taken into account all the valid circumstances, and they have come to the conclusion that with the experience in the various roads during the past ten years and the amount of premiums paid, there could be a saving of about three quarters of a million dollars per annum by carrying our own insurance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What were the companies with whom the insurance was placed?

Mr. GRAHAM: The insurance was placed, I think, with two companies of insurance brokers who distributed it amongst various companies. I cannot bring to mind the names now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were not brokers; they were companies.

Mr. GRAHAM: These companies do not carry the entire risk for the risks are very large.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They reinsure.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. As I understood the matter, they were insurance brokers, but I may be wrong about that. They, at least, distribute the insurance. The question was raised if it would not be wise to carry part of the insurance, perhaps in more densely populated areas. If that were done and our insurance were not spread over the lean areas, as well as the better portions, we were informed that the rate would be so much higher. As a matter of fact, the new president of the company procured a gentleman to go into the question of insurance in reference to the Canadian National Railway Board properties, and it was decided and the recommendation made that money could be saved by the government carrying its own insurance. Some years ago on the Intercolonial road, on which there was no insurance, the plan was inaugurated of the government putting aside each year from the returns from the road a certain amount for insurance. Our experience at that time was that that amount, although it was comparatively small, fully carried all the fire risks. The Grand Trunk, and, I think, one of the other lines have large insurance funds on hand now. I think the total of the two amounts is, at the present time, something like cash in hand of $2,000,000, so that the government insurance fund starts out already with a nucleus of about $2,000,000. It is not intended that, in the case of fire, the money should be taken in that particular way; but from the receipts of the system each year a certain amount will be put aside, approximately if not the same amount as would be paid under the ordinary rate of insurance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister tell us what rates the Canadian National secured and what rates the Grand Trunk secured, the government road as against the privately operated road?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not that with me at the present moment. I shall have it at the second reading of the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask the minister to get that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not expect the bill to come up this afternoon, and I do not have that information with me. I do not intend to go any further than the first reading of the bill this afternoon.

The other day the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) asked me two questions which I had better answer now. When the resolution was first introduced, I think the leader of the Opposition stated, if I remember correctly, that the words "restore or make good" were redundant. The instruments held by the trustees, in which instruments the covenants are made, contain two different forms of

covenant. One form says "shall make good." The other form says "shall restore." This resolution is merely to conform in identical terms with the other instruments held by the trustees, and this form of resolution has been agreed upon between the solicitors of the trustees and the solicitors of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I first of all have no objection at all to the new plan of insurance. With the much increased railway mileage and extent of property, it would seem to me the part of wisdom for the company now to carry its own insurance. I wish, however, information to be made official in this House as to the rate which the Canadian National Railways secured as compared with the rate which the Grand Trunk secured, and if the minister sees fit—I would not press for this—the rate which the Canadian Pacific secured. I have made some inquiries myself, and I must say I was astonished at the rate which the Canadian National Railway was able to secure on its insurance. I venture to believe that over an extended period of time, there would be little if any profit in this for the companies. It will be recalled that some year and a half ago, when it was thought fit to attack the management of the National Railways, special emphasis was laid on the horror of having directors there who were directors of companies doing business with the railways. That will be remembered. In my humble judgment, about the only one on the present board who has the right to be there in point of experience and capacity together, is head of the company doing a very large business with the railways. I would be the last to object to him on that ground, and I do not believe he will take the least advantage of this. His name is Mr. Stewart. But direction was especially drawn to the fact that the Canadian National Railway Company had insurance in concerns upon which even the manager, Mr. Hanna, and the treasurer, Mr. Mitchell, were directors. The public were led to believe there was something greatly wrong in that; that these men were favouring those companies with insurance for their own profit. I have gone to the trouble of ascertaining the facts. Those companies were doing insurance work for the Canadian National Railways long before Mr. Hanna or Mr. Mitchell was interested in them at all. Heavy losses, however, occurred in those companies, losses, arising chiefly from the San Francisco fire. Then it became necessary, if they were to get anything like the terms they got before, to reconstitute the directorate and to have some money provided. That was done under Mr. George A. Cox and others, in order that the interest of the railway company might be better looked after, Mr. Hanna and Mr. Mitchell were asked to take directorships on the insurance companies. They did that, and they did it with only nominal stock interest. They had nothing in reality; this was simply a small amount of stock transferred in their names for some years, when the policy was adopted of having only directors with a real interest. Then Mr. Hanna secured $500 worth in one company and $1,500 in another. The $500 worth in the one, he has lately sold at less than 30 cents on the dollar, and what he has in the other, he would be glad to sell at the same rate. This is the result of the interlocking directorships and the advantage to Mr. Hanna. Mr. Mitchell's experience is similar. It is only just to these men that this should be known. They were there in the interests of one of the largest insured parties of the companies, and I would be only too glad if their management of the railways in this regard was compared with the management of any private system anywhere, so that we might know whether or not the very lowest possible rates were secured. Instead of profiting by taking on these extra responsibilities they actually lost, and intended to lose.

[Mr. Graham.]

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Graham thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 116 respecting the Canadian National Railways.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of and concurrence in an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 7 to amend the Northwest Territories Act.

He said: As will be recalled, the purpose of this bill is to authorise magistrates for the Northwest Territories to try either within or outside the Northwest Territories, persons accused of offences committed therein. A special provision was adopted by this House to the effect that a person shall be qualified to serve as a juror in such trials although he is not a British subject. The Senate has refused to acquiesce in that provision and has therefore struck it out. We are accepting the amendment.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

JUDGES IN ADMIRALTY

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Admiralty Act, chapter one hundred and forty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, appoint for any admiralty district one or more deputy local judges, and revoke such appointments; appoint for any district or registry division of any district a deputy registrar; and when the local judge of the Quebec Admiralty District resides in Montreal, the deputy local judge residing in Quebec shall be paid the salary which he would have received if he were the local judge of the district; and when the local judge resides at Quebec, the deputy local judge residing at Montreal shall receive the salary which he would have received if he were the local judge of the district; but not more than one deputy local judge in any district shall receive a salary.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: By this resolution we propose to give to the Governor in Council power to appoint deputy local judges to act as Judges in Admiralty and we provide for a salary to be paid to the deputy local judge, which is not now provided for. We might take, for example, the province of Quebec, where we have two divisions of the Admiralty Court, one in Quebec and one in Montreal. At the present time the Judge in Admiralty is a judge of the Superior Court of Montreal. We have no deputy for the district of Quebec; We have only one registrar, whose office is in the city of Quebec; and we have no deputy registrar. As I have said, we propose by this suggested amendment to give to the Governor in Council power to appoint deputy local judges and, as well, power to revoke such appointments; also authority to appoint registrars. We provide further that when the local judge resides in Montreal and receives the salary which is provided for in the general statute, the deputy local judge residing in Quebec shall receive the same salary; and if the deputy local judge resides in Quebec the deputy local judge residing in Montreal shall also receive the same indemnity.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not very familiar with the provisions of the Admiralty Act. Is there any provision under that act empowering the Governor in Council to revoke the appointment of a judge?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I am speaking only of deputy local judges.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But I refer to any judge. We have local judges in Ontario, for instance, in the Supreme Court, and certainly there is no power in the Governor in Council to revoke their appointments. Is there a power under the Admiralty Act vested in the Governor in Council to revoke the appointment of a deputy local judge?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Chapter 141 of the Revised Statutes of 1906, the Admiralty Act, provides in section 8 that:

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, appoint any judge of a superior or county court, or any barrister of not less than seven years' standing, to be a local judge in admiralty of the exchequer court in and for any admiralty district.

2. Every such local judge shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons.

3. Such judge shall be designated a local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court.

As to the deputy local judges Section 11 provides:

A local judge in admiralty may, from time to time, with the approval of the Governor in Council, appoint a deputy judge; and such deputy judge shall have and exercise all such jurisdiction, powers and authority as are possessed by the local judge.

2. The appointment of a deputy judge shall not be determined by the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of the judge.

3. A local judge in admiralty may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, at any time revoke the appointment of a deputy judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I may be permitted, I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a decision lately given by the Court of Appeal of Ontario. I see in the papers this morning is reported the appeal of the case of the Wholesale Grocers and the Attorney General of Ontario. The Court of Appeal has held unanimously that the Dominion criminal legislation, section 498, is ultra vires. The disastrous consequences of such a verdict, if it is to remain undisturbed, are manifest.

The Chief Justice of Ontario bases his judgment upon the late finding of the Privy Council in the Board of Commerce case, and distinctly states that had it not been for that finding, that is to say, had his judgment been given prior to that finding, he would have held that section to be within the competence of the Dominion parliament. I do not presume to comment on the finding of the Privy Council except to say that I think it was most unfortunate. It was unfortunate that there should have been an appeal on that portion of the Board of Commerce and Combines and Fair Prices Acts. It was prosecuted by the province of Ontario, and I think by the province of Quebec as well, but chiefly at the instance of the Attorney General of Ontario.

I am not presuming to give an opinion, only to say that in the judgment of the Privy Council there is no language so decisive and so final as would make an appeal from the judgment of the Ontario Appellate Court a futility. One would think from reading it that the Privy Council never intended to undermine the whole basis upon which section 498 of the criminal code rests. I have it firmly in my mind that the jurisdiction of this parliament to enact such legislation must be upheld, and I earnestly hope the minister is considering taking immediate steps to see that the judgment so given does not become the law of Canada.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I should not like to express an opinion on the judgment referred to, not having yet read it, but I will certainly take under due consideration the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and do anything that is necessary and possible in the interests of the Dominion and the provinces.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Sir Lomer Gouin thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 117, to amend the Admiralty Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The bill is not printed in the two languages.

Progress reported.

PENNY BANK OF TORONTO ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 104 to change the name of The Penny Bank of Toronto.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1.—Name changed to "The Penny Bank of Ontario".

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, the founders of The Penny Bank were Toronto citizens, and when the institution was organized it received the name of The Penny Bank of Toronto. In later years the operations of the bank have extended throughout the province of Ontario, and the desire is that hereafter the institution should be known as The Penny Bank of Ontario. The only purpose of this bill is to change the name accordingly.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: At whose request is the change made?

Mr. FIELDING: At the request of the managers of the institution in Toronto through their solicitor in Ottawa. I noticed recently in the press there was some expression of opinion as to whether or not The Penny Bank was a successful institution. The only criticism of it was that it gives additional work to the school teachers and in some instances perhaps they are not willing to undertake it. However, I believe that is exceptional. The bank is operating quite extensively, and, so far as I know, to the general satisfaction of the public.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Militia Pension Act, chapter forty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide that pensions of retired officers, who served in the war and are employed in public service, be continued, and that the annual emolument of any such officer shall not exceed the annual rate of pay and allowances upon which the pension was computed; also to provide that pensions which have been paid to such officers shall not be recoverable from them.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MACDONALD: The purpose of this resolution is to provide for a situation that has arisen out of the late war. Under the provisions of the Militia Pension Act an officer shall not receive any pension while he is in receipt of a salary in the public service. This limitation did not apply to those who served as non-commissioned officers or privates. Since the war a number of members of the permanent force who served overseas and were promoted for service in the field or otherwise for merit, subsequently entered the public service, and by so doing lost their right to the pensions they would otherwise be entitled to on retirement. The Militia Pension Act was revised and brought up to date in 1909, when certain provisions were made in regard to pensions generally. Any officer who retires for any cause other than inefficiency or misconduct is entitled to receive out of the pension fund one-fiftieth, for every year he was in the service, of the amount he received during the last year in which he served. This fund is provided out of payments made by officers during the course of their service, at the rate of five per cent

annually of their pay. An anomaly has arisen through the fact that a man who entered the public service was put in a worse position as the result of his being promoted in the field than he would have been had he remained in the ranks as a private. This measure, therefore, is to provide that if such a man goes into the public service he shall not lose the right to pension which he would otherwise receive. It is also provided that if the amount of the pension and of the salary in the public service is such as to exceed the amount he received on the date of his retirement, the payments to him may be reduced so as not to exceed the rate on which the pension was computed. It has been found also in certain cases that pensions to officers who have been retired have been paid as a matter of course and that there has been no record in the Defence department as to what occupations the recipients of the pensions were engaged in. They may have entered the Customs service or the service of, say, the British Columbia government, and there would be no information with regard to their activities in that respect, the cheques issuing automatically. It was not until the Auditor General discovered that payments had been made in certain cases contrary to the provisions of the law of 1919 that the necessity for the present provision became evident. It was
4 p.m. felt, particularly in view of the small amount involved, that it would hardly be fair that the men who had received this money during the last year or so should be compelled to repay it. That, in brief, is the purpose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Can the acting minister inform the committee how many officers have been paid in excess of the amount to which they were entitled, as referred to in the last clause of the resolution? How many cases is this provision supposed to cover?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am informed that the cases are very few, but I can get the information for my hon. friend if he wishes it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are there only three or four?

Mr. GRAHAM: More than that, but not very many.

Mr. MANION: The minister states, as I understand it, that this is virtually putting these officers on the same basis as are the privates and non-commissioned officers?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Macdonald (Pictou) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 118, to amend the Militia Pension Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first and second times, considered in committee and reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

EVIDENCE IN MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 109, (from the Senate), to amend the Criminal Code with respect to publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Reports of proceedings in parliament; exception as to evidence in matters of marriage or divorce.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 322 of the Criminal Code explains the amendment which is proposed. It reads:

> No one commits an offence by publishing in good faith for the information of the public, a fair report of the proceedings of the Senate or House of Commons, or any committee thereof, or of any council or assembly aforesaid, or any committee thereof, or of the public proceedings preliminary or final heard before any court exercising judicial authority, nor by publishing in good faith, any fair comment upon any such proceedings. .

Mr. BOYS: While I approve of this legislation I ask the minister does he think very much is going to be gained by it in view of the fact that there are 450 copies of the evidence given before the divorce committee of the Senate which are printed and distributed for the information of members but which fall into the hands of many other people? If there is an earnest desire to stop the publication of this kind of evidence I think the minister should go further and find some way of restricting the method of distribution now in vogue in this House.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: What my hon. friend says is possibly true but I would point out that this bill originated in the Senate. It may be advisable, as the hon. member suggests that no publicity of any kind should be allowed. However, what is proposed here is a beginning and is something better than is in force to-day.

Mr. BOYS: I cannot say that I would go so far as to provide that there should be no publication of evidence at all in relation to these cases. It would be impossible for the

members of the private bills committee, who have from time to time to deal with divorce cases, to do so intelligently without the evidence before them; but there might be a provision that the distribution should be restricted to members of the committee, except in case of a division in the House, or something of that kind.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This bill provides for restriction.

Mr. BOYS: That is publication in the newspapers. As a matter of fact, so far as my knowledge goes I have never seen very much publication in the newspapers. I believe that if any injury is done it occurs through the publication of about 450 copies of the petition, the evidence, and the various proceedings before the divorce committee; it is through the distribution of those proceedings that the damage is done. Therefore I would like the minister to take that into his consideration and see if something cannot be done to lessen the very undesirable publicity that is now given to such matters.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have no objection to study the question, but I think the House should allow this bill to pass.

Mr. MANION: I would like to say a word regarding this question. There is no doubt that my hon. friend for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) is correct in regard to the distribution of the evidence taken in the Senate. As one who has three young boys growing up I am very much displeased when I read in my evening paper something I do not wish to fall under their eyes at the present time. As one who has that thought in his head, and there must be many others who look at this thing in the same way, I believe this is a move in the right direction. While I am not in favour of "uplift" movements by restriction, at the same time I think the publication in the public press of divorce proceedings, which some papers unfortunately "play up" a bit, is not to the benefit of the people of this country.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

COLD STORAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

House in committee on Bill No. 9, to amend the Cold Storage Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

[Mr. Boys.]

On section 2.—Repealed.

Mr. PARENT: May I ask the minister what the proposed contract in regard to cold storage warehouses consists of?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The form of contract is in the old act, it is rather a long document. As soon as the preliminary arrangements are made this contract is entered into.

Mr. PARENT: Do I understand that this measure is restricted to co-operative societies?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. PARENT: I would like an explanation from the minister.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Subsection 2 of section 1 was amended so as to include municipalities. As amended the bill will read:

The Governor in Council may enter into contracts with properly constituted co-operative societies, or associations, or municipalities.

The words "or municipalities" were inserted in the bill in the committee on Agriculture. The provision in the old act which granted subsidies to municipal cold storages is now extended so as to include co-operative associations and societies.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will an ordinary business association operating under the Limited Liability Act, be able to avail themselves of this provision?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That will depend in some measure on the object of the association. If the primary purpose is making profits, and it is tantamount to a profit institution, then the bill is not meant to apply to it, because it would then be in the same nature as it was at the outset. The former government changed the act so as to limit its application to municipal cold storages, but we are extending it to co-operative institutions and the vote in the estimates provides accordingly. There is only $50,000 in the estimates for the construction of cold storage plants, and if we opened it to such institutions as described by my hon. friend, one plant would gobble up the whole of the appropriation. For the present our intention is not to make it apply to institutions described by my hon. friend, unless their primary object is to give service rather than to make profits.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If according to the minister's statement he has only provided $50,000 and one private corporation could gobble up the whole of it, it stands to reason that one association such as he speaks of could gobble up the whole of it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, the hon. member is mistaken. These are institutions of a smaller nature. This $50,000 would take care of several of them.

Mr. PARENT: In addition to the questions which have already been asked I would like to know whether the minister has received representations from the Quebec Harbour Commission with regard to the establishment of a cold storage in that city. I understood from the representations made by these gentlemen that they would have liked to have a cold storage plant under the Quebec harbour board, and for reasons which have not been considered convincing up to date, the department has refused to amend the law so as to include a cold storage in Quebec city, under the supervision of the Quebec Harbour Commission. I would like to know if representations have been made to the minister, and the reasons he has to give for the refusal to give them favourable consideration.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Such representations were made to myself and my deputy, and it looked as if the Quebec harbour board desired to put up a cold storage plant. They have a precedent in the case of Montreal, where they went direct to the government and got a vote of several million dollars for the purpose of putting up a cold storage plant in the harbour of Montreal. To take advantage of this little act to construct the cold storage under the auspices of the Quebec harbour board I am afraid would be going beyond the intentions of the act. I do not think, if I remember rightly, that we turned the deputation down flatly. We seldom do that. I did not know but that the government would come down in the supplementary estimates with several million dollars for cold storage and we might be able to accede to this request, but with only $50,000 available, and with the precedent of the Montreal harbour board constructing a cold storage plant, I did not think I was able to hold out any hope to the Quebec harbour board that they could build a cold storage plant out of this vote.

Mr. THOMPSON: Does this resolution apply to the cooling of cheese in cheese factories and cold storages for cheese factories? A great many factories now are equipped with a cheese cooling room. Does this apply to factories where they wish to establish a cheese cooling room?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, that is one of the purposes in mind. I think in the hon. member's locality there are sufficient cold storages to take care of that business. However, if the co-operative institutions think differently, I think the Hon. Manning Doherty has a proposition in mind for the purpose of co-operatively marketing cheese products? If he carries out his scheme, and there is a proposition for constructing cold storage plants under it, this provision will apply. So far as I know the situation at present under the Dairy Produce Act, I think there are sufficient cold storages in these centres to take care of the curing of the cheese which my hon. friend describes. It is quite possible this act may be invoked in other parts of Canada for the purpose he describes, in which case it will apply.

Mr. THOMPSON: There seems to be a disposition on the part of the government to centralize co-operative societies in the large cities. This storage I speak of is in the city of Belleville, and the cheese factories are scattered all over the country. A cold storage operated in the city is of no benefit to the dairymen. What they want is cold storage in connection with their cheese factories. They have managed their own business, and by having the cold storage in connection with the factory they can hold their cheese and sell it at whatever time they think best, and I am very sorry to say that this does not apply, and is of no benefit, to the dairymen of central Ontario. I wish to inform the minister that these people have unanimously turned down the Hon. Manning Doherty's project. They have no use whatever for it. They feel that they want to use their own brains and intelligence in conducting their business affairs, and they would very much prefer to do so. On behalf of the dairymen, I wish to urge that this should apply to cheese factories, not to the central cold storage, which is owned by a private individual, because it would be a great inconvenience and expense to ship the cheese to those central points. In the first place the rate would be a quarter of a cent per pound on the cheese, and it costs the dairymen hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to carry out the ideas expressed by the hon. minister. On behalf of the dairymen of my district I want to protest against it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we had abundance of money and the cheese factories were of a reasonable size, which they are not, it would be very nice to have a cold storage plant of some kind, or even a cooling plant, even if it were only by the use of ice, and not mechanical power at all, in each individual factory, but to burden the different cheese factories with a cold storage proposition such as this would ruin them, instead of helping them. The time may come when we will have large creameries

such as they have in Australia, but we cannot install a cold storage in a small cheese factory without it being too burdensome to the institution. I think possibly that would be the ideal system, but it is impossible for the reasons I have indicated.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. minister tell us what he intends to do regarding the establishment in the province of Nova Scotia of plants in which to experiment in regard to the cooling of fruit? We have a fruit growing country down there and I think at least we are entitled to something from the government for the encouragement of the fruit growing. The minister should do something in regard to experimentation there, if he does nothing else. I know he wants to do everything possible. I have every faith in the minister as have the fruit growers of the province of Nova Scotia. We have every faith also in the government; but we should like to know what is going to be done towards experimentation in Nova Scotia, where this year fruit was practically thrown out of doors, because we had no market, and the fruit rotted before we got it to the market.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think one of the first public acts that I was privileged to perform after coming down here, was to establish a pre-cooling plant in my hon. friend's constituency. Is it not Annapolis?

Mr. MARTELL: Hants.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, it was somewhere in the apple district. Representations had been made to my department in the direction of a pre-cooling plant, just like the small creameries referred to by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Thompson). This pre-cooling plant could not stand the expense of a mechanical cold storage. Consequently it was supplied with ice-cooling appliances; but as this was done somewhat late in the year, the ice did not last as well although, as my hon. knows, the plant did excellent service. We have, I think, established the fact that it is good business to pre-cool in such cases, and do not hon. members think the next step would be for individuals concerned to get together and take advantage of the act providing for mechanical storage. We know pre-cooling is all right. The next step for Nova Scotia or any other province would be to organize a co-operative company and to get into touch with the officers of my department to find out the various steps to be taken until they are organized, and then to take advantage of this act. That would be the proper way, and I would be delighted to establish the very first one in Nova Scotia if they get busy before this amount of $50,000 is exhausted.

Mr. MARTELL: I do not want to delay this bill, because I am absolutely in sympathy with the minister in everything he is doing; but I believe not only what he is proposing now should be extended to co-operative people or to government institutions, but there should be some arrangement whereby private individuals could secure the advantage of subsidies, because often the way for co-operative and other work must be paved by private individuals undertaking the matter. People have become sick and tired, in many cases, of their experience in co-operative methods; and if a few private individuals would get together and form a company, say under the Nova Scotia Joint Stock Companies' Act, or in some other way, I believe the minister should be prepared to assist those people. If he does that, eventually we shall have in Nova Scotia the very finest methods of marketing fruit, because the minister knows that Nova Scotia has the finest quality of fruit in the world, and especially is this true of Hants.

Mr. WALLACE: I am not clear whether this applies to a pre-cooling plant operated by a co-operative society in connection with fruit or to a freezing plant in connection with fish.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This act applies to mechanical cold storage only. There is a matter I overlooked. There is in another act provision whereby a small grant of $100 for each factory can be applied for pre-cooling in just such institutions as were referred to by the hon. member for East Hastings. That is being taken advantage of. They obviously cannot put in anything except just straight ice or use what we call the brine system. That is not, however, what we are discussing here. This is mechanical storage; it can be used either for pre-cooling or for freezing.

Mr. MARTELL: Why is it proposed to take away from private individuals the benefit of this system?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are not doing that. This is taken away now. The act as it is to-day applies only to municipalities. It was the late government that took it away from private institutions, and I think at that time they were correct. I have no criticism to make of them in that regard at all. The larger institutions built by private enterprise had received a great deal of assistance, and a new day has come now when

we are introducing the idea of co-operative marketing more than ever. This co-operative marketing is going to be an outstanding feature of to-day. The private institutions have had their assistance. When they were deprived of this subsidy, it was extended for the last four years only to municipalities. We are extending it back again so as to include municipalities and co-operative associations. Therefore, this government is not the party that took the benefits of this act away from private concerns. My hon. friend, I think, knows that.

Mr. MARTELL: I quite appreciate what the minister says; but he has probably noticed in this morning's Journal that the leader of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia has introduced a resolution in the provincial legislature towards secession. Prior to 1896 it was necessary to advocate secession in Nova Scotia, because at that time we were in dire straits, but we undoubtedly have hopes that under this administration, secession talk will soon die out, because we have every faith in the present party in power. Nevertheless the minister has said that the last government took away these rights from private individuals. Cannot the minister see some way clear whereby he can permit private individuals who have foresight enough and sufficient faith in Nova Scotia to establish private cold storage plants, again to take advantage of this act? They were given these benefits by the Hon. Sydney Fisher who, with the exception of the present Minister of Agriculture, was the greatest Minister of Agriculture this country ever had.

Mr. THOMPSON: Has there been any request from any dairy organization such as the Dairymen's Association or the Cheese Board or from dairymen in general for this bill?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I cannot recall them all just now; but representations have certainly been made from many sources that this should not be confined to an activity that does not take advantage of it. The fact that it was confined entirely to municipalities is because none of those subsidies has been used at all during the last four years. This shows pretty conclusively that the act as it now stands is a dead letter, and, therefore, some change must be made or the act repealed altogether.

Mr. THOMPSON: The minister has, I think, evaded the question I asked. I asked if he had received any requests from the Dairymen's Association or from dairy organizations.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not recall being asked to make this change by any dairymen's association; but surely the right is recognized of anybody responsible for a department to initiate something himself without waiting for somebody else to tell him what to do. I know this was asked for in two or three places. If we always waited until somebody asked, that would not show great resourcefulness on our part.

Section agreed to.

On section 2:

Section 4 of the said act is amended by adding thereto as subsection 2 the following:

"(2) provided further that, in consideration of such subsidy, the owners of such cold storage warehouse shall execute in favour of the government of Canada a lien the terms and conditions whereof shall be prescribed by regulation under this act, on the said warehouse, to the full amount of such subsidy, such lien to be held by the Minister of Agriculture in perpetuity as a security that such cold storage warehouse shall continue to be available for general public use and be subject to the supervision provided and regulations prescribed by and under this act."

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have not the original act before me. Is there power under the original act to make regulations?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Just glancing over this proposed amendment, I do not think it is in just the best form; but if it has been drawn by the legal adviser of the House I do not suppose I should take objection to it. It would read much better as follows:

Provided further that, in consideration of such subsidy, the owners of such cold storage warehouse shall execute a lien in favour of the government of Canada upon terms and conditions to be prescribed by regulations under this act.

I do not like the way it is worded now, but a change of language perhaps might not be important.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We wrestled with it a good many times in the committee and I do not think it is exactly in the shape the executive council left it. The Agricultural committee mutilated it and possibly the phraseology is not what it should be. I rather like the amendment suggested by my hon. friend and if he will be good enough to draft it I shall accept it.

Mr. MARTELL: Perhaps the chairman might read the original section.

The CHAIRMAN: The original section is not before the committee; it is not in the bill. The amendment proposed by the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) is as follows:

Provided further that, in consideration of such subsidy, the owners of such cold storage warehouse shall execute a lien in favour of the government of Canada,

represented by the Minister of Agriculture, upon the terms and conditions to be prescribed by regulations under this act, on the said warehouse, to the full amount of such subsidy, such lien to be held by the government in perpetuity as a security, that such cold storage warehouse shall continue to be available for general public use, and be subject to the supervision provided and regulations prescribed by and under this act.

Mr. MARTELL: I would move as a sub-amendment that the words "or incorporated company" be inserted after the word "association" in the third line of section 1 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 1 has already passed; we are now on section 2.

Mr. MARTELL: I do not like to dispute the word of the Chair, but the proposed amendment is an amendment to section 1

The CHAIRMAN: Section 2 of the bill is before the committee. We have already passed section 1.

Mr. MARTELL: I have the bill before me. Section 2 refers to chapter 8 of the statutes of 1909. Section 1 refers to the sort of contracts that can be entered into.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already said that section 1 is passed. Is the hon. member proposing an amendment to section 2?

Mr. MARTELL: I do not think you called for the proviso to section 1.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no proviso.

Mr. MARTELL: There is a proviso moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie).

The CHAIRMAN: There is no proviso in section 1. Shall the amendment moved by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) carry?

Mr. MARTELL: But what is it?

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) that section 2 be stricken out and that there be substituted therefor the amendment I have already read, which has been accepted by the minister. Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. MARTELL: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Wellington will say, yea.

Mr. MARTELL: I have before me Bill No. 9, the bill we are discussing, but I have not the amendment proposed. Copies of the bill have been supplied hon. members, and the one I have provides in section 1:

Section 2 of the Cold Storage Act, chapter 6, of the statutes of 1907, as amended by chapter 8 of the statutes of 1909, is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

(2)—

That substituted section would undoubtedly take the place of the original section 2 in the act. It provides that the Governor in Council may enter into contracts for the construction, equipment and maintenance of public cold storage warehouses equipped with mechanical refrigeration and suitable for preservation of any food product. Surely you do not expect me, as representing an agricultural constituency, to accept from the committee an amendment which has never been submitted to me. I am not finding fault with the amendment the hon. member moved, but in the bill, as I have it, I wanted to insert in section 1 the words "or incorporated company" between the word "association" and the word "for" in the third line.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 1 has already been adopted by the committee; we are now on section 2.

Mr. MARTELL: Well, all I can say is that it is unreasonable to ask members to adopt legislation without the proper data before them.

The CHAIRMAN: This is the practice that has always obtained.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would suggest that the minister move that we revert to section 1 to afford the hon. member an opportunity to move his amendment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I distributed sixteen or eighteen typewritten copies of the amendment among hon. members. I scattered them around the chamber as evenly as I could. When we get through the bill I have no objection to reverting to section one at all.

Amendment (Mr. Guthrie) agreed to.

On section 2—Repeal.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Section 2 in the old bill should be No. 3, I presume.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The consent of the committee is asked that clause 1 may be referred to again.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MARTELL: I beg to move that there be added the words "or incorporated company" after the word "associations" in the third line subsection 2 of section 1.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, if those words are inserted we shall have the bill back in the same position as the original act of many years ago.

Mr. MARTELL: That is where it should be.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The late government found after a number of years' experience that the activities of private companies had been pretty well taken care of by the subsidies granted and that if continued far more money was likely to be required than the House was disposed to vote. Consequently the act was changed. True, this was during the war, but I think the change would have been made anyway. The legislation applies to muncipalities and now we have widened it to cover co-operative activities, and these have been provided for in the estimates accordingly. To still further widen the operation of the act will only result in dissipating that vote all over the country so that it will fail to achieve the purpose we have in view. For instance, the cold storage plant at Prince Rupert would require nearly as much assistance as the entire amount voted. This measure is for the purpose, as I have said, of developing co-operative cold storage plants for dairy products, fruit and fish—in a word, for anything that requires cold storage. I would be delighted to accept the hon. gentleman's amendment but the circumstances I have described forbid it.

Mr. WALLACE: The hon. minister refers to co-operative activities. In my own district we have the Norfolk Co-operative Company, which is organized under the Companies Act but is absolutely and strictly a co-operative organization. Would this bill apply to such a company?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. I have intimated several times that where the organization was under the Companies Act but was co-operative in its nature and particularly if it distributed its profits on the basis of the business supplied, it would certainly be recognized as coming under this legislation. But that would have to be left to the discretion of the department in the administration of the act.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Chairman I do not want to press my amendment unduly, but if we have to rely on co-operative and municipal cold storage plants in Nova Scotia we are not going to get any. We are a small province. Occasionally we can get private individuals to build cold storage plants, and these plants must of course rely upon the agricultural and other industries to get business; but we cannot secure co-operative effort in the same way as it operates in the West or in the big province of Ontario. Therefore I think it is a mistake for the minister to take away financial encouragement from those who want to engage in this form of private enterprise. The old act contained the necessary provision to this end, and I believe it should be maintained in the present act. As I see it, the minister is actuated by a desire to get away from the big cold storage plants receiving bonuses. The Agricultural department should certainly assist every small industry that has for its object the advancement of agricultural interests. We in the province of Nova Scotia cannot get co-operative or municipal cold storage plants, and although I have every admiration for the minister, I submit it is a mistake for him to exclude from the operation of the act say, four or five individuals who may associate together for the purpose of securing a charter under the Nova Scotia Joint Stock Companies Act in order to carry on a cold storage plant. The whole tendency appears to be to discourage individual effort directed towards the promotion of agricultural industry in the small provinces. The trouble to-day is that we have democracy running riot. I am just as much a low tariff man as the Minister of Agriculture, and I am just as much interested in some phases of public ownership as he is, but when we get so far away from practical business as to endeavour to encourage co-operative and municipal effort as against the initiative of private individuals, I say we are usurping functions that governments were never intended to assume. I believe that the old act of the Honourable Sydney Fisher was the best possible legislation to encourage the erection of cold storage plants. True, time may have shown that some changes were necessary, but to discourage private initiative is to create chaos and kill industry, and, representing an agricultural constituency, I protest against such a course. I believe an individual should have the right to engage in any sort of industry, and I do not think that it is in the interests of the masses generally that municipal and co-operative bodies should be encouraged at the expense of private enterprise.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When the bill was first introduced it did not include municipalities, but at the instance of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) in the Agricultural committee the bill was amended to meet his views and the farming members particularly of the committee were

in favour of the amendment. To extend the bill as proposed by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) would simply defeat its purpose; in fact it now covers companies such as those described by the hon. member provided their primary purpose is service rather than profit.

Mr. MARTELL: Do you expect private individuals to invest money in an undertaking without getting a legitimate dividend upon it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They will get a legitimate dividend.

Mr. MARTELL: You say the test is public service rather than profit.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Otherwise they could not exist. If we have voted moneys sufficient to take care of that sort of activity it would be another matter, but we have not done so and are not likely to. Therefore let us not attempt to spread ourselves all over and accomplish nothing.

Mr. MARTEL: Cut it all out.

Mr. CHAPLIN: When this bill was under consideration before I pointed out the very same feature to the minister and asked him if he would consider an expansion of the clause by including the words "incorporated companies." At that time the minister said the matter would be considered and that the suggestion would likely be adopted. I certainly agree with the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) that with the restrictions laid down in the act there is no reason why incorporated companies should not
5 p.m. be included. I would point out also that the provision is that the Governor in Council "may" enter into a contract; so that the minister cannot say he is not able to prevent people from grabbing, or, to use his own expression, gobbling the whole thing. There is no obligation to enter into a contract; it says the Governor in Council "may" do so.

Amendment (Mr. Martell) negatived.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. MARTELL: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the third reading be delayed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the House.

FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 82, to amend The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think we should have some explanation of this bill.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Perhaps I had better give a general explanation of what is embodied in the bill, and then we can deal with the clauses in detail. The statement which I have is as follows:

In the accompanying schedule a new description of each of the thirty-nine reserves in included, although there is no change proposed in the areas comprising many of these reserves. The rewriting of the schedule was approved owing to the fact that the original description in the 1911 act was made by the metes and bounds system, which is a very cumbersone and complicated method, and also in view of the fact that in the numerous amendments to the original act the lands added or withdrawn have been described by section, township and range. The result is that it is a very difficult matter for anyone not familiar with the act and all its amendments to determine the lands which are included in forest reserves. In the accompanying schedule, each reserve has been described by section, township and range, all previous withdrawals or additions having been taken into consideration, and provision having been made for such alterations as are proposed in the present bill.

Manitoba

Eliminations.

It is proposed to withdraw from the Spruce Woods Forest Reserve three-quarters of a section, and from the Porcupine Forest Reserve No. 1 one-quarter of a section. These lands have been examined and found to be of possible agricultural value. It is also proposed to withdraw 38.00 square miles from the Riding Mountain Forest Reserve. All of this area except one section is included in a block isolated from the main reserve by the withdrawal of lands for soldiers settlement when the act was last amended. This isolated block has been jointly examined by representatives of the Soldier Settlement Board and of the Forestry Branch and it has been decided to eliminate it so that it may be used for soldier settlement.

The total area to be withdrawn from the reserves in Manitoba is 39.00 square miles.

Additions:

It is proposed to add 28.36 square miles to the Riding Mountain Forest Reserve. This area was withdrawn in 1919 for soldier settlement purposes but it has been decided by the Soldier Settlement Board that the lands contained therein are not suitable for soldier settlement, and, located as they are, adjacent to the present reserve boundary and consisting of lands along the south shore of Clear Lake and also of a tract frequented by the elk from the game preserve during the winter months, it is considered that this area would form a valuable addition to the reserve.

One new reserve is poposed, namely, the Sandilands. This proposed reserve is situated in the southeastern part of the province and comprises an area of 187.75 square miles and consists chiefly of sand ridges with intervening muskegs. A soil survey of the area has been made by the Geological Surveys and they classify the land contained therein as being entirely unsuited for agriculture. They recommend that it be reserved for forestry. Our report on the area confirms that of the Geological Surveys.

The total area proposed to be added to the forest reserves in Manitoba is 216.11 square miles.

Saskatchewan

The Steep Creek Forest Reserve which comprises 7.0 square miles has been included in the description of the Nisbet Forest Reserve, as the former reserve is of too small an area to be administered as a unit and is, in fact, now being administered as part of the Nisbet Forest Reserve. The Steep Creek Reserve is an established reserve and no additional area is being placed under permanent reservation by including it in the Nisbet Reserve.

Eliminations:

The withdrawals recommended in Saskatchewan consist of 2.65 square miles from the Moose Mountain Forest Reserve, .50 square miles from the Dundern Reserve, 5.25 square miles from the Fort à la Corne Reserve, .90 square miles from the Nisbet Reserve, 3.51 square miles from the Pines Reserve, 1.54 square miles from the Manito Reserve, 1.44 square miles from the Cypress Hills Reserve No. 2, .50 square miles from the Pasquia Reserve, all of which lands upon re-examination have been found to be of some agricultural value. It is also proposed to withdraw 19.50 square miles from the Keppel Reserve. These lands are either patented to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or lands for which it is desired to grant patent to the company as a result of exchanges for areas which are now included in the reserve. It is recommended that 31 square miles be withdrawn from the Beaver Hills Forest Reserve as a result of a land classification made by the Topographical Surveys Branch.

The total proposed withdrawals comprise an area of 66.79 square miles of land considered to be of agricultural value.

Additions:

It is proposed to add .25 square miles to the Fort à la Corne Forest Reserve. This land which forms a narrow strip between an Indian Reserve and the Forest Reserve was inadvertently omitted in the original act. It is also proposed to include in the Manito Reserve two islands in Manito Lake, the areas of which amount to 2.12 square miles.

Proposed additions to forest reserves in the province of Saskatchewan amount to 2.37 square miles.

Alberta

All lands included in Dominion Parks have been excluded in the descriptions of the Rocky Mountains and Cooking Lake Forest Reserves, as re-written for the accompanying schedule.

Eliminations:

It is proposed to withdraw one quarter section from the Rocky Mountains Forest Reserve, and .31 square miles from the Cypress Hills Reserve No. 1. These lands are considered to be of sufficient agricultural value to warrant withdrawal.

Additions:

No additions proposed.

British Columbia

Eliminations:

Practically all of the lands recommended for withdrawal from reservation in this province have been applied for by returned soldiers under the soldier settlement scheme. The lands have been carefully re-examined and although found in some cases to be of doubtful agricultural value, it is considered advisable to recommend the elimination of the areas in question, as in many instances the applicants intend to use these lands in conjunction with homesteads already held in the same vicinity, and in other cases a half section is granted to one applicant so that the opportunity for successful settlement should be greater than if only the usual grant of a quarter section were allowed. The area proposed to be withdrawn from the reserves in British Columbia comprises 6.06 square miles.

Additions:

It is proposed to add to the Tranquille Forest Reserve one half section which was erroneously eliminated by the 1919 amendment to the act.

That covers the very large amount of descriptive matter in connection with the bill.

Section agreed to and bill reported.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT (1907) AMENDMENT

Hon. James Murdock (Minister of Labour) moved that the House go into committee on Bill No. 84, to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Declaration by officers of trade union:

Mr. GUTHRIE: We want some explanation of this clause?

Mr. MURDOCK: The change proposed here is in order to facilitate the application that may be made for a board of investigation. It has been stated, in certain cases in the past, that committees could not make the necessary application provided for in section 15 of the act for the reason, it was said, that communications which employees committees would address to the employer were unanswered, that negotiations were not held, and that therefore they could not literally make the declaration that negotiations had been held, and that all efforts to effect a settlement as a result of such negotiations had failed. By this section it is proposed to assist in meeting that situation and if the committees can make the necessary declaration that it has been impossible to secure a conference, or enter into negotiation, and that all efforts to obtain a satisfactory settlement have failed that shall be sufficient, in the interest of co-operation as between employer and employee, to warrant the formation of a board.

Section agreed to.

On section 2.—Relation of parties pending proceedings:

Mr. GUTHRIE: We must have some explanation of this clause also.

Mr. MURDOCK: We are undertaking to put in what it has always been held section 57 meant. We are inserting such language as, it is believed, will more clearly convey the original intent. During last summer this particular phase of the Industrial Disputes

Investigation Act was brought to a head when it was undertaken to reduce wages before a board had sat on the controversy and had filed its award. As the result of some correspondence and negotiation in the matter the employers agreed to await the orderly consideration of the controversy involved by a board of investigation, and the filing of the award, before taking advantage of their right to change the wage schedule. There is another important thing in section 57: It is proposed to place clearly upon one of the parties to the dispute the onus or responsibility of applying for the board of investigation. In many cases in the past the employer and the employee have waited for the other to move, the one expecting that the other was going to ask for a board of investigation, neither party accepting it as their responsibility to make the necessary application. It seems as though—in the general orderly process that, I think, Canada requires in the conduct of relations between employers and workmen—the responsibility for making the application should rest somewhere. We are trying, in section 57, to define where that responsibility shall rest and to indicate to either the employer or the employee, as the case may be, that it is his responsibility under the law to make the necessary application for the board.

Mr. BOYS: Is there any compulsory feature in connection with this proposed amendment? I do not quite see what change is brought about by it. One of the parties must make application under the existing law and will not that be the same under the amendment? Unfortunately, I have not the act itself here, and without it it is very difficult to follow these proceedings.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend will look through the bill he will see that the new words, which it is proposed to include, in section 57, are set out in italics. It is placed on the page opposite that in which the text of the proposed Bill No. 84 appears. There is the entire language of the section.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not quite clear as to the meaning of the word "desired." Will the minister explain that fully?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am quite sure my hon. friend for South Wellington will agree that an employer might indicate his intention to change a particular wage rate, either by reducing it or increasing it, as and of a certain date, but an employee can only indicate a desire for an increased wage rate, or changed conditions, as of a certain date, and it seems as though there is a very proper distinction between the intention of the employer to change wage rates and the expressed desire of the employee for changed wage rates, and that is the distinction which we propose to recognize.

Mr. BOYS: I read the bill hurriedly and when I first spoke I did not notice that section 57 was quoted on the opposite page. The language is—

> The application for the appointment of a board shall be made by the employers or the employees proposing the change in wages or hours.

Has that always been done? One party had to make the application, so far as I know the law.

Mr. MURDOCK: I only wish to say that my hon. friend's understanding was right, but unfortunately we have not found it so. I could give many concrete examples to indicate to my hon. friend that both sides have just simply marked time and done nothing, or as some would say glared at each other, and passed the buck, indicating it was the other fellow's turn to move, and nothing was done until there was a strike. That is not right, and both could state with some degree of accuracy under the law, that it was not their turn to move. There was no specific or special obligation placed upon them to take action. In other words, the employees have said that the employer should set the example, and the employer generally said "The employees are the most concerned, and they should make the application for the board." My hon. friend may be interested in knowing that by far the largest number of applications that have been made for boards have been made by employees and not by employers.

Mr. BOYS: I think the minister misunderstood what I meant. All I said was that, so far as the law was concerned at present, the application for a board must be made by one of the affected parties. As far as I can read this amendment, that is so. All the bill says is that:

> The application for the appointment of a board shall be made by the employers or employees proposing the change in wages or hours.

Suppose they do not make it, what will happen?

Mr. MURDOCK: If they do not make it, we will be in very much the same position as we have been in the past.

Mr. BOYS: Exactly.

Mr. MURDOCK: In answer to my hon. friend as to what will happen then, I cannot

say. Many things have happened in the past. Strikes have taken place without a board being applied for, which is undesirable, and when these strikes have taken place I do not think there has been one case in which it has not been alleged that it was the other fellow's business to make application for the board. That has been the claim on both sides. We want to place clearly the responsibility for making the applications. We think this will help do that, and I have never before heard the contention that it would not be an additional help if we could place the responsibility for applying for the board.

Mr. BOYS: I do not see that that explanation disposes of the matter. Suppose the application is not made, are we any further ahead than we are at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, sir.

Mr. BOYS: I would like the hon. member to explain the improvement the proposed amendment will bring about.

Mr. MURDOCK: The improvement would be that we would, at least, know definitely under the proposed change who it was that had failed to exercise the obligation as a citizen of Canada, whether it was the employer or the employee. We want to place the responsibility for failure to do the thing which the public expects shall be done on the part of an employer or on the part of the employee.

Mr. BOYS: If neither responds, I do not know how you will fix responsibility. They are both in default.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can explain the matter. I remember the question coming up on different occasions when I had to do with the administration of the act. The purpose of the law is to prevent any sudden change of conditions in regard to those utilities to which the act applies. If the employer changes the conditions, where the law provides that there may be no strike or lockout as a consequence of the change, the working man may claim—and I think my hon. friend will see that there is a sense of fairness in it—that it is but right that, inasmuch as the employer has made the change, he should ask for a board, rather than that the employee should be put in the position of appearing to be the party always agitating for a board. It simply puts on the person the onus responsible for the change in conditions of asking for the board, to avoid a strike or lockout. The result is the same, but it does not put the opposing party in a false position. If the workmen ask for a change in wages or hours, the employer need not threaten a lockout before a board is appointed. It is up to the workmen themselves to ask for a board, they being the ones who are responsible for the change in that case. It is a matter simply of trying to place, so far as the public are concerned, the onus of asking for a board on the party who is responsible for the change in conditions.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

TRADE MARK AND DESIGNS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill 21, to amend the Trade Mark and Designs Act.

Mr. BOYS: I do not think this bill was mentioned last night as one of the matters which was to have been considered to-day, and I happen to know that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has given this subject some attention.

Mr. ROBB: I know the hon. member for South Wellington is particularly interested in the Copyright Act. This is not the Copyright Act.

Mr. BOYS: I understood he had gone into this as well. I do not want to see the business of the House held up; but if some other business could be gone on with, I should be glad.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would Bill No. 20, to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to Patents of Invention be all right?

Mr. BOYS: The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is devoting himself to that, and he is at present in the Banking and Commerce committee. The great trouble is that all these members are engaged on various committees, and it is difficult to have them in the House. If the Prime Minister particularly wants to take up this bill, I will get the hon. member at once.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will agree to whatever my hon. friend wishes.

Mr. ROBB: The bill to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act is only a minor one, and we could go on with that while the hon. member is getting the hon. member for Vancouver Centre.

Mr. BOYS: The hon. member for South Wellington is gone, and I am told that his papers are at his house; but I am quite will-

ing, if something is taken up for a few moments, to send for the hon. member for Vancouver Centre.

Motion stands.

PATENTS OF INVENTION

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 20, to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to Patents of Invention.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask the minister to explain.

Mr. ROBB: This act has not been revised since 1903, about twenty years ago. A bill was introduced in 1920; but at that time owing to other business and the lateness of the session, the bill was not pressed. The bill was again introduced in 1921, and it reached its second reading. I understand the bill had at that time been submitted by the government of the day to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and different public bodies interested, and that it had met with their approval; but when it had reached its second reading, there was some objection from some individual manufacturers, and the bill was not pressed. Canada now desires to enter the Berne Convention, so that we in Canada shall be on the same basis with all the world. Incidentally I might say that Canada's cost for maintenance of the International Convention at Berne will run about $5,000 to $6,000 per year, and that the revenue from the Patents branch is about $250,000 a year. The experience of the officers in the administration of that department has convinced them that certain amendments to this act are very desirable in the interests of the Canadian public generally. The more important provisions in the bill relate to the manufacture and importation of patent inventions, and they will be found in clauses 40 and 41. It is thought that the proposed improvement to the act will enable Canada to join the International Berne Convention and will improve the position generally of Canadian citizens in trade throughout the world. There are some minor provisions so as to transfer to the Patent office the right to revive lapsed patents, because this now requires an act of parliament and interested parties are put to considerable expense. We propose to modify that in some degree. That is briefly the gist of the bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister explain to the House the full benefits of the Berne Convention?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is second reading.

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. ROBB: We shall have that as we go along in committee.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definitions:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are there any changes in this clause?

Mr. ROBB: In paragraph (e) the letter "e" is added. That is the only change.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is in the word "patentee." What did it read before?

Mr. ROBB: I think it read "e" instead of "ee".

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This bill does not show, as does the last bill, what changes are to be made in it. Looking at it, we do not know what the previous law was. Instead of delaying the matter, I am going to rely on the minister. Does the minister say that there is no change in this clause except the correction of the mistake in spelling in the former section 2?

Mr. ROBB: That is my information from the department.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Patent Office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I put the same question to the minister.

Mr. ROBB: There is no change whatever. This is the same as the old act.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Duties of commissioner.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No change?

Mr. ROBB: No change.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Powers of commissioner.

Mr. ROBB: I have a memorandum from the department in connection with this. I beg to move:

That clause 5 be struck out and the following substituted:

"5. The commissioner shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed upon him by this act subject to the minister and in the absence or inability to act of the commissioner any officer or clerk named by the minister to perform the duties of the commissioner may as acting commissioner exercise such powers and shall perform such duties".

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister will state the effect of that change. What is sought to be done?

Mr. ROBB: Under the Patent Act as it stood in 1918, the Minister of Agriculture was the Commissioner of Patents and the Deputy Minister of Agriculture was the Deputy Commissioner of Patents.

In that year the Patent Office having been transferred by order in council to the Department of Trade and Commerce, by law the Minister of Trade and Commerce became the Commissioner of Patents and his deputy became the Deputy Commissioner of Patents. This was contrary to the intention of the government which, in making the transfer, intended to leave the administration of the Patent Act in the hands of the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Commissioner of Patents under the Minister of Trade and Commerce as a deputy minister but with the title of Solicitor of Patents.

In July, 1919, to carry out their intention, the government caused an act to be passed, chapter 64, providing for the appointment of the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture as Commissioner of Patents and that he should continue to be a deputy minister. My hon. friend will remember that. By that act the minister ceased to be commissioner and the position of deputy commissioner disappeared.

As all the powers and authority of the act were then by its terms conferred on the commissioner it was enacted by the act of 1919 that the word "minister" should be substituted for the word "commissioner" throughout the act. The powers were all vested in the minister but were to be exercised by the commissioner. As there has been no revision of the statutes since 1919 the substitution of the terms has not been made and according to the text of the Patent Act all the powers are conferred on the commissioner. In 1920, the bill, substantially in the form in which it has been recently introduced, was revised and put into form for parliament by the then Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Gisborne, who decided that it was preferable to retain the text of the act as it stood without the substitution of the terms, and this accounts for the present form of the bill conferring all its powers on the commissioner instead of the minister. Of course it was understood that the commissioner was to be subject to the minister in the exercise of the powers given him. Having decided to retain the text of the old act, clause 5 should not be in its present form in the bill as the commissioner and not the minister is authorized and empowered by the bill to do the several things therein mentioned.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Trying to put what has been said into short, commonsense language, I suppose that the change is one which throws upon the commissioner, instead of upon the minister, the right to carry out the Patent Act; in other words, to exercise the functions which are given thereunder.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, but always subject to the minister.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that although the powers are all given to the commissioner absolutely, the minister has the right to tell him whether he shall exercise them or not.

Mr. ROBB: Does not my hon. friend think that is advisable?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am merely trying at the moment to get at the facts. You have a general delegation of powers by parliament given to the commissioner, and then you provide that notwithstanding all this, the minister may take those powers from him at any time he likes, and the commissioner is to act only as the minister directs. Am I right in assuming that this is what the minister is doing?

Mr. ROBB: I think my hon. friend will agree that that is fair legislation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want the facts.

Mr. ROBB: The minister of the day is the person finally responsible to parliament.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that that is at all something we can admit. I wanted first of all to find out what the facts were before I started to debate the question. This is not an ordinary matter of administration, for the commissioner is charged with duties which are practically judicial in their character. He passes on matters of tremendous importance, and I wanted to find out whether, instead of having a particular specified officer entrusted by parliament with the discharge of highly technical and difficult duties, the act was going to provide that the minister at any time could interfere with that work and discharge these functions himself.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend argue that parliament should delegate to an official, a civil servant, if you wish to use that word, all powers of administration, removing them from the purview of parliament?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I am not going that length at all.

Mr. ROBB: That is the logical inference from what the hon. member has said.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Undoubtedly there is an administrative side of the office, embracing the conduct of ordinary business and so forth. But there is also a judicial phase of the duties of this officer; he has to decide whether Jones shall get a patent or Smith shall be denied one, or whether any patent shall issue at all. Does my hon. friend suggest that under this scheme of legislation, which I may say I have not had the chance of reading, but which I am just following as it comes along, the minister should have the right to interfere in the issuance of a patent here or a patent there.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend knows that the commissioner is a deputy minister and exercises all the powers of a deputy, subject always to his minister. The hon. member was himself a minister and he knows that it is not the custom of ministers to interfere unduly with administration.

Mr. FORKE: The provision here also refers to any clerk; it says "or any clerk."

Mr. ROBB: Of course, there must be some provision for the business to be carried on in the absence of the deputy.

Mr. FORKE: Is it not rather serious for a clerk occupying a junior position to decide whether a patent shall be issued? The provision seems rather wide.

Mr. ROBB: What he does is always subject to the approval of the government. If my hon. friend were a minister and he appointed a clerk he would be finally responsible.

Mr. FORKE: If I were seeking a patent I should hate to have a clerk decide upon it.

Mr. ROBB: I think people do, generally.

Mr. FORKE: I have heard complaints along that line.

Mr. STEVENS: I think I see the minister's point, but this official is in a somewhat different position from the ordinary deputy. All through this act the commissioner exercises exceptionally responsible powers and discharges very onerous duties. The safeguard mentioned by the hon. member for Brandon is an appeal from the decision of the commissioner to the Exchequer Court. That, I think, adequately protects the public from that angle. While I have given the act some consideration I have not studied this particular phase of it, but it would appear that in ordinary matters of departmental routine the minister desires to bring the commissioner under his control as an ordinary deputy. I would point out however, that it would hardly do to make the commissioner subject to the minister in the discharge of his functions under the act as commissioner in the determining of applications for patents. I do not think that this should be subject to the review of the minister, because it is subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court. So that if this amendment is inserted some distinction should be made between these two classes of duties of the commissioner. Perhaps the minister might be able to clear up that point.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend must appreciate this, that we are giving no greater powers to the Commissioner of Patents than we give to the Deputy Minister of Finance or the Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, yes.

Mr. ROBB: No, they must be subject to the minister of the day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely my hon. friend is not serious in suggesting that no greater powers are given here than are given to other deputies. What statutory power has the deputy of either of the other offices? We are giving great statutory power here and it is only right that we should do so. We are giving powers under the act to an officer who understands this kind of work, who has special knowledge of it, and has had expert training to enable him properly to discharge his duties. What other deputy has the same powers? You may call him deputy or anything else you like; the designation has nothing to do with this bill. His deputyship refers to his standing in the civil service, with his rights of pension and so forth. But what other deputy is in the position of extinguishing or creating legal rights, involving great sums of money, as is this deputy, if you care to describe him as such. I would suggest to the hon. minister that we proceed with other sections, bearing this point in mind. It may be that after we have gone through the act we will have no difficulty whatever in either consenting on the one hand to the amendment or on the other hand in making a slight alteration to it which while leaving the minister in complete control of the administration of the office, would protect the public from political interference in the granting of patents.

Mr. ROBB: I have no objection to delaying it, but I would point out that, admitting for the moment all my hon. friend has said, is there not all the more reason why some responsible person elected by the people should have the last word in case of dispute?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would not think so at all. I would think that what the people are interested in, in the first instance, is a proper patent law, and, next, an impartial non-political administration of that law. I would not think they would be at all interested in knowing that the person who administered it was concerned in votes in this or that constituency.

Mr. ROBB: They are not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is for the purpose of getting away from just what my hon. friend says the practice has always been, to take to the Exchequer Court the question as to whether a patent ought or ought not to be granted. I fear that under this section the minister can take the place of the Exchequer Court to some extent.

Mr. ROBB: All the powers to-day under the existing act are in the hands of the minister. We are widening them a little, transferring some of the powers to a commissioner.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And under the existing act the minister has absolutely full responsibility, there is no chance of his saying that it is the commissioner who is doing this thing; there is no chance of the hidden hand. If it is done in this way the minister, so far as the public is concerned, has no responsibility at all, for he can say that he has the active commissioner administering the act and cannot interfere.

Mr. ROBB: I am afraid my hon. friend does not understand the section. We will let it stand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I confess I have not had a chance to go into it.

Section stands.

On section 7—Applications for patents—who may obtain patents:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Any change?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: This is partly a new clause. In line 29 there is a period of two years fixed. In the following clause it will be noted that a period of one year is prescribed. Why should two years be fixed?

Mr. ROBB: Under the old section public use or sale for more than one year in any part of the world prior to application for a patent is a bar. Under the new clause public use or sale is extended to two years. One year has been found in practice to be a very short time in which to allow an inventor to try out his invention on the public in order to ascertain whether or not it is worth patenting. This gives a little more time.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not particularly disputing that, but still I am not at all agreeing that it is a wise change, unless the officials of the department are very sure of their ground based upon extended practice. But the words in line 30, "in this country", I understand are not in the old act, and objection is taken to them on the ground that it is going to hamper inventors. There seems to be no particular reason why they should be inserted there. It is sufficient to control the situation to leave out the words I have referred to.

Mr. ROBB: Those words were put in with a view to protecting Canadian patentees against unscrupulous persons from other countries who might come in and interfere with the patentees' rights.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think, Mr. Chairman, we will get along better if before we do anything with these sections the minister will tell us just what changes are proposed. We now learn from the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) that there are two changes here. Are there any others?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we should have all the changes of each section stated so we can understand what we are discussing.

Mr. ROBB: In the old section the word "process" does not appear in the list of inventions for which patents may be granted. Patents for processes are very numerous. They were supposed to be included in the term "art" in the old section, but it has been questioned.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So we have those three changes?

Mr. ROBB: Those three minor changes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not see any objection to the extension of the word "process" at all. As to the point raised in connection with the words "in this country," I suppose really what is behind it is this: that you might have a perfectly proper Canadian patent attacked on the ground that it has

been for sale or in use for a couple of years, say, in the interior of China, and a Canadian patentee might find it very difficult to meet such a case.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has stated the point exactly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then it seems to me to be a move in the right direction.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Inventions for which foreign patents have been taken out, etc.

Mr. ROBB: We propose to amend clause 8 by adding at the end of sub-clause 1 the following words:

or from the passing of this act if no patent has been issued on a foreign application for an invention for more than one year.

And after the word "filed" in the eleventh line of sub-clause 2, the following words:

or from the passing of this act.

It has been pointed out that in order to avoid injustice it is necessary to extend the time allowed by this clause for filing an application in Canada for a patent after a foreign application for the invention has been filed.

Under section 8 of the present act, an application may be filed in Canada by the inventor at any time within one year from the date of the earliest foreign patent granted for his invention. Under the clause as it stands the year runs from the date of the foreign application and not from the date of the patent.

Inventors who have relied on the terms of the present law would find that they would be too late to file an application in Canada as in many cases particularly in the United States patent office where the work is in arrears their applications may have been pending two or three years.

Such inventors should be allowed one year after the new act comes into force to file their applications in Canada and consequently this clause should be amended by adding at the end the amendments I have just submitted.

Mr. STEVENS: I confess it is a little difficult to appreciate the significance of these two amendments.

Mr. ROBB: We will let them stand, if my hon. friend so desires.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not press that; but do I understand from the amendment that the suggestion is that a patent might have been issued to a foreigner for one year?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the amendment really agrees with the minister's explanation. What I thought he meant was this: that patentees who desired to get their patents might not know about the passing of this act, and therefore if the provision were put back to the time the application for patent was made, the rights of the applicant might expire. It would appear that the minister's desire was to extend the rights of the patentees to this extent, but I do not think the amendment does that. I do not see how the stipulation about one year comes in at all. Why not simply say, "or from the passing of this act?"

Mr. ROBB: It is pointed out that an application may have been made eighteen months ago, and the patent was allowed a year; we are giving him a year from the passing of this act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the significance of these words:

If no patent has been issued on a foreign application for the invention for more than one year.

Suppose it has been issued for two years, what would the minister say then?

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister's object not be attained, as suggested by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), by saying "or from the passing of this act" and letting it end there?

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 110, (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Fong Young.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 111, (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Percy Eversfield.—Mr. Ryckman.

PATENTS OF INVENTIONS

House again in committee on Bill No. 20, to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to Patents of Inventions, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that clause 8 as amended carry?

Mr. STEVENS: Is the minister satisfied, after thinking this over that it is necessary to have the amendments as amended?

Mr. ROBB: Yes after discussing it with the commissioner we are satisfied that the clause should go through just as amended.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Canadian society known as the Society of Chemical Industries have asked that an amendment be made to this section by striking out the words "in Canada" in the sixteenth line of subsection 2. I have not for the moment had time to consider what the effect of the proposed amendment is.

Mr. ROBB: If those words were struck out it would conflict with some clauses that have already been passed. We have had some representatives from the chemical association regarding clause 16, and we are largely meeting their views in that clause.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the minister any objection to striking out the words "in Canada"?

Mr. ROBB: It would conflict with clause 7.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I see that the society proposes an amendment to clause 7 but I was not present when that clause was being considered. They ask that the words "in this country" in line thirty of the section be deleted. I was going to ask the minister if he would refer back to that clause when consideration of the bill is finished so that the amendment might be made.

Mr. ROBB: There is a difference of opinion upon the subject. The majority of views coming into the department indicates that the clause is better as it is.

Mr. McMASTER: I may state in connection with subsection 2 that I have had the advantage of receiving a memorandum concerning this bill from one of the foremost patent solicitors in the country. In that memorandum he indicates that subsection 2 is a very desirable one and should remain as it is.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 9—Improvements may be patented:

Mr. ROBB: That is the same clause as before.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Oath of inventor to be made before obtaining patent:

Mr. ROBB: The committee will observe that there are slight changes in subsection 2. The following words have been added, after the word "dead" in this section:

"Or mentally or physically incapable, or after the assignment of his invention, the inventor refuses to make such oath or affirmation, or if his whereabouts cannot be ascertained after diligent inquiry.

Experience has shown that this addition is necessary. In a case reported to the Patent office action was taken to compel the inventor to make an oath after assignment, and it was held that the court did not have the power to make such order.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—Refusal to execute assignment:

Mr. ROBB: This is new. My memorandum reads:

At the Imperial War Conference, 1917, certain amendments proposed to be made to the British act were submitted for the consideration of the delegates, with a view to their adoption by their respective governments. In the memorandum prepared by the department in connection with the Imperial War Conference in 1918 it was recommended that certain of the amendments, including the present one, be adopted, experience has shown that this amendment will be useful.

Mr. BOYS: I observe that this clause provides for an appeal. It does not say whether it may be taken in one month or six months or five years. I observe in section 20 that that feature has been considered and an appeal may be taken at any time within six months after notice has been given. I think there should be some time fixed within which the appeal can be taken. A matter of such importance as this should not be disposed of as in the last four lines of this section. It provides that one of the parties, where there are two interested in a patent, may be allowed to prosecute his application. I think that should only be done on definite notice to the other party interested. I daresay the minister will see that that is provided for. The last four lines read:

—so however that all parties interested shall be entitled to be heard before the commissioner, and an appeal shall lie from the decision of the commissioner under this section to the Exchequer Court.

I think there should be a provision requiring certain notice of a definite length of time to be given to one of two applicants who is not proceeding with the application. After that notice the commissioner might well proceed and dispose of the application as he thought best. The remaining two lines should be varied and they should provide that after notice to the applicant who has been successful, say, in ten days or two months or whatever time the minister thinks would be reasonable, the other party could appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. ROBB: I admit there is some force in the argument of my hon. friend. This clause was presented at the Imperial Conference in 1917. I suggest we might let the matter stand and if the hon. member will confer with the deputy—

Mr. BOYS: If the minister thinks the suggestion is worthy of consideration I think the deputy could work it out.

Mr. ROBB: Let it stand.

Section stands.

On section 12—Election of domiciles:

Mr. ROBB: I propose to move, in substitution for clause 12, the following clause:

(a) Every applicant for a patent and patentee who does not reside in Canada shall file at the Patent office a notice in writing designating, and specifying the address of some person resident in Canada to represent and stand in the place and stead of such applicant or patentee for all the purposes of this act including the service of proceedings taken under any provision of this act.

(b) Upon failure to file such notice as above required or in the event of the person designated not being found at the address specified the applicant or the patentee as the case may be shall be deemed to have elected domicile for all purposes aforesaid at the Patent office.

(c) In the case of applications pending or patents issued at the time of the coming into force of this act the applicant or patentee shall not be in default in respect of such notice before the expiration of six months from such time.

(d) Copies of any proceedings under any provision of this act served upon or left for any applicant or patentee at the Patent office shall be forwarded by mail to his last known address.

The object of this clause is: Under the previous clause domicile was given simply in some city, without giving any address therein, and in consequence the section serves no purpose. The draft clause which we now propose is satisfactory to all interested. If the hon. member opposite desires to have this go on Hansard and stand for further consideration, I have no objection.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The first two paragraphs are perfectly plain but I did not get the effect of the last one.

Mr. STEVENS: It struck me, from what the minister read, that what he was substituting for clause 12 is more complicated than the present clause. I will admit the present clause is very brief, but it does provide that the applicant shall elect his domicile in Canada. My own notion is that the more simple we make the legislation the better. Unless there are very strong reasons for changing the section, I think it would be inadvisable to change it, but if there has been experience in the way of extensive litigation or something of that kind, of course it might justify the change.

Mr. ROBB: Experience has been that in many instances they are unable to find the patentee, who has given his address as Montreal, Vancouver, or Toronto, without designating any particular street.

[Mr. Robb.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the hon. minister quite clear that this will only apply to non-residents?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend will note in paragraph (a), it states that every applicant for a patent and patentee who does not reside in Canada shall file at the Canadian office, and so on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are you quite sure that covers the other clauses?

Mr. STEVENS: The present clause does not refer merely to absentees.

Mr. ROBB: We propose to make it more clear.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it proposed to add this provision to the present clause?

Mr. ROBB: No, it is in substitution. It has had the approval of the law officers.

Mr. McMASTER: Section 11 of the present act provides that:

The applicant for a patent shall, for the purposes of this act, elect his domicile at some known and specified place in Canada, and shall mention the same in his petition for a patent. R.S., c. 69, s. 11.

That would cover both those who live in the country, and those who reside outside of the country. I do not see the necessity for the change which would merely put the obligation of electing domicile on some one who lives outside the country. I do not see the reason for the change.

Mr. ROBB: It is very largely because experience has been that 75 per cent of the patents issued are to non-residents.

Mr. STEVENS: If the minister drops the existing clause, then applicants who are bona fide citizens and residents of Canada would not be provided for at all, because his substitution clause refers to applicants for patents who do not reside in Canada. If the minister intends to add these three, four subclauses to the existing clause, that might be desirable: but I cannot see how we could possibly drop the existing clause altogether.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The difficulty with this clause arises from the legal fiction of the language; that is, that the applicant, although he may live out of Canada, shall elect his domicile in Canada. Any domicile so elected is not the true domicile of the applicant, and I can see reasons why an applicant might decline to elect a domicile in Canada. I think the new clause, while it is lengthy, applies to this case. One who comes from the United States, Europe, the ends of the earth, should give, in a case of this kind, an address in

Canada which, if it does not reach him, will reach someone authorized by him, and that is what this amendment provides. A man living in the United States, Europe or the aforesaid end of the earth, is not electing a true domicile if he names Canada as his domicile. I think the clause as it is proposed to amend it is quite proper.

Mr. ROBB: If this will meet the wishes of the committee, there will be no objection to striking out the words "who does not reside in Canada," so that the clause will apply to every person.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would seem rather absurd if that is done, because the clause will then read that every person who is an applicant in Canada shall specify some person who resides in Canada to do his business for him.

Mr. ROBB: He may elect his own domicile.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: "Of some person." It looks as though the person were someone other than himself. I am in no difficulty about the question of domicile in clause 12 as regards a Canadian; I do not think the clause was ever intended to apply to him in one way or the other. It seems rather absurd to say that a Canadian has to declare a domicile in Canada. This was never done anywhere else as regards a Canadian citizen; it is to cover the case of a foreigner. I think the minister will tell me that that is how the act is being administered. Am I right?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, if I am right in that, there is one real objection to this. It is too vague and it is much better to have a specific name and address for purposes of business. Would the department use sub-clause (d) for the purpose of serving papers in that way on people in Canada who have not given that address and who have not made that nomination? Sub-clause (d) is limited.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it the intention of the minister to drop clause 12?

Mr. ROBB: No, I think we had better accept the substitution.

Mr. STEVENS: That is what I say. Does the minister intend to drop clause 12?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, the old one.

Mr. STEVENS: I must say that I disagree with my hon. friend who spoke a moment ago regarding this. It certainly is necessary to have the address of an applicant in Canada recorded, as well as that of an applicant from outside of Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: How would the clause read when amended?

Mr. ROBB: It would read:

> Every applciant for a patent and patentee who does not reside in Canada shall file at the Patent Office a notice in writing designating, and specifying the address of, some person resident in Canada to represent and stand in the place of such applicant or patentee for all the purposes of this act including the service of proceedings taken under any provision of this act.

Mr. McMASTER: I can see the advantage of having it stated that an applicant who comes in from outside shall specify someone in Canada on whom papers will be served. I do not, however, see that that is incompatible with the retention of the law as it is, that an applicant living in Canada should indicate his address, should elect a domicile. He can elect domicile at his office; he can elect domicile at his residence; or in the event of his expecting to be out of the country, he can elect domicile at some patent solicitor, or family solicitor, or his business counsel on whom he wishes papers to be served. I think the clause as drafted is a good one; but I do not think it should be substituted for the present law. It should be added to the present law, and the officers in charge of the bill should draft a bill which would cover the situation as I think it should be covered.

Mr. ROBB: If that will meet the wishes of the committee or the legal members of the committee, we can add this sub-clause 2 of clause 12.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It cannot do any harm. I do not know if it will do any good.

Mr. PUTNAM: Would that allow a man to elect a domicile not his true domicile?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that what the hon. member for Brome is really trying to get at is this, that a man might well want to have another specific address for the purpose of service, which would not be his home address. The word "domicile" is not at all appropriate for that, but it would do no harm leaving it in, I suppose.

Mr. FORTIER: Why not leave the clause as it is and substitute the word "mention" for "elect"?

Mr. ROBB: That is what we have decided to do.

Mr. FORTIER: The clause would then read:

The applicant for a patent shall, for the purposes of this act, mention his domicile.

If he is resident in this country he will give his Canadian address and if he lives outside he can elect his address there for the purposes of the act.

Mr. PUTNAM: I agree with the hon. member. I care not whether the language is new or old, it is an anomaly to say that a man may elect his domicile.

Mr. McMASTER: That may be an anomaly under English practice, but it is not an anomaly under the practice of the civil courts of Quebec, where people constantly elect domicile for the purposes of contracts, or specifying the place at which legal papers may be served upon them.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I wish to make myself clear on this point if I can. I object to the word "domicile" being used to apply to an applicant who is not resident in Canada. "Domicile" is derived in two ways. You have an actual domicile where you live and are well known to reside, in short where you sleep at night; and you can elect another one, so long as you use it as the place where you reside, in other words where you sleep at night. There are questions of taxation that arise, and there are also questions in divorce court proceedings that come up in the United States; and there is many an applicant for a patent from Canada who is unwilling to have himself described as taking the first step towards acquiring domicile by election. He might find out when he had effected domicile that he was held to reside in that place and therefore came within the tax law or the divorce law of that country. Let us consider the case of an applicant for a patent in Canada who elected his domicile, for reasons best known to himself, in the city of Montreal. Suppose divorce proceedings should take place in one of the United States, Nevada, for instance, and he should be on the witness stand. If he were asked to state his domicile, which is a most important matter, he would give the address of the place where he resided, wherever it might be. But someone would confront him with the statement made by him over his own hand that he was domiciled in Canada. The thing is simply inconsistent; the word "domicile" is not strictly applicable in this connection; it is a heritage, a vestige of the past. Let us make it plain that the applicant for a patent in Canada shall give a specific address where he can be reached by any communication that might be addressed to him; and let us provide further that in case he is not reached at that address there will be someone there empowered to receive communications on his behalf.

Mr. MARTELL: I thoroughly agree with what has been said by the last speaker. If you leave the word "domicile" in the section you will simply leave it open to a great deal of legal argument. Anyone who has studied law knows that the law of domicile is one of the most perplexing of legal questions. We are told by the law lecturers and the text books that in order to establish domicile a person must have the animus manendi without the animus revirtendi.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MARTELL: It is all very well for hon. members to say "oh, oh" but if they do not know what the law is I cannot help that. That is the sort of law we got in Nova Scotia, the good old English law.

An hon. MEMBER: They do not understand the Latin.

Mr. MARTELL: Well, I cannot help that. The principle is that the man must have the mind to remain in a certain place and not the mind to return to the place from which he came. That is not the intention in this act. A man may be a United States citizen and may wish to secure a patent in Canada. But it is not necessary in order that he may get it that he should be domiciled in Canada; and it seems to me that the whole intention of the act is to have him designate some place in Canada where all legal documents or anything appertaining to the patent might be served on him. When the minister inserts the word "domicile" he does not realize the trouble he is laying up in store for the courts in the future; it is simply opening the door to endless litigation. I would suggest that the minister strike out the word "domicile" and insert instead the word "residence," or other words indicating some place where legal process could be served upon the applicant.

Mr. ROBB: If we do that we shall be striking out words that have been in the act for fifty years.

Mr. HANSON: That is no reason at all; it is the weakest argument. I agree with the learning exhibited by the hon. member (Mr. Martell). He was brought up in the same legal school as myself—

Mr. MARTELL: A good one, too.

Mr. HANSON: —and he recalls pleasant memories. However, joking aside, he is

absolutely right, and I am glad to find myself in agreement with him for once.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I hesitate to say a word when the argument has been amongst gentlemen who are able to refer to one another as "my learned friend." .However, I want to interject a word or two of common sense after so much legal verbiage. The section may be considered from two standpoints, one with regard to Canadians and the other to outsiders. Let the Canadian have his domicile here and let the other man designate some place where papers can be served on him.

Mr. PUTNAM: That is the proposal. Now we are looking to the last hon. gentleman for the language.

Mr. BOYS: While this discussion has been going on I have been trying to draft a clause to cover the proposal. I would offer the following:

Every applicant for a patent shall, for the purposes of this act, state in his application, if resident in Canada, his address in Canada, and if not so resident, the name and address of some person resident in Canada to represent and stand in the place and stead of such applicant or patentee for all the purposes of this act, including the service of proceedings taken under any of the provisions of this act.

Mr. ROBB: We will accept that amendment.

Mr. BOYS: As a matter of fact, I am adopting in the part complained of the language which the minister had in the closing part of paragraph (a) of the proposed amendment. Someone asks me whether I said anything about street address in the clause I have drafted. I should think the word "address" would be sufficient.

Mr. McMASTER: Meaning his postal address.

Mr. BOYS: I do not think it would be necessary to mention anything about street address.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 13—Particulars required on application:

Mr. ROBB: No change.

Section agreed to.

On section 14—Specifications; place and date; drawings; duplicates; copies in place of duplicates:

Mr. McMASTER: What changes are made in this section?

Mr. ROBB: Subclause 2 is changed by striking out the words "and by two witnesses to such signature of the applicant." This is to conform to the practice in Great Britain, the United States and other countries. There are no other changes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is another change in the act; section 15 of the old act has been omitted. That section provided that "on each application for a patent a thorough and reliable examination shall be made by competent examiners to be employed in the patent office for that purpose." Representations have been made to me that the examination before a patent is granted is perhaps the most valuable part of the procedure, for it saves many a contest after the patent is granted. My proposal is that a section be added as section 14-A re-enacting section 15 of the Patent Act and adding thereto as subsection 2 the following:

The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the manner in which an invention shall be examined, and such regulations shall be published in the Canada Gazette and shall form part of this act.

I do not see why the clause providing for an examination was eliminated. I am informed that in Washington very special and very strict examinations take place before patents are issued, far more strict than we have ever been in the habit of applying to applications here. I suppose there has been some reason for leaving out clause 15 of the old act. Perhaps the minister would give the committee his reasons.

I have been asked to move that clause 15 of the old act in the form I have read to the committee be restored.

Mr. McMASTER: Subsection 5 of section 14 reads as follows:

The commissioner may, in his discretion, dispense with the duplicate specification and drawing, and in lieu thereof cause copies of the specification and drawing, in print or otherwise, to be attached to the patent, of which they shall form an essential part.

I would suggest that there should be inserted after the word "drawing" these further words:

and the additional or third copy of the claim or claims.

I believe this will make the subsection fit in better with the rest of the section.

Mr. ROBB: The law in its present form has worked very satisfactorily, and if the clause suggested by my hon. friend for Brome were adopted it would involve additional work, which would mean an increase in the number of employees with a consequent and very material increase in the expenses of administration without any very good results accruing.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not press my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The following is moved in amendment by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) as section 14 (a):

On each application for a patent a thorough and reliable examination shall be made by competent examiners to be employed in the Patent Office for that purpose.

(2) The Governor in Council may make regulations describing the manner in which an invention shall be examined, and such regulations shall be published in the Canada Gazette and shall form part of this act.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I am sure no one will see the objection to this amendment quicker than its mover, because no later than last night he criticized the department somewhat severely for taking on additional employees to deal with the business of the country. I am told that in Washington there are over 400 examiners employed, and on the same basis applied to our business it would involve an additional 100 employees and increase the civil government expenses about $250,000 a year to carry out the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As I understand, section 15 has been in force all these years, and I have been under the impression that the necessary examinations took place under it. I am merely asking to put in the present bill what we have had in force since 1887.

Mr. ROBB: But experience has taught us that it has been honoured mostly in the breach.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the difficulty. It is complained that Canadian patents do not have the same standing as American, for the reason that there is not that careful and thorough examination made in our Patent office before the patent is issued. I have heard patent solicitors in this country and in the United States make the same observation. United States patents are by no means absolute, but they are very seldom overridden by their courts as compared with the experience in our courts. The reason is that they are more carefully examined and tested before the patent is issued. This clause requiring examination has certainly been in our statutes since the act was passed, and I was under the impression that it was being carried out. If 400 examiners are required in a country like the United States, a country which has 120,000,000 people and the largest patent office in the world, I should think that from half a dozen to a dozen should do the work here. But I had thought that some examination was always made and that men were employed in the department for that purpose. If there is no examination now before a patent is granted I can well understand that the Canadian patent is not looked upon as a very valuable asset, because undoubtedly it could be upset in the courts.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to support what the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has said. Perhaps I am wrong, but I cannot imagine what the value of a Canadian patent would be if it is issued without any examination as to its novelty or usefulness. I have heard that the present Patent office is understaffed and that they are not coping with the work in the way we would like to see the work done. At the same time, we are rushing from one extreme to the other if we do away with any examination whatsoever. I have had an opportunity of discussing this matter with a patent solicitor of standing and he tells me that it would be a very grave matter for the people who are engaged in the solicitation of patents, and also for the patentees, if the examination is done away with. I am as strong for economy as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is, but if we as a civilized people undertake to grant patents it seems to me that should mean that in the opinion of competent officers the process or device or whatever is being patented possesses certain elements of novelty or usefulness; and I should be sorry to see the clause struck out altogether. I quote from the clause as it stands, chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes:

On each application for a patent, a thorough and reliable examination shall be made by competent examiners to be employed in the Patent office for that purpose.

I do not know that the law as it stands might not be modified, but certainly I cannot with equanimity see this provision entirely done away with. What would be the value of a Canadian patent if there is not this investigation? And just let me point out that if the patent has not had a preliminary examination, are we not going to throw an enormous burden on the courts? Are we not going to involve the courts in the trial of patent causes to an extent that they have never been burdened with before? It seems to me that is the result which would follow.

Mr. ROBB: We do not propose to diminsh in any degree the examinations that have been held heretofore; we will have the necessary examination provided by order in council. But may I submit to the committee some references from the experiences of other countries? In France no attempt is made to examine for

novelty; their system is simply registration. If it is deemed expedient, the examination may be covered by regulations to be approved by order in council when the new act comes into force. If we were to extend the examination as urged by the member for South Wellington—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not want it extended.

Mr. ROBB: Let us take the experience of the United States patent office. On their own statement, they have failed to have a proper examination. United States patents are frequently set aside by the courts on the ground of lack of novelty in the invention—quite as frequently as our Canadian patents.

9 p.m.

Mr. PUTNAM: As frequently in proportion to their number?

Mr. ROBB: In proportion, yes. In order to make such examination as the law requires now we would have to make our examining staff at least equal in proportion to the number of patents issued to that of the United States. In the United States, for the year ending December 31, 1922, they issued 38,670 patents; in Canada during the last fiscal year over 12,000 patents were issued. The examining staff in the United States is over 400; in Canada it is about 25. To make the Canadian examining staff proportionately equal to that of the United States, about 100 examiners would have to be added at an annual salary of, say, $2,500 each, making a total of $250,000, and in addition, to provide the material for the examiners, that is to say, copies of all the patents of the world, and publications relating to inventions, including assembling, classification and translation of the same, there would have to be an annual appropriation of $250,000. So that it would mean an increased expenditure of $500,000 to this country.

Mr. McMASTER: How many applications do we have in a year?

Mr. ROBB: We put through 12,000 in the last fiscal year. At present the examination in the Canadian Patent office is confined to our own records, with a view to seeing that a patent for the invention has not already been granted, and that we are consequently in a position to grant one. If it be found that no patent is already granted and the inventor meets the other requirements of the law, the patent is granted. The inventor swears he is the first to make the invention, and his statement is accepted. If it turns out that he has made a misrepresentation and that the invention has already been patented, so much the worse for him, because his patent will be set aside by the courts. The responsibility is upon him, and the country is thus saved a vast sum of money. We have now a net revenue from that department of over $250,000. If we carry out the ideas suggested by my hon. friend, instead of having a surplus of $250,000 we shall have an additional expenditure of $500,000.

Mr. BOYS: Is it the intention of the department to relax activity in the examination of patents?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. BOYS: If it is the intention to maintain the same degree of care in the examination, why not leave the clause as it is? The clause does not give any guarantee to a patentee; it merely provides that there shall be a thorough and reliable examination. It does not say that the examination is final or anything of that kind, but it does guard against the granting of patents where they should not be granted. I have had some little experience in connection with applications for patents, and I know that people in the country have not the facilities to find out whether or not a given article can be patented; they could only do it if they had access to an extensive library. I have sometimes taken the precaution to write to Washington to get what information I could, but that information is not always reliable. Where there is no suggestion to guarantee and where the minister intends to make the same careful examination—and he will require the same number of officials to do it, why not leave the provision as it is? I have in mind two cases where after an examination the patents were refused. Now, if there is any relaxation, patents may be granted when they should not have been granted and the money of the applicants will be thrown away. I certainly want to strongly support what the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) have said. If the idea was to give a guarantee I certainly would agree with the minister. I do not think that precautions should be done away with entirely. There should be a reasonably careful examination of the patent to see whether or not it should be granted and thereby stop the issue of patents for which there is not justification.

Mr. ROBB: There would be no objection to leaving in the words "reasonable examination". If you adopt the words "thorough and reliable examination" that will not be a reasonable examination.

Mr. BOYS: I appreciate the fact that the words " thorough and reliable " are very strong and it might be inferred from their use that the patentee was practically guaranteed his patent. Supposing we adopted " thorough and careful examination ".

Mr. McMASTER: Would it not be well to go even further along that line and make such changes so that the clause would read:

On each application for a patent an examination shall be made by competent examiners to be employed in the Patent office for that purpose.

As I understand the situation it is this: The patent office is not satisfied that it has the personnel and money at its disposal to enable it to give the examination which it wishes. Well, let us leave out the word "thorough and reliable"—I do not like to see the clause struck out entirely. From the best information that I can get from those who know a great deal more about this kind of law than I do, I am very much of the opinion that it would be a mistake to cut the clause out altogether.

Mr. BOYS: Either have a careful examination, Mr. Chairman, or do not have any.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How would it be if we leave the words " thorough and reliable " out. Then it would read:

On such application for patent a careful examination shall be made.

If the words " thorough and reliable " are too strong and involve something in the nature of a guarantee they might be misleading.

Mr. ROBB: We will accept that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then I will move to strike out the words " thorough and reliable " and put in the word " careful ". This will provide for a careful examination.

Mr. ROBB: Where are you putting that in?

The CHAIRMAN: Inserting it after clause 14 as 14a:

On each application for a patent a careful examination shall be made by Patent examiners employed in the Patent office for that purpose.

Mr. McMASTER: Would it not be an advantage to retain that under the same numbering as it had in the old act?

Mr. ROBB: It would mean renumbering the clauses.

Mr. BOYS: I want to convey to the attention of the minister the same thought that I brought forward in connection with a previous clause. At the close of subsection 2 of section 16 you find these sentences—

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: We have not reached section 16 yet.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment moved by Mr. Guthrie is as follows:

On each application for a patent a careful examination shall be made by patent examiners to be employed in the Patent office for that purpose.

The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the manner in which an invention shall be examined, and such regulations shall be published in the Canada Gazette and shall form part of this act.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner points out to me that the latter part of the subsection is absolutely unnecessary as power is given in the bill to make all these regulations.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If there is such a power in the bill then that provision is not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall paragraph 2 of Mr. Guthrie's amendment be stricken out?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is about the right to make regulations by order in council?

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 15—Models and specimens:

Mr. ROBB: That is the clause in the old act.

Section agreed to.

On section 16—Patents to be for special methods or processes of manufacture:

Mr. ROBB: I wish to move that the section he amended by striking out the word "or" where it appears for the second time in the second line and substituting therefor the word "and".

Mr. STEVENS: In both cases?

Mr. McMASTER: How will the clause read then?

Mr. ROBB: It will read:

In the case of inventions relating to substances prepared or produced by chemical processes and intended for food or medicine—

And so on.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A suggestion made to me in regard to this proposed amendment is that instead of the word "and" the two words "which are" should be substituted. The wording would then be:

—produced by chemical processes which are intended for food.

Mr. ROBB: It is all a question of language whichever my hon. friend prefers.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think, perhaps, that "and" is a better word to use. I would agree to using the word "and" there.

Mr. McMASTER: Will the hon. member for South Wellington read the clause as amended by the addition of those words?

Mr. GUTHRIE (reading):

In the case of inventions relating to substances prepared or produced by chemical processes and intended for food or medicine.

That is the way it will read after the amendment is made. I am quite satisfied if the word "and" is put in instead of the word "or".

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister note that in clause 7 we have made provision for:

Any person who has invented any new and useful art, process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter—

It provides in that clause for the patenting of "composition of matter". Now in clause 16 we have these words:

—the specification shall not include claims for the substance itself.

I understand from those who are intimately acquainted with these matters that in other countries, particularly in the United States, chemists and others are not only allowed to patent a process but they are allowed to patent the substance produced. Illustrations were given to me of such things as this: rubber articles made of some chemical composition such as ink bottles and many other articles that are in daily use. I am not clear in my own mind that this clause prevents what it is claimed to prevent. It prevents the patenting of the substance itself. Unless it can be shown very clearly that there is some reason why that should be, it strikes me that it is a particular injustice to the investigating or experimenting chemist who is constantly experimenting with different processes and substances, and I think he is, perhaps, one of the most useful investigators that we have in industrial life and should be encouraged. Perhaps the minister has before him some explanation of that.

Mr. CALDWELL: I will point out that this particular clause only applies when the article is intended for food or medicine.

Mr. ROBB: It has been pointed out that if a man has a process and gets a patent, he is protected for that particular product made in that way. It does not prevent any other person from obtaining a similar product made in another way. You cannot tie it up in that way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister tell us if that is the law in any country? For instance, we have the discovery of insulin, which is produced in a particular way. Under the law in any country, could that product be patented so that nobody else could make it, no matter what process he adopted?

Mr. ROBB: No; they could do it in most countries in the world. What does my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. STEVENS: This is really a very important matter indeed. I have before me a memorandum on the subject which was handed to me and I will read a clause or two from it. Perhaps it will give it more clearly than I could describe it in my own language. This memorandum reads:

The patenting of a new substance, apart from the method of producing it, prevents importation of the same article, and it would be practically impossible to demonstrate how that same article is made in foreign countries.

I pause there. There might be some articles, such as I have mentioned, used every day in the office or household which are imported from another country, of a hard rubber type, made by some chemical process. Now, a chemist who discovers that is entitled in equity I think, not only to patent his process, but he is entitled to patent the article itself, because he is the pioneer in the discovery. That is, he discovers that by certain chemicals being combined, a given result will be achieved. He discovers that. Then someone else might vary the process and produce a similar result. The first man loses practically all the value of his research or invention. That is really the point I am trying to make, and I apprehend from the minister's reply that he is not certain in his own mind at all that in other countries this is not the case. If we were definitely assured that in other countries they never had this, I grant you that would be a strong argument, but I understand the minister to say that in other countries they did allow the patenting of the article.

Mr. ROBB: This change is the result of a conference held in 1917, as I pointed out before. This is identically the same as was brought down by the preceding government in 1920 and 1921. My hon. friend made a reference to a patent on inkstands. This section only applies to foods and medicines.

Mr. STEVENS: I really do not think that alters the fact. I had used the illustration because I had in mind these hard rubber products which are very common, and as to the

fact that was brought out before, the minister, I am sure will admit that we are not seeking to criticize the bill unfairly.

Mr. ROBB: Oh, no.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a very technical bill and while I have given considerable thought to it, I confess it is most difficult to follow without having expert advice. I do not know much about the conference to which he refers, but in the United States, which is our chief competitor after all in these matters, they do allow patenting the process of an article.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps my hon. friend is right in that respect. For the information of the committee, I will read the following notation—

At the Imperial War Conference, 1917, certain amendments proposed to be made to the British Act were submitted for the consideration of the delegates, with a view to their adoption by their respective governments. In a memorandum prepared by the department in connection with the Imperial War Conference in 1918 it was recommended that certain of the amendments, including the present one, be adopted; experience has shown that this amendment will be useful.

The following memorandum was submitted to the Imperial War Conference of 1917 by the British Board of Trade in connection with this amendment.

"Patents in respect of inventions relating to drugs or medicines.—Various instances have occurred in which Germans have patented a process for producing a new drug or medicine and have also a separate patent or a separate claim for the substance produced by the patented process. The result is that nobody can, until the expiration of the patent, make the drug or medicine by any other process. In some cases the process only in such cases is allowed to be patented. In the amendment now proposed no patent is to preclude the premanufacture or the free sale or use of any article for human food or medical purposes."

Mr. McMASTER: I appreciate the fact that, with the change to which the minister has consented, substances of food, or medicine cannot be patented, though processes can. I asked myself the question whether that is quite fair. Why should a man who through chemical discovery and experimentation, has arrived at a valuable medicine, be deprived of the privilege which is given to a brother inventor who has found out some mechanical device which has increased the happiness or the safety of humanity? Are we not likely to defeat the very purpose of the law as proposed in the bill? We want people to invent good medicine and good food, but what incentive will there be for them to do so, if, although the process can be patented, the substance cannot be patented? If after the substance has been put on the market it may be possible, by chemical analysis of that substance, to readily arrive at some other manner of making the food or medicine, then the patented process may be of little or no value, because the substance can be made in another way. I do say that the object of the bill as proposed does make available for the public patented medicines, patented food, giving to the patentees merely the right of the patent on the processes by which he made the medicines or the food. But are we not likely just to defeat the object of the bill by taking away the incentive to chemical scientists to develop, along the line of food or medicine, inquiry and invention? It seems to me that the clause in the bill is hardly fair. If we admit the public policy of granting patents, why should we limit them in any way to take away from a man who has invented a good medicine or food, what he would have received had he invented a good rubber tire?

Mr. ROBB: It may interest the committee to know that this clause, with the proposed amendment, has been submitted to and approved by the chemists of Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Hardly approved, according to the instructions I have.

Mr. ROBB: With the amendment as suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps I had better read my instructions on that point. This is a letter from the Chemists' Association:

The clause as it stands is of such wide scope that it is unfair to the chemist, depriving him of the right to patent any article the manufacture of which depends on a chemical process. We consider such a position indefensible. As amended—

That is, with this change.

—medicinal and food products become non-patentable. We should like to see certain other chemical products made unpatentable also, but the difficulties of legal definition have been too great to enable us to express our full wish, nor are we confident as to what might be the consequences to the manufacturer of having such wishes embodied in law.

Under those conditions they are willing to accept the amendment proposed by the minister.

Section 16, subsection (1), as amended, agreed to.

On subsection (2)—No patent to preclude free manufacture or free sale or use of article for human food or medical purposes:

Mr. BOYS: This was the clause that I was going to refer to a moment ago. We have the same difficulty here in the last paragraph of the clause:

Any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Again I say that there is no time within which the appeal should be taken. Various

appeals are provided under this bill, and it would seem to me that there should be in the bill a general clause providing that all appeals should be taken within a certain time.

Mr. ROBB: Would it suit to insert, towards the end of the bill, a clause covering all this?

Mr. BOYS: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Do the regulations of the department not provide for that?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: That ought to be in the act. When people want to know where they are at, they produce the act.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner has made a note of that point.

Section 16, subsection (2) agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 17—Withdrawal of application:

Mr. ROBB: This is the old clause.

Section agreed to.

On section 19—Notice to applicant:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any change?

Mr. ROBB: No change.

Section agred to.

On section 20—Appeal to Exchequer Court:

Mr. ROBB: This is new. This clause is simply the enactment of 3, 4 George V, chapter 17, amending the Exchequer Court Act, which in effect repealed section 19 of the present act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not follow that. What is new about it? This looks rather as if it was old.

Mr. ROBB: It is new. Section 19 reads:

(1) Every applicant who has failed to obtain a patent by reason of the objection of the commissioner as aforesaid may, at any time within six months after notice thereof has been mailed by registered letter, addressed to him or his agent, appeal from the decision of the commissioner to the Governor in Council.

We propose to substitute this:

(1) Every applicant who has failed to obtain a patent by reason of the objection of the commissioner as aforesaid may, at any time within six months after notice thereof has been mailed by registered letter, addressed to him or his agent, appeal from the decision of the said commissioner to the Exchequer Court.

(2) The Exchequer Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine any such appeal.

Section agreed to.

On section 21—to be decided by Exchequer Court.

Mr. BOYS: I would like to suggest this. Where there are conflicting applications, is there any reason why the commissioner should not be called upon to give a decision in the first instance? This would probably dispose of the matter in the large majority of cases, and then provision should be made whereby either party could appeal from the decision of the commissioner to the Exchequer Court.

It does not seem to me that any lawyer has been engaged in connection with the framing of this measure. It is all very fine to say that these things are technical; but when one comes to apply the act, one does not know what in the world to do. Procedure should be provided for in these various sections. This section reads:

In case of conflicting applications for any patent, the applicants shall be notified by the commissioner that the question is one for the decision of the Exchequer Court, and no further proceedings shall be had or taken by the commission concerning the applications until a judgment is produced deciding which applicant is entitled to the patent.

Surely some procedure should be provided. How are you going to get to the Exchequer Court? What are you going to do? Where is the provision that anybody picking up the act can find, setting forth what he has to do to go to the Exchequer Court, when he may go, how he may go?

Mr. ROBB: I am informed that the procedure will be found in the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. BOYS: Then insert in this bill the words "in accordance with the provisions of the Exchequer Court Act," so that there will be some reference to the procedure the applicant must follow.

Mr. McMASTER: I hope the hon. gentleman will not propose that until we discuss whether this clause will remain as it is or not.

Mr. BOYS: All I am doing is to make one or two suggestions that occur to me on a hurried perusal of this measure. I am more insistent on the first point. I cannot see that the power given under this legislation to the commissioner is too great. He must necessarily become familiar with patents, with the law regarding patents, and he could surely be called upon to give a decision in the first instance. In probably nine cases out of ten that would put an end to the matter. I do not wish to make his decision final by any means, and I would suggest that an appeal

should be given from his decision to the Exchequer Court in accordance with the practice set out in the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Upon the suggestion of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys), I am going to move as an amendment—

Mr. ROBB: Before my hon. friend moves his amendment, we propose to amend this clause 21. We propose to strike it out and to substitute the following, really the present law.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The present clause is one to which, I think, great objection has been taken. It is the old arbitration clause. It provides that where there is any conflict between applicants for a patent, three arbitrators shall be appointed. The machinery is very cumbersome and the proceeding is very often long drawn out and expensive. I agree entirely with what the hon. member for South Simcoe says. We have a Commissioner of Patents. In the vast majority of cases, he can decide as between conflicting claims, and I am satisfied that his decision will be accepted in the great majority of cases. But at the same time I believe there should be an appeal from his decision. That is the view of many public bodies in the country and people interested in the question of patents, and an amendment has been prepared along that line. Upon the suggestion of the hon. member for Simcoe, I move:

That section 21 be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

(1) In case of conflicting applications the commissioner shall determine the right of the applicants to receive a patent or patents for the invention involved.

(2) Any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

That simplifies the procedure very much. That will avoid delays consequent upon arbitration and also save the expense of arbitration. As I say, in the vast majority of cases the decision of the commissioner will be the one accepted. In very important cases there will no doubt be appeals.

Mr. ROBB: Before the hon. member presses his amendment, may I point out that the present method which we propose gives an option either of arbitration or of appeal to the Exchequer Court. The proposition my hon. friend makes means additional expense in the administration of the department. It will mean an additional staff in the office and more lawyers, with possibly more delay. What the hon. member is suggesting really is that we set up a court in the patent office. We have the Exchequer Court now which is proving satisfactory; and there is the option either of appeal to that court or of recourse to the board of arbitration.

Mr. STEVENS: That is not the point at all. The minister surely does not mean to suggest that the commissioner has any knowledge of these applications. When applications are made, if there is any conflict they must be submitted to the commissioner before he can notify the parties according to the section, that they must go to the Exchequer Court. So that what he certainly ought to do would be to give his decision, having had the two applications before him, and then there could be an appeal. I cannot for the life of me see how that would involve a larger staff. As to adding to the staff by engaging lawyers and holding court, that is not the idea that either my hon. friend or I have in mind. We simply suggest that the commissioner, with his practical knowledge of patents, and having perhaps a wider knowledge of this business than any other man in Canada, should decide what in his opinion is right as between two conflicting applicants.

Mr. ROBB: But he cannot possibly decide before hearing fairly the evidence from both sides.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not a question of evidence; it is a question as between two applications.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to support the proposal that the cases should not be flung into the Exchequer Court before the commissioner has given a first decision. I agree with what has been proposed, but I believe that it might be wise to indicate the procedure which should be followed by the commissioner when there are two applications in conflict. I understand that the proper term is that they are in interference; that is to say, the claims made by each applicant conflict. I propose that we should follow the procedure which is observed in the United States in this regard. In view of the close business relationship that exists between the two countries I think it is not unwise to have our procedure in our patent office follow on not dissimilar lines from the procedure in the American office. What they do there is this:

In case of conflicting applications the commissioner shall determine the right of the applicants to receive a patent or patents for the invention involved.

The commissioner has had the thing before him; he is conversant with the matter before the conflict arises. What I want to bring before the committee is the procedure that should be followed to carry out the proposal

of the hon. member for Wellington, that there should be a decision from the commissioner in the first case.

(2) The nature of the conflict shall be clearly pointed out to the applicants and each of them shall be required, within a time fixed by the commissioner, to file in the Patent office a preliminary statement under oath setting forth the earliest date on which such applicant conceived the invention involved in the conflict and such other facts as the commissioner may require. Any applicant who fails to file such statement when required shall be deemed to have conceived the invention only on the date of his application for patent in Canada.

What I am told by one who is very much more familiar with these matters than I am is that when two conflicting applications get into interference, the contesting applicants, as a rule, withdraw their weaker claims and finally by agreement reduce the contest between them to quite narrow limits. Then:

(3) Each applicant shall, within a time fixed by the commissioner, file in the Patent office written statement of testimony taken under oath, together with such other matter as he considers necessary to establish his right to a patent; provided that if such testimony or other matter should prove a date of conception earlier than set forth in the preliminary statement of such applicant, the applicant shall be deemed to have proved only the date set forth in his preliminary statement.

(4) The commissioner may summon any applicant or other person to appear at any place and before any person mentioned in the summons and may require him to give evidence on oath orally or in writing (or on solemn affirmation if such applicant or person is entitled to affirm in civil cases) and to produce such documents and things as are requisite to the full investigation of the conflict, and the commissioner shall have the power to enforce the attendance of such applicants and other persons, and to compel them to give evidence, as is vested in any court of justice in civil cases, in the province where such applicant or person is summoned to appear.

(5) A patent may be involved in conflict with an application; provided the date of such patent is not more than two years prior to the date of the application; and in such cases the patentee shall be governed under this section in all respects like as an applicant.

(6) Anything in the Exchequer Court Act and amendments thereof, or in any other Act, to the contrary notwithstanding, the commissioner shall have exclusive primary jurisdiction to determine the grant of a patent in any case of conflict between applications or between an applicant and a patent as in this section provided.

(7) Any applicant or patentee to whom an adverse decision is rendered by the commissioner under this section, shall have the right of appeal.

The committee will see that I follow the main lines of the proposal made by the member for Wellington, namely, first a decision by the commissioner and then an appeal to the Exchequer Court. I have merely indicated in my remarks the procedure which I propose that the commissioner shall follow, which is the same procedure which is followed in the patent office of the United States. Now, answering the minister as to the question of cost If the matter is referred immediately to the Exchequer Court, the patent solicitors, who form really a distinct body of lawyers and who sometimes are not even barristers, will have to employ counsel to appear before the Exchequer Court. On the other hand, if my suggestion is adopted, the conflict will be determined by the commissioner, which determination is likely to be accepted by both parties so that an appeal to the Exchequer Court might be avoided. It does seem to me a great mistake to throw the case into the Exchequer Court before there has been a preliminary investigation by the commissioner and a chance given to the parties to get together and confine the scope of their conflict to the narrowest limits. The Exchequer Court probably has the largest jurisdiction of any of our courts, and if it is to be the tribunal of first instance in this case those concerned may have to travel from Halifax or from Vancouver to Ottawa to appear before the court. The procedure which I indicate gives wide powers to the commissioner to appoint other commissioners for the hearing of evidence and provides a practical and well thought out scheme for the adjudication of the dispute—a scheme which has been followed in a jurisdiction very similar to ours for some years past.

Mr. ROBB: As there appears to be a conflict of opinion I will put in the original motion I made:

That clause 21 of Bill 20 be struck out and the following substituted as clause 21—

Which is really the old act. We will allow the section to stand so that hon. gentlemen may consider it. I would point out again, however, that the experience of the department is that the method employed in Washington is very objectionable compared with ours, and that ours is the most economical and the most satisfactory to all concerned except the patent solicitor. I admit that he would like to get an additional fee from his client.

Mr. McMASTER: He does not get the fee; some lawyer does.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely my hon. friend is not serious in suggesting that arbitration is cheap and satisfactory. We have generally found arbitration the most lengthy, expensive and unsatisfactory method of settling differences.

Mr. ROBB: There are two options, arbitration or the Exchequer Court.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They have a right to go to both?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely if my hon. friend thinks that arbitration is not satisfactory—and we all agree that it is not—he will admit that some indication should be given to the Exchequer Court as to what the department's views are. That is practcially all that is asked. I hope that my hon. friend will think this over before he comes to a conclusion.

Mr. ROBB: We will let it stand.

Mr. BOYS: Does the act provide for two courses, one by arbitration and the other direct to the Exchequer Court? If so, it must be by amendment, for it is not in this.

Mr. ROBB: It is provided for in the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. BOYS: Section 20 provides for the disposition of conflicting applications, and they are to be disposed of under that section by arbitration. As the section is to stand over I shall not prolong the discussion, but I do not want the minister to think that in making the suggestion I did I was trying to provide work for lawyers. I had no such thought in my mind; quite the reverse. I was trying to simplify and improve the procedure for those seeking patents. If you want to make it expensive and cause delay and inconvenience, all you need do is go back to section 20 and adopt the cumbrous process of arbitration. which lasts very much longer, costs very much more, and half the time when one of the parties is dissatisfied it is not very difficult for him to upset the award.

Section stands.

On section 22—What patents shall contain and confirm, etc:

Mr. ROBB: No change.

Section agreed to.

On section 23—Patents for inventions by persons in public service, etc.:

Mr. ROBB: This clause has been added to the bill at the request of the Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. It refers to patents for inventions made by scientists employed in the public service in the course of their employment. While allowing the inventor to obtain patents for such inventions, it establishes the rights of the public therein and conserves the same.

Mr. BOYS: A moment ago there was an effort apparently to escape from responsibility on the part of the commissioner; in this section we have the converse. Under subsection 2 he is given absolute jurisdiction. It is debatable if there should not be a right of appeal.

Mr. ROBB: We will let that stand for consideration also.

Section stands.

On section 24—Form of issue:

Mr. ROBB: That is the old clause.

Section agreed to.

On section 25—Term limit:

Mr. ROBB: That is the same clause as in the old act.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—Issue of new or amended patents:

Mr. ROBB: There is an amendment to this clause by adding after the word "date" in the eighth line of subclause 1 the words "or within one year from the passage of this act."

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I suggest this with diffidence because I am not sure whether there will be any objection to it, but is there any objection to giving the right to a patentee to ask at any time during the life of his patent for the correction of clerical or typographical or other obvious errors? I have had placed in my hands a memorandum concerning this act, in which the author says:

> In view of the fact that this section limits the period for re-issuing patents to four years, it seems advisable to add a paragraph by means of which minor errors may be corrected any time during the life of the patent. The following is suggested:
>
> "(5) Any time during the life of a patent a patentee may make petition to the commissioner for the issue of a certificate of correction, and if the commissioner is satisfied that the correction desired to be made relates to a clerical, typographical or obvious error, the correction of which will not alter the scope of the patent, the commissioner shall, upon payment of a fee as hereinafter provided, issue a certificate of correction in duplicate, one copy of which shall be attached to the patent under the seal of the Patent office and become a part thereof, and the other copy of which shall remain of record in the Patent office, and after the issue of such certificate the patent shall be read as corrected by such certificate."

I am not sufficiently familiar with patent practice to say whether a case like this often occurs, but the suggestion seems to be a reasonable one.

Mr. ROBB: On the face of it it sounds reasonable, but in practice it might lead to abuses. It is very hard to determine what is really a clerical error, and the experience of the department is that it is better not to accept the suggestion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Offhand I would certainly agree with the hon. member for Brome that if an error was made it should be corrected. It does not make any difference whether we discover it this year, next year or the year afterwards. What is the principle underlying the idea that a patent, once issued, cannot be corrected?

Mr. ROBB: If it is shown that the mistake occurred in the office, the correction can be made, and in practice that is done. But if you admit a clause such as the one suggested you are opening the door to abuses. It is unnecessary language to add to the provision.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What kind of abuses might be anticipated? Is it feared that under the guise of making a correction some other novelty may be covered by a patent without any additional patent fee?

Mr. ROBB: There is a possibility that the opportunity might be taken to extend the scope of the patent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely it would be known whether the man was fairly putting his patent into such shape that he could support it and use it, or whether, on the other hand, he was using the power of amendment for the purpose of extending the patent.

Mr. ROBB: He is enabled to come back within four years; that is a reasonable length of time.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want to press this unduly, because I cannot give a specific case, but I presume that this has happened in practice, or the matter could not have been placed before me. I can easily understand that a patentee might receive his patent, and, taking it for granted that the work had been accurately done, he would not scrutinize it or make any exact comparisons. Perhaps six or seven years afterwards he gets into a lawsuit concerning the patent. The patent is read over with the greatest care; obviously clerical errors are found, and the patentee feels that before going into the court with the document those errors should be corrected. That is an easily supposed case which is, I think, of the nature of those intended to be covered by the suggestion I have made. I would invite the minister's attention to that phase of it.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 26 as amended carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suggest that the minister will probably want to consider the suggestion made by the hon. member for Brome. In the case of a purely technical error, a mere oversight, what bearing has the question of a time limit upon the making of a correction? In other words, if it is justice to correct it, why place anything in the way of doing the right thing simply because a year has expired from the date of the passing of the act?

Mr. ROBB: The experience is that by a change of wording the scope of the patent might be extended, and in the meantime the public has been using it. Four years is a reasonable length of time; there is no hardship to the patentee at all. The hon. member for Brome, I understand does not press his amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: I am not going to divide the committee on it, because I do not feel strongly enough about it. But it seems to me to be a fair suggestion.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: There are a few old clauses that we might put through. There are no changes in 27 or 28.

Sections 27 and 28 agreed to.

On section 29—Patents to be assignable:

Mr. ROBB: There is a slight amendment here. At the Imperial War Conference of 1917 certain amendments proposed to be made to the British act were submitted to the consideration of the delegates, and in a memorandum prepared by the department in connection with that conference it was recommended that certain amendments, including the present one, be adopted. Experience has shown that this amendment would be useful. That applies only to subsection 2 of section 29 of the bill which reads as follows:

> No assignment of, or any other instrument affecting the title to, a patent or any interest therein, or a license to use a patent, shall be admitted in evidence in any court unless it has been registered in the Patent Office.

Mr. BOYS: I do not know whether the minister wants to finish by ten o'clock, if he does I would ask him to let this section stand. I certainly want to oppose this suggested change. I can see no reason for it, and I think it would be very unfair in many cases.

Mr. ROBB: Let it stand.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 10 p.m.

Monday, April 23, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 119 (from the Senate), to change the name of Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo Telephone Company to "Brazilian Telephone Company".—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 120 (from the Senate), respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Denis (Joliette).

Bill No. 121 (from the Senate), for the relief of Fannie Boyle.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 122 (from the Senate) for the relief of James Forbes.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 123 (from the Senate), for the relief of Julia Tracey Kay.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 124 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Philip Roy McCabe.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 125 (from the Senate), for the relief of William George Haden.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 126 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gertrude Irene Wood.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 127 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Murray.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 128 (from the Senate), for the relief of James McAllister,—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 129 (from the Senate), for the relief of David Albert Clayton.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 130 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hugh Russell Fulton.—Mr. McKillop.

Bill No. 131 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maybelle Elizabeth French.—Sir Henry Drayton.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Stewart) inform the House as to whether the report in the press as to the deputy minister's return from England is correct? If it be correct will he inform the House as to whether he has entered into an agreement with the British government and whether it is the intention of the minister to table that agreement.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not seen the deputy minister, but any arrangement he has made, or any arrangement the government has entered into, will be tabled.

[Mr. Fielding.]

BANK ACT REVISION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SHAW: Will the minister inform the House whether he has received a copy of the resolution passed by the legislative assembly of the province of Alberta, urging that the pending revision of the Bank Act be postponed for one year, and if the resolution has been received, will the government place it on the Table?

Mr. FIELDING: Several requests of that nature have come from various organizations. I am not quite sure that one has been received from the legislature of Alberta. I will inquire, and if one has been received, there is no objection to laying it on the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 113 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jean Elizabeth Burgess.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 114 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Wesley Scott.—Mr. Chew.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MINTO STREET ARMOURY, WINNIPEG

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. For what purpose is the Minto street barracks, Winnipeg, now being used?
2. Are recreation privileges granted? If so, to whom and under what conditions?
3. What is the cost of upkeep?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The Minto street armoury, Winnipeg, is used for the accommodation of the following non-permanent active militia units located in Winnipeg:—

The Winnipeg Rifles,
The Winnipeg Grenadiers.
The Cameron Highlanders of Canada.
10th Machine Gun Brigade.
10th Divisional Train, C.A.S.C.
10th Signal Battalion.
3rd Field Ambulance, C.A.M.C.
No. 10 Detachment, C.A.V.C.
13th Field Battery.
17th Field Battery.
19th Field Battery.
38th Field Battery.
11th Siege Battery.
12th Field Company, Canadian Engineers.
Cyclist Company, Corps of Guides.
Fort Garry Horse.
2nd Motor Machine, Machine Gun Brigade.
District Medical Stores.

Small quantity of Ordnance Stores.
Royal School of Artillery.
Naval Cadets.
5th Artillery Brigade Headquarters.
6th Mounted Brigade Headquarters.
20th Infantry Brigade Headquarters.
Winnipeg Highland Cadets.

2. Yes. Non-permanent active militia units; Garrison Badminton Club, and Military Athletic Association.

The conditions covering such use for recreation purposes by other than non-permanent active militia units are,—

(1) Without expense to the public.

(2) That special precautions be taken to safeguard the contents of the building.

3. The cost of upkeep of this armoury for the fiscal year 1922-23, was as follows:

Fuel	$ 9,847 98
Light	328 82
Water	78 05
Telephones	227 10
Firemen	1,627 50
Caretaking	6,559 25
Engineer Services	742 00
Miscellaneous Services	10 00
Total	$19,420 70

MR. P. J. O'CONNOR

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Is Mr. P. J. O'Connor employed in the Lands branch of the Indian department at Ottawa?
2. If so. when was he appointed (a) to this department; (b) to this branch?
3. What promotions, if any, has he had since his appointment?
4. Did he pass a regular Civil Service examination for each promotion?
5. What is his rank at present, and what is the date of the Civil Service examination passed by him to qualify for the position?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.

2. (a). Temporarily on 15th February, 1898; permanently on 1st July, 1901; (b) in November, 1902.

3. To second class clerkship on 1st July, 1905; 2A clerkship 1st April, 1909; head clerk, 1st May, 1922.

4. Yes, when the same was necessary under the Civil Service Act.

5. Head clerk; as the position was filled by competition and Mr. O'Connor was the only applicant, no examination was imposed by the Civil Service Commission.

FLATHEAD DISTRICT ROAD

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Did the government during the summer of 1921 commence construction or clearing of right-of-way of road in the Flathead district, Alberta, to connect up the Waterton townsite in the Warterton lakes section?
2. What is the length of the said road?
3. How much money has been already spent?
4. Is it the intention of the government to continue construction of this road?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. In December, 1921, the government commenced clearing and grubbing operations and rock excavation work on portions of this road. This work was undertaken in connection with winter relief work for unemployment conditions.

2. The length of the proposed road to connect Waterton townsite in Waterton lakes park with the existing Oil City road is 4.4 miles.

3. $8,445.68.

4. As the road is considered an important one in connection with the development of Waterton lakes park, it is the intention to proceed with its construction as soon as funds become available.

DIRECTORY OF GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Mr. MAYBEE:

In view of the fact that no directory of the various government offices in Ottawa, with addresses, is available, will the government consider the compilation and distribution of same, for use of members and others?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

Yes, the government are obliged to the hon. member for his suggestion, and they will give directions that such a directory be prepared.

OTTAWA-PEMBROKE PROVINCIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Has any portion of the provincial highway, between Ottawa and Pembroke, been placed under agreement with the provincial government, under the Canada Highways Act, by which 40 per cent of the cost of the work will be paid by the federal government?
2. Has any portion of the said highway in Carleton county been approved by the federal government?
3. Does any agreement exist whereby the federal government agrees to pay 40 per cent of the cost of the county provincial road between Renfrew and Pembroke, via Douglas, in the county of North Renfrew?
4. If not, has any promise covering such an agreement been made by the federal government?
5. Is it possible for the federal government to make any such agreement or promise?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.
4. No.

5. Yes; on the initiative of the province and subject to subsection "A", section 4, 9-10 George V (Canada Highways Act), reading as follows: "Any highway for which aid is granted shall be constructed or improved, as the case may be, in accordance with the

terms of an agreement to be made by the minister with the government of the province. Such agreement must be approved by the Governor in Council and shall contain such provisions as to location, cost, description, specifications, time and method of construction, supervision and other necessary particulars as are essential to protect the public interest ".

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—DORCHESTER EMPLOYEES

Mr. CANNON:

1. What are the names of the employees of the National Railways in the county of Dorchester?
2. What were the dates of their respective appointments?
3. What are their duties and their respective salaries?
4. On whose recommendation was each appointment made?

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES

Mr. MICHAUD:

What was the total expenditure for each department of the government for civil salaries, both for temporary and permanent employees, for the fiscal years from 1911 to 1922, both inclusive?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

PRINCE RUPERT CIVIC EMPLOYEES

Mr. STEVENS:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, telegrams, and other documents, since January last, passing between the Minister of Labour or any officer of his department and the Civil Employees Union of Prince Rupert, or any officer or any official of the municipal council of Prince Rupert, or other persons, having reference to a request for a conciliation board.

MONTREAL AND LONGUEUIL BRIDGE

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of the report of 1923 of the Montreal harbour commission on the construction of the new bridge between Montreal and Longueuil, and also a copy of the plans prepared by the harbour commission for the construction of said bridge.

RADIOTELEGRAPH ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend The Radiotelegraph Act, chapter forty-three of the statutes of 1913, by providing that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of a portion of the license fees collected in respect of certain prescribed licenses, to a provincial government, private company, or other prescribed party, and notwithstanding anything to the countrary in any act, to any department or employee thereof, for services given in connection with the operation of broadcasting stations and for services performed for the minister in connection with the licensing and inspection of stations.

[Mr. Graham.]

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and has been pleased to recommend the same to the consideration of the House

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence) moved the third reading of Bill No. 118 to amend the Militia Pension Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

COLD STORAGE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the third reading of Bill No. 9, to amend the Cold Storage Act.

Mr. MARTELL I was given to understand that this bill would remain over until to-morrow, so that a conference might be held.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Motion stands.

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved the third reading of Bill No. 82, to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

PATENTS OF INVENTION

House again in committee on Bill No. 20, to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to Patents of Invention, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 29—Patents to be assignable:

Mr. BOYS: I wanted to offer some opposition to sub-clause 2 of this clause; but I understood there would be no objection to striking it out. If that is the case there would not be much object in speaking at length in connection with it. I can see no reason why an assignment, even if not registered, should not be given in evidence in a court, just as much as a deed between two parties. It is perfectly true that to protect third parties registration is necessary; but as between the parties themselves if an assignment has been validly completed and executed, I can think of no reason why that assignment should not be produced in any court of justice and given as evidence. I do

not want to discuss the matter longer if sub-clause 2 is going to be cut out; but if not, I will do so.

Mr. ROBB: I can see some force in the observations of my hon. friend. This clause was inserted in connection with the Imperial War Conference of 1918; but while it has been found useful, it is not absolutely essential I therefore move that subsection 2 of section 29 be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 30—Assignments in case of joint applications:

Mr. BOYS: What is the intention of this section? There is no reason why there should not be a provision requiring the registration of an assignment in the Patent office, but is it the intention of this section that any assignment not registered shall be invalid? If that is the purpose of the section I think it is a mistake, and my remarks in connection with subsection 2 of section 29 would be equally applicable to this section. I can quite understand that you want to have assignments registered, and it is very proper that they should be registered. It would, therefore, be advisable to provide some penalty if assignments were not registered. I fear, however, that the section as it stands might be constructed to mean that if assignments were not registered they would be void. There is no reason why they should not be perfectly good as between the parties to the assignment, although invalid as against third parties.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner tells me that this section has been in the act ever since it has been on the statute book.

Mr. BOYS: Even if it has, I do not think that is sufficient reason. Can the minister tell me whether he considers the section to mean what I have indicated, namely, that an assignment is bad in any event if it is not registered?

Mr. ROBB: We might let the section stand for further consideration.

Mr. STEVENS: I might point out to the minister something which I know must impress him, that is, the exceedingly complicated nature of the bill, which is really a complete revision of the Patent Act. I have been trying in my own way to give a reasonable amount of study to it, but the more I see of it, the more I learn about it, the more convinced I am that I know comparatively little about it; and I do not believe that, except for a very very few, others have a much greater knowledge of the bill than I have. If there ever was a piece of legislation that should go to a special committee, where the representatives of the department and, if you like, the representatives of the manufacturing interests, as well as chemists and others who are engaged in the laboratory and other investigatory work, might be invited to give their views upon it, this bill undoubtedly is legislation of that character. It is exceedingly difficult to criticize intelligently the sections of such a bill as this, the contents which have not been carefully studied, because we are met with just such answers as the one the minister has given us, which unquestionably has a good deal of force in it, if one understands it, and that is that the section has been in the act ever since we have had an act. On that account one hesitates to disturb it because it may have some other relations which we should not like to interfere with. But the minister's reply is scarcely satisfactory in view of this fact: as nearly as I can learn, in constructing the new act the draughtsman has lifted out of the British act whole sections and just conveyed them into this legislation. I have no reason whatever to assert that they are not entirely fitting; but certainly the House is not passing intelligent judgment on that fact under the present circumstances. Nor do I know that any of us are able intelligently to criticize the bill. The only way in which we can consider legislation of this kind is to have it go to a committee who can hear the views of the officials of the department and others who are conversant with the subjects it deals with. I am afraid it will be impossible for me to present properly the views I have in mind on several sections in the bill owing to their highly technical nature. One hesitates to speak dogmatically about a technical matter in the way we are forced to speak in the House, where one might by a little questioning get a correct understanding of ordinary subjects. But this is only one instance of the difficulties that are to be encountered in this bill. As we proceed and come to clauses 38, 40, 41 and 42, which are the main sections of the bill, I, at any rate, shall be quite reluctant to give my consent to the bill. I do not suppose that it makes much difference whether I do that or not; but certainly I cannot agree to the bill going through as it stands. I feel we are going to make errors that perhaps will be serious to many of the interests of the country; whereas if the bill went before a special committee it could be studied with some degree of that thoroughness and effect which it deserves.

Mr. HANSON: I agree with a great deal that has been said by my hon. friend. I have

studied the bill somewhat and I believe that if it were submitted to a special committee, where there could be free interchange of opinion with the experts of the department, the underlying reasons for certain sections would be more apparent than they are now. I do not know whether it is possible at this stage to have the bill go before a committee. Reverting to this very section, 30, if it means anything it means that assignments must be registered; otherwise they shall not be valid. I do not think there should be any such intention; the assignment should be valid as between the parties. It should be perfectly good whether registered or not, but as against third parties it should be registered. I wish the minister would give some consideration to that view.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is no doubt right in so far as the assignment relates to third parties. As regards the observations of my hon. friend for Vancouver, it is a little late in the session to suggest referring the bill to a special committee, when so many committees are already at work. May I observe again what I pointed out on Friday in introducing the bill, that it is precisely the same as that introduced in 1920 and again in 1921 and which reached a second reading. It therefore seems to me that no good purpose can be served by delaying the measure. Generally speaking it has met with the approval of all interests, with very few exceptions. As a matter of fact there is no opposition before the department. While some requests have been made to me that the bill be referred to a special committee, I rather gather that these requests have come from sources that want to tie up legislation altogether. It is not the policy of the government to introduce such a measure and let it drop again by the wayside. This is the third time the bill has been introduced, the first time before this parliament, and twice before a previous parliament. I think we had better make some progress with it here, because it will have fair consideration in this Chamber and it can be considered fully in the Senate again. We can serve no good purpose by delaying it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the closing sentence of my hon. friend's remarks really gives the key to the whole situation. This bill is to have proper consideration in the Senate, and because it will have proper consideration there, there is no reason why we should not get rid of it, knowing little if anything abut it.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. ROBB: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would point out to my hon. friend that it is a very good thing when introducing legislation to know why it is being introduced. It is a pretty sound principle that the House should know why changes are being made. I asked my hon. friend the other day, for example, just exactly what the benefits of the Berne convention were to which he was referring, but he left us without any information in regard to it. I think my hon. friend ought to tell us why each change is being made so that the House may assist him in seeing that the purpose desired is being properly carried out

At present we are discussing section 30 dealing with joint assignments. We have already dealt with the ordinary class of assignments. Hon. gentlemen from this side asked the minister as to whether or not rights inter partes are discharged unless there is registration. The minister is going to look into the question. Hon. gentlemen on this side have pointed out that rights inter partes should not be interfered with, and that the only effect of a non-registration penalty should be as against a third party. Section 30 itself looks after it. It provides that assignments shall be registered, and that they shall be null and void in the case of third parties unless so registered and all that section 30 does is to put the joint assignment in the same position as the single assignment. If we could have these sections read out at the time, Mr. Chairman, we would learn what they are. For instance, if section 29 had been read out we would have known where we were at in regard to section 30. I think the least the minister can do is to read out every change that is being made and give the reason for it so we will know something about it.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is quite right, but the clauses under consideration are old clauses and have been in the act since its first enactment. I can quite understand some hon. members opposite who have not had an opportunity of reviewing this bill, finding fault with it, but I can scarcely understand my hon. friend's criticism. He sat around the council table when this bill was considered first in 1920 and again in 1921. He was a member of the government that advanced the bill to second reading and then let it drop by the wayside. Surely he is not in a very good position to reprimand me now for introducing this measure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not blaming my hon. friend for introducing this bill

but for the lack of information he has given us. The bill before never reached second reading, and my hon. friend knows perfectly well that these details are only worked out on the second reading. It is no argument for him to say now that because the former government thought this bill should be brought down and afterwards dropped it before second reading, therefore the measure was a mere matter of form. If his predecessors had considered it in such a light it would not have been dropped.

Mr. BOYS: I quite appreciate the difficulties any minister would have in connection with a bill of this kind. All I am trying to do is to add a clause which anyone reading can understand. Section 30 of this bill was section 28 in the old act; but section 27 of the old act, which provided that if an assignment is not registered it shall be null and void against any subsequent assignee, is not incorporated in the present bill. My own opinion is that section 30 in the absence of a provision similar to that contained in old section 27 would not make an assignment null and void. But why leave the matter in doubt? I would suggest that a word or two be added to clause 30 to show that the assignment is not null and void except against subsequent purchasers or assignees without notice.

Mr. ROBB: What words would my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. BOYS: It should be null and void as against subsequent purchasers or assignees without notice—but should not go any further. I appreciate there is a very decided difference between the ordinary assignment and an assignment in cases of joint applications because when two parties apply for a patent you have to deal with both of them. At the same time if no notice is given to the department of an assignment, the department proceeds as if no assignment had been made, knowing nothing of such. The department is not to blame. The assignee would have to sue the two, and it would then be up to the latter to straighten out the difficulty between themselves by an assignment. If I could only find out what is the intention of the minister I would be in a better position to suggest. Is it the intention under section 30 that an assignment shall be null and void unless registered? If so, I think it is a mistake. My suggestion is that it should be null and void against subsequent purchasers or assignees for value and without notice.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner tells me that in his 21 years' experience such a case has never arisen. I think we will accept my hon. friend's suggestion, but I would propose that we let this section stand so that the commissioner may have an opportunity to confer with him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Section 30 says:

> In cases of joint applications or grants, every assignment from one or more of the applicants or patentees to the other or others, or to any other person, shall be registered in like manner as other assignments.

Section 29 shows how they are to be registered in connection with other assignments:

> Every patent issued for an invention shall be assignable in law; either as to the whole interest or as to any part thereof, by any instrument in writing; but such assignment, and every grant and conveyance of any exclusive right to make and use and to grant to others the right to make and use the invention patented within and throughout Canada or any part thereof, shall be registered in the Patent office in the manner from time to time prescribed by the commissioner for such registration.

We are now dealing with the effect of default.

> and every assignment affecting a patent for invention shall be null and void against any subsequent assignee, unless such instrument is registered as hereinbefore prescribed, before the registration of the instrument under which such subsequent assignee claims.

Those positions are applicable to section 30. So when the minister is considering it, he had better consider section 29 as well.

Mr. ROBB: Will my hon. friend let me know what he desires in connection with section 30?

Mr. BOYS: I do not know that I can add anything more. If the commissioner wishes me to devote a few minutes to the consideration of the section I shall be very pleased to meet him at any time.

Mr. ROBB: Stands.

Section stands.

On section 40—Conditions:

Mr. STEVENS: Section 38 of the old act is dropped, is it not?

Mr. ROBB: Yes. Sections 38, 39, 40 and 44 of the old act are repealed.

Mr. STEVENS: Sections 40 and 41 are really the crux of the whole bill. Will the minister advise us whether these two sections are taken from the old British act of 1907?

Mr. ROBB: Partly, with modifications to suit conditions in Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: Is the minister aware that the British act of 1907 was materially amended by the British act of 1919?

Mr. ROBB: That was represented to me this morning by a gentleman who is opposing this measure.

Mr. STEVENS: There are points in connection with sections 38 and 44 of the old act which do not seem to be covered by section 40 of this bill. There ought to be a complete explanation of these two sections and their substitution for 38, 39, 40 and 44.

Mr. ROBB: I cannot do better than present to the committee a memorandum prepared by the commissioner, who has had a very considerable experience, not only in Canada but in other parts of the world, in the administration of patent acts, and who has given a great deal of study and attention to legislation respecting patents. It is true, as my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) says, that the greatest changes in the bill are found in sections 40 and 41. The memorandum says:

The sections that have been struck out were enacted for the purpose of compelling the patentee to continously manufacture his invention in Canada, supply it to the public at a reasonable price, and to prevent him from importing the invention into Canada. While they have served their purpose in some respects they have failed to do so in others. It is thought that the proposed clauses will better serve the purpose of these sections and will be free from some objectionable features attaching to them. There is no doubt that it is the general desire that the law should, while assuring the inventor an adequate return for his invention, enable the public without difficulty to obtain it at a reasonable price. In the latter respect, the law at present fails. The sections impose on the patentee the obligation of supplying his invention, but they do not give the public the right to compel him to do so. The only right of action that the public have, by reason of the default of the patentee, is for the cancellation of the patent, which is not satisfactory; as in the majority of cases the person requiring the invention is not in a position to manufacture it, the cancellation of the patent is of no benefit to him.

The law requires the patentee to furnish the invention at a reasonable price. Difficulty arises in determining what is a reasonable price. Failing agreement between the patentee and the would be purchaser, if action be taken and the court finds that the price asked is too high, the patent is cancelled, although the patentee might have honestly considered he was entitled to the price which he asked. The law requires the patentee to continuously manufacture the invention and forbids him to import it. There is difficulty in determining what constitues manufacture and importation within the meaning of the act. In a recent case in the Supreme court four of the judges were of the opinion that the facts as established showed that the patentee had failed to manufacture and had imported, and as a consequence the patent was cancelled. A dissenting judge was of the opinion that the patentee had complied with the law in these respects and was in favour of sustaining the patent. Owing to these uncertainties it is frequently difficult to determine whether Canadian patents are in force or not, which reduces their value, as naturally there is hesitancy in investing money in the exploitation of a patent which may turn out to be void through failure of compliance with these requirements of the act. If the proposed amendments be adopted these difficulties and uncertainties will be removed, as in the case of disagreement the court will fix the price at which the invention is to be supplied and the patent will not be forfeited unless the patentee fails to supply the invention at that price within the time also to be fixed by the court.

The amendments will involve modification of the present importation provision, which absolutely prohibits the importation of the invention on pain of nullity of the patent. The amendment, while not expressly prohibiting importation, will expose the patent to forfeiture if the manufacture of the invention is not carried on to an adequate extent in Canada.

The reason that has always been given for retention of section 38 is that over 75 per cent of our patents are granted to United States citizens and it was feared that were it not for the provisions of this section the patented inventions would be imported from the United States plants and Canada would get nothing in return for the patent. It is now thought that the proposed clause will safeguard Canada's interests in this regard. Any loss that might result from the relaxation of the importation provision, it is thought, will be more than compensated by the benefit to be derived from adherence to the international convention for the protection of industrial property, for which the amendment will open the way.

Then this answers the question of my hon. friend:

This convention was constituted in 1883 and is composed of the principal countries of the world.

Its whole spirit is shown in article 2 of the constitution which declares that subjects or citizens of each of the contracting countries shall as regards patents, trademarks, etc., in all other countries of the Union enjoy the advantages that their respective laws grant to their own subjects or citizens.

In some important countries, notably the United States, Japan and Germany, Canadians are at present under certain disabilities as compared with the citizens or subjects of these countries.

In 1900 Canada endeavoured to join the Union, but failed owing to repugnancy between its importation provision and article 5 of the convention which states that introduction of the patented invention made in a Union country into the country where the patent was granted shall not entail forfeiture.

By the proposed amendment this repugnancy will be removed and the way opened for joining the Union for which there is a very general demand. (For further information re the Union see appendix A attached hereto).

In amending the act in 1903, section 44 was enacted to provide for granting licenses in respect of certain patents covering inventions which it would be unreasonable to require the patentee to manufacture in the absence of a special demand. If the proposed amendment be adopted this section will be repealed. The amendment will apply to all patents without regard to the nature of the inventions covered by them.

Under the provisions of the act the commissioner may extend the limited time for manufacture and importation and may place patents under section 44 at his discretion.

The commissioner is moved to exercise this discretion by formal petitions more or less voluminous and supported by affidavit or solemn declaration. These petitions require careful consideration, orders must be made thereon and there is much correspondence therewith. In some years over 5,000 were dealt with in the Patent office. These petitions would be entirely done away with by the amendments as there would be no fixed time to extend and section 44 would be repealed.

Mr. STEVENS: As we proceed with the sections I wish the minister would be good

enough to supplement the very excellent presentation he has just made by applying it to these sections and showing exactly how they will work out. May I ask this? Suppose a citizen of the United States has taken out a patent for an article in the United States and has then taken one out in Canada. The present act, as I understand it, by section 38 protects the Canadian in that the patentee from outside must manufacture in Canada and cannot simply take out his patent, or possibly sell it to someone else making a similar article, and then ignore altogether the Canadian market so far as manufacture is concerned. Or he might take out a patent and not use it, manufacture the article at home and sell it in Canada. Or it might be a machine, of which there are many; what comes to my mind is a machine such as the Goodyear welting machine. I do not know that it would be applicable to machines of that general type, for which a patent might be taken out in Canada and the article be manufactured over in the United States. Now as I understand section 38, it was especially designed to protect against such cases as that. If the minister as we proceed with section 40 can show that we have ample protection, then my perplexity will be largely met. I think we ought to read these sections very carefully, not merely the marginal notes.

Mr. ROBB: I think my hon. friend and I understand the law alike. If I understand it aright, under the old act unless the patent was manufactured in Canada it automatically became void, or if the invention were imported and not manufactured in Canada it became void. I will give my hon. friend an illustration of how under the old act a patent might become void in Canada. Suppose a person is manufacturing an article in Canada for which he has obtained a patent, and his property is destroyed by fire. It might take a year and a half to rebuild that property, and if during that period he imported from his United States factory the requirements to keep the business going, his patent in Canada would become void.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the minister argue that that obtains under the existing act, under section 38?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: It seems pretty far-fetched.

Mr. ROBB: That was the explanation given to me by the commissioner and it was the judgment of the courts under the old act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under the old act?

Mr. ROBB: Under the old act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the existing act?

Mr. ROBB: Yes but under the act as we propose to amend it the commissioner will have discretionary powers to determine whether in the case of such an accident occurring they should be compelled to manufacture in Canada within the period, or he may give them a reasonable time to rebuild. The powers are largely within the discretion of the commissioner, and I am sure hon. gentlemen will appreciate the fact that the commissioner is not going to give a ruling that in his judgment will be detrimental to
4 p.m. manufacturing interests in Canada. At the same time it will afford a little leeway for importation of articles from other countries if there is actual necessity for it.

Mr. STEVENS: Would it not be better to maintain the compulsory provision, that is, make it obligatory on the parties to manufacture in Canada, but in the case of such an accident as the minister has mentioned, fire, deluge, or some act of that kind, the commissioner should have power to extend the period? But the principle is what I am after. I think we ought to retain as far as possible the principle of obligatory manufacture in Canada, making it imperative or obligatory upon the person taking out the patent to manufacture in Canada. If we remove that feature and give to the commissioner discretionary powers such as my hon. friend has just intimated, it is in my estimation altogether, too extensive a power to delegate to an official. Let it be the reverse. I think the principle of the old act is the better. However, if the minister wishes to proceed with the reading of the present section, we can probably bring these points out as we proceed.

Mr. ROBB: I was just going to say that the section really does provide for that, but in different language. If we leave in the old language, it prevents us from entering the Berne convention. If my hon. friends who are legal gentlemen will follow the section closely, I think they will find that though the language is somewhat different, all they desire is provided in this clause.

Mr. BOYS: The minister speaks of discretionary power being given to the commissioner under section 40. Under what sub-

section is there any discretionary power given to him except to refer the petition to the Exchequer Court?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, that power is given.

Mr. BOYS: I would not call that discretionary power at all. A petition comes before the commissioner; the commissioner considers the petition, and if a prima facie case is made out he does nothing himself but refers it to the Exchequer Court. That involves the matter we were discussing the other night, in an effort to get away from responsibility. It seems to me nobody should be better able to dispose of matters of this kind in the first instance than the commissioner himself, who, with the years of experience behind him, should be well able to do it.

Mr. ROBB: Before my hon. friend presents the amendment will he read section 41?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think we can go on now with section 40. I again want to understand what we are doing it for? From what I understand from the minister, the underlying reason for the changes in the act is that the Canadian patentee does not get equal rights in the United States, Japan and Germany—

Mr. ROBB: And some other countries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Those are the countries the minister mentioned.

Mr. ROBB: I gave those notably. There are other places such as Brazil, Cuba and so on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Those are quite important countries. What rights are withheld from us? What do we gain by this? What specific disabilities is the Canadian under in Japan or Germany?

Mr. ROBB: I will give an instance which came under our observation recently. Some fish were shipped down to Brazil; they had trade-mark designs exactly like this, and they refused to register this trade-mark in Brazil. Not only that, but they pirated the trade-mark and threatened to expropriate any Canadian goods that were sent down with that trade-mark. The trade-marks and patents are coupled together there.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for that?

Mr. ROBB: We are not in the convention.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the Brazilian law the convention law?

Mr. ROBB: They are in the convention.

[Mr. Boys.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the United States in the convention? Are Germany and Japan in the convention?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do these sections just follow the American sections?

Mr. ROBB: I could not say as to that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the sense of the sections the same?

Mr. ROBB: No, this is very different. The commissioner advises me that in the United States there are no conditions attached to the patent as regards manufacture and importation. They do the thing a little differently from the way we do it. We might as well be frank in regard to this. There has been a measure of protection under our Canadian law. In the United States it is wide open, and they give the protection through their custom houses. That is the difference in the law as bewteen Canada and the United States.

Mr. STEVENS: Is the minister right in saying that the United States is a member of that convention? I understood that country was not a member.

Mr. ROBB: Not of the copyright, but of the patents and trade-marks it is.

Mr. BOYS: As suggested by the minister, I have looked at section 41. I cannot see how it can be coupled with section 40. Section 41 has reference to the revocation of the patent on the ground that the patented article is manufactured or the process carried on exclusively or mainly outside of Canada. Section 40 deals with the reasonable requirements of the public, and provides that if the article is being manufactured but is not being supplied at a reasonable price, relief may be afforded the public.

Mr. ROBB: Under section 41, if the reasonable requirements of Canada are not supplied, then the commissioner has the right to revoke the patent.

Mr. BOYS: That is section 40 and not section 41.

Mr. ROBB: No, section 41.

Mr. BOYS: I think possibly the amendment I want to suggest may be acceptable to the minister. I suggest that subsections (c) and (d) be deleted, and the following inserted in their place:

(c) If the parties do not come to an arrangement between themselves, the commissioner shall then consider the petition and shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the matter.

The minister will at once see that there is the main difference. The section as we now have it in the proposed bill gives him no jurisdiction. He simply finds out if there is a prima facie case and if so, he sends it to the Exchequer Court. This provides that he shall have jurisdiction and shall hear and determine the matter. Then the amendment proceeds—

> And if it is proved to his satisfaction that the reasonable requirements of the public with respect to the patented invention have not been satisfied the patentee may be ordered by him to supply the patented article within reasonable limits at such price as may be fixed by him, and in accordance with the custom of the trade to which the invention relates as to the payment and delivery, or to grant licenses for the use of the patented invention, as may be fixed by him in either case within and after such time as may be fixed by him and on pain of forfeiture of the patent.
>
> (d) Any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. ROBB: In considering the amendment I wish to bring to the attention of the committee the sections that it is proposed to delete, namely (c) and (d). Subsection (c) reads:

> The commissioner shall then consider the petition—

That is when representations are made to him that the goods are not manufactured in Canada—

> The commissioner shall then consider the petition and, if the parties do not come to an arrangement between themselves, the commissioner, if satisfied that a prima facie case has been made out, shall refer the petition to the Exchequer Court and, if the commissioner is not so satisfied, he may dismiss the petition.

It will be observed that in the first instance he takes upon himself the right to dismiss the petition, but if there is any doubt about it he refers the matter to the Exchequer Court, and there the interested parties go before that court and submit evidence for and against. I submit to my hon. friend that if his amendment prevails it means no more and no less than establishing a second court within the Patent office, and adds enormously to the machinery of public service in this country, and, in my judgment, adds quite an unnecessary expense. There might not be more than one or two cases develop during the year, but you would require all the machinery of the court to sit there waiting for such cases to come up. The Exchequer Court is a fair method of arbitration for all parties to go before and to bring their witnesses. There may be many witnesses to be heard; there may be long records to examine, and in the interest of economical government and fair play to all interested parties, as well as in order to do justice to all the people of Canada, I do not think my hon. friend should press his amendment. It seems to me that the present method is a fair one. The commissioner explains to me that in the early nineties they had the machinery which my hon. friend now proposes to reintroduce; but experience proved that it was too cumbersome, and they had to abandon it. That is why at this time they have decided to refer all these cases to the Exchequer Court. That is what the Exchequer Court is for. If there are not enough men on that court, let more be put on, but why establish a court within the Patent office?

Mr. BOYS: I should like to say at once that in proposing this amendment, I had no thought of putting anybody, not even the government, to expense. My thought in suggesting this amendment is the very reverse. I do not think persons interested in patents, where there is room for some little dispute, should at once be drawn into the law courts at great cost and delay. It might be interesting to know just how many cases, such as are involved in the matter we are now discussing, have arisen in the last twenty years. I do not suppose there are many, but surely when a question arises whether or not an article is being supplied at a reasonable cost to the public, the commissioner, without a string of officials, without a great deal of expense, can read the petition, hear the persons interested in the patents, and then and there determine whether or not the public are being supplied with the article at a reasonable cost. If he thinks they are, he dismisses the application; if not, he says so, and he imposes such terms as he thinks proper. For argument, in the case of an article selling at a dollar, he will say: "You have here an article that costs five to ten cents to manufacture; you ought to supply it to the public at fifty or seventy-five cents," whatever he thinks proper. He gives his judgment accordingly, and I venture to say that in most cases his judgment will be accepted by the parties. But in case any injustice may be done, let an appeal to the Exchequer Court be reserved to protect the party who fails. You have then the ordinary machinery of that court to follow. How the minister can think this is going to involve an army of employees or even an extra employee, I cannot see. This will not increase expense; it will diminish it. It is going to keep applicants for patents out of litigation. This may seem a peculiar thing for a lawyer to suggest; but my interest in this matter is as a member of parliament, and not as a lawyer. I am speaking in this case as a member of parliament. I certainly desire, as

a representative of the people of Canada, to do all I can to keep them out of law. I am going to read a comment which has reached me in connection with this clause. I do not desire any credit for this amendment. It was handed to me by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who, being unable to be present, asked me to take charge of it. This is the comment; with which I entirely agree:

> These are framed to reduce the necessity for suit before the Exchequer Court. There is strong feeling against throwing all doubtful cases at once into the law courts and compelling litigation on questions which may well be determined within the Patent office. In fact, there is a strong feeling that without the passage of such amendments the Patent office will be receiving fees without earning them, and as the bill stands at present the Commissioner of Patents is stripped of his proper functions—

With that I absolutely agree.

> —which are handed to the Exchequer Court, while the patentee may at any time find himself forced into legal procedure which might be properly avoided.

The only answer made by the minister to that is the imaginary expense it is going to lead to. Let us see what this clause contemplates. The public think they are being called upon to pay an extravagant price for an article the manufacture of which is patented. They present a petition to the commissioner setting out their grievances, I presume, giving some evidence that the article cannot cost more than 20 to 30 per cent of the selling cost, and stating that there should be a reduction in price. When the commissioner receives the petition, he then decides whether or not it should be granted or dismissed. As the minister says, he can dismiss it under the proposed legislation. I want to go a step further and to meet the case when the commissioner, after consideration, is of opinion that the article is being sold at too high a price. He may then say so, and add what he thinks it should be sold for, to supply the public with the article at a reasonable price. He gives his judgment accordingly. Where is there anything cumbersome, troublesome or expensive in that procedure? The commissioner is given many powers in this legislation. Why not give him an important power in this connection, and keep people out of law, if possible. If they must have law, they can appeal to the Exchequer Court from his decision. I must say the minister has not said anything which makes me think this amendment should be withdrawn. I do not present it for the purpose of embarrassment at all; I present it in the hope that the minister may think it is reasonable; that the provisions of this measure will be improved, and that the cost connected with patents will be lessened. In no other spirit do I offer the amendment to the minister. If he just views the situation which might arise under it, I do not see how he can imagine for a moment that the troubles which he has anticipated will occur. I agree with the comment I have read that if you do not give the commissioner such a power as this, the Patent office will be actually receiving fees without earning them. We do not want a commissioner, a man of experience and ability, to merely receive and file papers, and to tell people, if they are not satisfied, to go to the Exchequer Court. We have a commissioner, as far as I know of considerable capacity. He is paid with that in view. Give him some responsibility in connection with the enforcement of this legislation. Do not strip him of responsibility and send everything of any doubt or trouble to the Exchequer Court, which, I think, is fairly well loaded up with work at the present time.

Mr. ROBB: Probably my hon. friend might be right in many arguments that would come up; but there are some cases where, I think, I could almost convince my hon. friend that it is quite necessary that this should go to the Exchequer Court. The commissioner has recently pointed out a case that came before him in connection with a system of recovering ore at the Cobalt mines, a very complicated matter, where royalties would run into millions of dollars. My hon. friend can understand that if the commissioner undertook to hear cases of that kind, they might extend over quite a long time and tie up the work of the office. My hon. friend has not yet persuaded me that it is best to establish a court within the Patent office. He will not deny that it will be necessary to equip the Patent office further, if they are properly to hear all evidence in connection with appeals that arise from time to time. May I again remind my hon. friend that the system he suggests was in vogue prior to 1890?

Mr. STEVENS: The minister is objecting to the establishment of a court within the Patent office; but he is establishing a court by this clause. He is empowering the commissioner to say, no, but he forbids him to say yes. He empowers the commissioner to dismiss a case; but if the commissioner does not dismiss a case, he must send it on with a sort of "God bless you" to the Exchequer Court. Let me read the clause, and the minister will see where his argument is without foundation at all:

The commissioner shall then consider the petition, and . . . . if satisfied that a prima facie case has been made out,—

But how can he determine that such a case has been made out unless he hears the evidence? How can he determine that a prima facie case has been made out if he has not read the petition and heard or read the evidence and given it his consideration; in other words, unless he has sat upon the case as a court?

Mr. ROBB: He need not necessarily act as a court.

Mr. STEVENS: Follow me a step further. The section goes on:

—and, if the commissioner is not so satisfied, he may dismiss the petition.

You deny the petitioner the right of appeal if the commissioner says no, but you send the case to the Exchequer Court if he says yes. Why, the thing is really preposterous. The minister says in effect that the commissioner cannot try these cases because he has not the equipment nor the time. But a petition comes before him and he is empowered to say, "You have no case;" and there is no right of appeal, no safeguard at all. But has not the commissioner considered the case if he dismisses it? If he has not, then this law is a travesty on justice; it is only an insult to the intelligence of the people. My hon. friend will certainly have to amend the section because I cannot see how he can escape it. Let us read the clause carefully:

The commissioner shall then consider the petition and, ... if satisfied that a prima facie case has been made out, shall refer the petition to the exchequer court—

For purposes which are determined in the next section. But, mark you, he must determine first whether a prima facie case has been made out.

—and, if the commissioner is not so satisfied, he may dismiss the petition.

If the commissioner is not satisfied, after having given due consideration to the matter, he may say to the petitioners, "You have no case, go away," and that ends it. They have no right of appeal. Now, that is a dangerous power to put into the hands of the commissioner. We do not ask that; we say, let the petition go before the commissioner; and we ask him to do what you are asking him to do here, namely, to consider it. We say that if he considers a prima facie case has been made out he shall refer the matter to the Exchequer Court; and if, on the other hand, he considers that no prima facie case has been established, then we ask that, if the petitioners, or either party, are not satisfied, they be given the right to appeal to the court.

Mr. ROBB: That is not what the amendment says.

Mr. STEVENS: Virtually it is; that is exactly what we mean.

Mr. BOYS: It does say that.

Mr. STEVENS: As far as I know it does; that is what we are asking. I think I have made that point perfectly clear, and there can be no possible escape from that reasoning. But let us look for a moment at another phase of the matter. The cost question has come up several times and the minister has expressed the opinion that we are going to add to the cost if we adopt this amendment. It does not matter where the case is decided, whether in the Exchequer Court, in the Patent office, in the Justice department or anywhere else, it must be given consideration and there must be cost. There must be cost in maintaining the Exchequer Court, because there have to be clerks, judges, registrars, etc.; and there must be cost if the matter is to be considered in the Patent office. In short, wherever the case is considered cost is involved. For the commissioner to say that he will just simply unload all his work on the Exchequer Court in so far as decisions are concerned, and thereby effect economies in the administration of the act, is absolutely nonsense, because if the Exchequer Court is in such a condition to-day that case after case can be referred to it without adding to its cost, there must be something wrong somewhere. It may be argued by the minister that the parties appealing to the courts will pay their own costs. That is a point to be considered; but I want to point out that they have already paid their costs to the Patent office. If I remember rightly, and, of course, I am subject to correction, the Patent office now has a revenue of over $200,000. These fees are paid to that office for just such cases as this, where there is a difference, where there is a ruling, where there is a search wanted. All these things are the reasons for the fees that are paid into that office. I would say, if the minister argued on the basis of cost, that he at once reduce the fees to applicants, because the Patent office never was intended as a profit-making institution. I cannot see, therefore, that my hon. friend has made an adequate defence at all in regard to this section. On both these grounds I appeal to him again, supporting my hon. friend who presented the amendment. Let the commissioner have the re-

sponsibility of deciding the case and let an appeal be allowed in both cases to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BOYS: There is one further observation I would make. If I understand the section rightly it is really for the benefit of the public that it is being enacted, and not for the benefit of the patentee. Well, analyze that situation for a moment. If a petition is presented it comes only from the public; it is a petition from the public to have the article supplied to them at a reasonable rate. The commissioner passes upon that, having heard, I presume, the evidence only of the petitioners. In other words, it is a prima facie case that has been made out; he does not hear the defence. Having heard what the petition sets out he is permitted to say to the public, the petitioners, "I do not consider that you have made out a prima facie case," and there is an end of the matter. The public have no chance to go further. Is that desirable? In one breath you say you do not want to give the commissioner the responsibility or the power except to refer a petition to the Exchequer Court, and in the next breath you give him the opportunity of deciding that a prima facie case has not been made out, and then you refuse the public the right of appeal. The proposed amendment provides that the commissioner shall reach a decision, whichever way he thinks right, in the first instance, and either party being dissatisfied may go to the court for relief, and there the matter shall end. If the minister wants to protect the public it seems to me he should accede to the amendment, because it is only in the interests of the public that it is intended. As a matter of fact the section itself is meant to protect the public, and if the commissioner is given in one instance the responsibility I have referred to, I do not see why he should not be given the dual power of both rejecting or admitting the petition and granting relief.

Mr. BRISTOL: Has this section as drawn been copied from any other act? I can see what is in the commissioner's mind as well as what is in the minds of my hon. friends. They want to have the commissioner determine the case one way or the other. As the section is now drawn, all that he determines is whether there is a prima facie case; and I think that is open to this objection. There are tremendously valuable and intricate patents to-day in connection with radio and electrical inventions of one kind or another, and if you are going to ask the Commissioner of Patents to go into the merits of any case he would have to have expert assistance and really set up something like an Exchequer Court. But as I understand the section the idea is that the commissioner would say whether on documents submitted to him there was a prima facie case, and if he said there was, then it would go to the Exchequer Court to decide whether in fact there was a case on the merits. That court is equipped for the purpose and specially intended for the trial of patent cases, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court. It seems to me that everything my hon. friends desire to do could be accomplished if there was the same right of appeal from the commissioner's decision that there was not a prima facie case Otherwise it puts this tremendous power in his possession, that in perfect good faith he might say that in his opinion there was not a prima facie case, and possibly enormous interests might be involved, but there would be no opportunity of proceeding to the Exchequer Court. It seems to me it would be perfectly right and proper if the person presenting a petition for a patent was thrown out of court by the commissioner on the ground that he had not established a prima facie case that there should be a right of appeal from the commissioner to the Exchequer Court. That is the only suggestion I should like to make. If you are going to throw the responsibility of some of these tremendously important cases upon the commissioner, then there will certainly be a very expensive procedure incurred, which is not in the interests of the patentee, who usually has not very much money to spend on securing a patent for his invention. He is usually up against very powerful interests who will go ahead and fight the case through to the Supreme Court. The amount of money collected by patentees for damages in the last ten years is less than a million dollars, while the value of the patents involved is hundreds of millions of dollars. Do not put more expense and difficulty on the poor patentee in protecting his rights. I do think that if his petition is thrown out by the commissioner on the ground that no prima facie case has been made out the patentee should be allowed to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. McMASTER: I think perhaps there is a way to meet the objections which have been raised by the hon. and learned member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) and also to prevent too great an accumulation of appeals. I have listened with a great deal of attention to what the hon member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) has said, and with it I am in almost entire agreement. What I understand is desired by the minister is the avoidance of

a multiplication of vexatious appeals. He wishes to prevent this stituation: A man pretends that the patentee has not provided for the reasonable requirements of the public; he brings a petition before the commissioner, who finds he has no prima facie case at all and turns him away. Now the suggestion of the hon. member for South Simcoe is that that man should be put in precisely the same position as is the man in connection with whose application a prima facie case has been held to have been made out by the commissioner and that the applicant who has been turned down by him should have the right to go to the Supreme Court also. That is what I understand is the position taken by my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: To the Exchequer Court.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, I mean the Exchequer Court. Would it not be possible to meet the desires of the member for South Simcoe and the desires of the minister by making this provision? Where the commissioner thinks a prima facie case is made out he refers the matter to the Exchequer Court, which is equipped to deal with it. I see force in the argument that we do not want to establish a court that will go into the whole matter; it might involve the commissioner in months of work and the office might more or less be retarded by the fact that he was tied up on the case just as our courts get tied up with cases lasting weeks; and that where a prima facie case is made out the commissioner transmits the matter to the Exchequer Court immediately. If the commissioner does not believe that a prima facie case is made out, and rejects the application, I would not want to deprive the applicant of any recourse whatsoever. But I would say to him: You have failed to make out a prima facie case; you may go to the Exchequer Court, but you must go on such terms as will assure your opponent that you are not resorting to that court vexatiously. Therefore I would suggest this course to the minister: That where an applicant has had application turned down by the commissioner, and wishes to go to the Exchequer Court, he should put up security for the costs that will be involved in his application. That will meet the views of the hon. member for South Simcoe. It will not put the commissioner in the position where he can arbitrarily turn down an application which perhaps has more merit in it than he thinks, but it will allow the applicant, on giving security, to go to the Exchequer Court. At the same time the fact that the applicant whose application has been turned down has to put up security will discourage people from making frivolous applications before the commissioner and before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BOYS: I am very slightly convinced perhaps in one connection by the remarks of the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol). I can conceive that occasionally a case of a highly technical nature might arise which would lead perhaps to a prolonged investigation and would require expert testimony. As a way out of the difficulty would it be improper to make this suggestion: While you put upon the commissioner the responsibility I have already indicated, you might add a proviso that in cases of a highly technical or unusually difficult nature the commissioner could, with the approval of the minister, refer them to the Exchequer Court. The effect of such a proviso would be that in all ordinary cases the commissioner would give a quick decision and, I venture to say, nearly always a satisfactory decision, at very little cost and with very little delay; but when he finds himself involved in some of the highly technical cases suggested, he will have the power to say, "This is a case of a highly technical nature and unusual difficulty and, with the approval of the minister, I shall refer it to the Exchequer Court". This would protect everybody; it would protect the public and it would protect the patentee, and besides this protection the costs in the majority of the cases will be kept down to the minimum, there being no necessity for an extra staff in the department. I think this would meet the objections advanced by the member for Centre Toronto. If I were permitted I could very easily add such a proviso to my amendment. Possibly it is a matter of such importance that the minister will let the section stand and so afford us sufficient time to draft what is necessary by way of amendment. I think this would save time in the end.

Mr. ROBB: Stands.

Mr. BRISTOL: Before this is done I would suggest to my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Boys) consideration of this aspect: Whether instead of doing what he suggests where the commissioner said no prima facie case had been made out, it would not be better to let the applicant appeal to the Exchequer Court provided the Exchequer Court gave leave. He really gets a hearing then before the commissioner, and if he succeeds, then he should; if he does not succeed, then the thing is ended.

Mr. BOYS: That does not meet my main purpose in submitting this amendment, which is, as I have said, to get an inexpensive and a quick decision on the part of the commissioner. I should be losing the entire object that I have in view if I adopted that suggestion.

Mr. FORTIER: I am in favour of the provision as contained in the bill. In the discussion of this matter we should not lose sight of the petition itself, which is a special petition, from, we will say, a third party who contends that the price of a patented article is too high. He represents himself as an interested party, but he is looking after the interests of the public, and he presents his petition to the commissioner. Of course, he comes up against a condition of affairs that has existed for some time, involving certain vested rights. Well, when he goes before the commissioner and asks that a change be made, it is my opinion that the commissioner is in a perfectly good position to say prima facie that the petition should not be entertained. It is wise that the commissioner should have the power to decide whether or not the petition is well founded. If he does not do so, and if he renders a judgment equivalent to the granting of the petition, which asks for a change in the price of an article, that is where the difficulty comes in. Would he be in a position to protect the public by making a change in the price without going into a long enquete, without hearing experts, without having engineers before him, and so on? The holding of such an enquete, is not within the jurisdiction of the commissioner, and therefore it is wise that the matter should be referable to the Exchequer Court. The question of costs is involved; the petitioner will be obliged to incur certain costs if the investigation is held before the commissioner, then, if appeal is taken to the Exchequer Court there is what one might call a double trial.

Mr. STEVENS: He has no appeal if the commissioner says, no.

Mr. FORTIER: So much the better; I am not in favour of an appeal. I say the bill is wise in giving power to the commissioner to have this matter placed before the Exchequer Court at once with a view to their deciding on the merits of the petition. That may involve not merely the granting of the petition itself but the fixing of a price in order to protect the public. It is only after a full trial before a court that the matter can be dealt with satisfactorily to the public.

Mr. ROBB: I was disposed to allow the item to stand but before finally deciding that I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Boys) if he would accept the clauses as they are, with the addition of these words:

Any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

That would give them the right of appeal. I think my hon. friend is almost convinced that the hon. members for Centre Toronto Mr. Bristol), Labelle (Mr. Fortier) and Brome (Mr. McMaster) are right.

Mr. BOYS: The minister evidently thinks that all I am striving for is an appeal, but that is not the case. It is not an appeal I want; it is a quick decision, and the minister's suggested amendment will not help that at all. I do think an appeal is necessary. I do not think it is proper to give the commissioner the power he has under this section without providing for an appeal in case the petition is refused. But the real purpose of my amendment is not that at all; it is to get a quick decision in all cases.

Mr. BRISTOL: Which amendment is the hon. member speaking to, his own or the one the minister has just read?

Mr. BOYS: We are dealing with both.

Mr. BRISTOL: It seems to me that if there is the right of appeal when the commissioner decides that there is no prima facie case, then the public will be protected. I cannot see how you can get a quick decision one way or the other, because each case depends upon a great number of circumstances. Some cases may be extremely simple and some very complicated, and only to be interpreted with the assistance of experts. That is really the gist of this whole situation, as I view it—the right of appeal in either case. That is what I would like to see; any amendment along that line would be fair to everybody.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend wish the section to stand, or will he accept my amendment?

Mr. BOYS: I am not personally interested, Mr. Chairman, but I have reason to believe that there is a large class of persons who do feel interested in the matter, and this amendment is perhaps the result of their wishes. Apart from that, it makes no difference to me at all. I do not recede from the position I have taken that in the ordinary case the commissioner can easily decide the matter. Let me add one observation, and I am through, whatever happens. Take the ordinary case of litigation in the courts: I venture to say that not more than one case in fifteen goes

to appeal; a decision is rendered and the parties, as a rule, accept it Appeal is taken in a limited number of cases, and so it would be in respect to these petitions. It is perfectly proper to protect the public by appeal, but I think that in the other way you would get a decision much quicker, and you would not heap upon the Exchequer Court every case in which there was any doubt at all—and that must be the result here. The commissioner would have no power except to dismiss the petition. I do not imagine he would be inclined to dismiss unless he was very certain about it; therefore, wherever there is any doubt you throw the people interested into litigation in spite of themselves, although they might be willing to lay their views before the commissioner and accept his decision.

Mr. ROBB: In the hope that at six o'clock the commissioner and the legal gentlemen may get together and introduce language that would suit all, I suggest that the clause stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 40 and amendment thereto stand.

On section 41—Revocation of patent time limit:

Mr. BOYS: We see at once, right in this section, the very thing we have been striving for in the last. I cannot understand this: in one section you give the commissioner certain power and in another section you run away from it; in another you come back again to it, and then run away from it. In the last section we were trying to give the commissioner the power a man of his ability and experience might properly be vested with, but we were met with the suggestion that it was too great a power. Now, here is subsection 2 of 41:

> The commissioner shall consider the application, and, if after inquiry he is satisfied that the allegations contained therein are correct, then, subject to the provisions of this section, and unless the patentee proves that the patented article or process is manufactured or carried on to an adequate extent in Canada, or gives satisfactory reasons why the article or process is not so manufactured or carried on, the commissioner may—

Not refer it to the Exchequer Court but may do something himself, and to find out whether he is going to do that something or not, the case has to be proved before him. How does he do it? I suppose a court, as the minister suggested, would be required in connection with the last section. Witnesses come before him, are examined pro and con, and when all that is done and satisfactory reasons are given the commissioner then comes to a decision. It is not a case of a prima facie proposition in which he refers it to the Exchequer Court, or dismisses it; he reaches a decision. Now what is the difference between this and my contention in connection with the last section? Absolutely none except with regard to perhaps highly technical cases. They impress me, I admit. In some very difficult cases it might lead to a prolonged investigation. It will lead to that anyway before the Exchequer Court, and I should imagine the commissioner of patents ought to be just about as well able to dispose of matters respecting patent rights as a judge of the Exchequer Court, who may be very able, but is not, at all events, confining his attention to one line all the time as the patent commissioner is. So here in this section we have adopted what was rejected in the last. I can see no reason whatever for its rejection except in technical cases.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister must realize the sanity of my hon. friend's suggestion sanity that is in comparison with the obvious —what shall I say—not insanity, but bordering on it of these two sections when one is compared to the other. Not only is what my hon. friend (Mr. Boys) has said true, but it will be noted that the power given to the commissioner in this section is to revoke a patent, cancel it, to take from a man all rights he has in it. It is the ultimate power, one might say. But not only that, the commissioner must be in a position to understand all the details of all treaties of this country with other countries. This is a power infinitely wider than the power in section 40. Perhaps we had better have the two sections stand until after six o'clock in order to have them harmonized. Let the powers whatever they are be the same in both cases and run in some degree of harmony.

Mr. ROBB: How would it be to pass this section? Then we shall have a precedent for what is suggested by my hon. friend for Simcoe.

Mr. STEVENS: We will have to look at the powers of appeal.

Mr. McMASTER: The section provides for power of appeal.

Mr. STEVENS: That ought to make this section a model for the other.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall subsection 2 carry?

Mr. BOYS: If this carries with a view to amending section 40 to meet it, I can understand it, but surely you do not want one section contradicting the other. I think the committee has to decide whether you are going to have a commissioner in the patent office who is to have responsibility com-

mensurate with the importance of the office, or whether you are going to
5 p.m. have merely a clerical officer there. That is the first thing to decide. If you are going to have a commissioner in the true sense, and that is what I want, then give him these powers—don't empower him under one section and refuse power under another, but give him power throughout, reasonable power subject to appeal. Either do that or abolish all idea of him being a commissioner and get down to a clerical basis and let everything go to the Exchequer Court. I do not think we should pass this section unless the minister is really disposed to adopt the principle involved here in the last section also.

Mr. BRISTOL: What machinery has been provided by the act—I am not familiar with it—for the taking of evidence before the commissioner on such important matters as are dealt with here? Does he take evidence under oath, have counsel the right to appear before him and examine and cross-examine, or does he take it by affidavit and have absolute discretion? As a matter of litigation the question whether an article has been imported or manufactured, and that sort of thing, is very important and you get a great deal of contradictory testimony. If it is all done by affidavit the cleverest man at making affidavits would win. That is a matter that should be considered by the minister. These are very wide powers and very important questions would come up for decision.

Mr. ROBB: The only provision in section 41 is for taking evidence by affidavit. There is no provision for examination of witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall subsection 2 carry?

Mr. STEVENS: That is with the understanding that section 40 is to be remodelled and harmonize with section 41.

Mr. ROBB: No, I would prefer them both to stand.

Section 41 stands.

On section 43—Tariff of fees:

Mr. ROBB: There are some slight changes made in the present tariff.

An item is added to provide a fee for proceedings in new sections 16, 23, 40 and 41; also an item for the fees on drawings, which were provided for by a repealed section. The fee payable on the patent which the patentee has allowed to lapse has been made the same as the original fee, which is thought to be only reasonable. Since the present tariff came into force there have been several cases of hardship through failure to pay the final fee within the fixed time. It is thought it would be well to provide for relief from forfeiture on payment of the prescribed fee, which is really a penalty.

Mr. BOYS: It is rather hard to digest all this in a hurry. The old fee for a patent good for a term of eighteen years was $60. Now the fee for a patent is to be $15 on filing application for patent—

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend must have the wrong tariff. I will read to him the tariff of fees. The fees are provided by the act of 1921.

Mr. BOYS: What about the tariff of fees provided here in section 43 now under consideration? The list appears there, and what I am trying to find out is whether or not the fees there are correct. This scale provides for $15 on filing an application for patent and a fee of $20 on the grant of patent, which would be $35 altogether, whereas the former fee was $60. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 47, subsection 1—Restoration and revival of patent:

Mr. ROBB: This section is entirely new and gives the commissioner the power to revive lapsed patents, which heretofore had to be done by parliament. The commissioner now has that power.

Mr. STEVENS: In other words this will remove the necessity of passing special private bills for reviving patents?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 6—Right of appeal:

Mr. STEVENS: There is a point in subsection 6 that requires some attention.

Mr. ROBB: I desire to strike out the words "within six months from the date hereof," in the fourth line of this subsection. That is to meet an objection raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys). We provide for that in another section.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 48—Government may use patented inventions:

Mr. STEVENS: Suppose one of the employees of the government in one of the departmental laboratories should make a dis-

covery—I care not what it may be—is there any provision in the act protecting him?

Mr. ROBB: I think that is provided for in section 23.

Mr. STEVENS: The reason I think we should be very sure of that is because this section provides—

The government of Canada may, at any time, use any patented invention, paying to the patentee such sum as the commissioner reports to be a reasonable compensation for the use thereof.

While I do not wish to dispute this point, I think that in the case of employees of the government, for the sake of encouraging them in their work, there should be some definite allowance made to them. I understand there is some understanding, but whether it is incorporated in the bill or not I do not know.

Mr. ROBB: I think that is provided for in section 23, which says—

Every patent granted in respect of an invention made by a person while employed in the public service of Canada—

And so on. I think it is fully covered by that. My hon. friend for Simcoe had some suggestions to make in regard to that section. We propose to go back to section 23, my hon. friend suggested that the following words be added:

Any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BRISTOL: It seems to me that provision should apply all through the bill. I think it should be a matter for the Exchequer Court to say what is reasonable. Section 48 says—

The government of Canada may, at any time, use any patented invention, paying the patentee such sum as the commissioner reports to be a reasonable compensation for the use thereof.

Mr. ROBB: What does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. BRISTOL: I think there should be an appeal to the Exchequer Court as to the amount of that compensation. It seems to me that, with all the work the commissioner has, he should not have to render an absolute decision for the government, but that there should be an appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. ROBB: There is no objection to that; it is reasonable. Will the hon. member move the amendment?

Mr. BRISTOL: I will move an amendment to that section, similar to the amendment which is being made to the other section.

Mr. STEVENS: We might enact a general section providing that in all cases where an appeal is not provided for in the act an appeal would be permitted to the Exchequer Court. There should be no objection to a general section.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner tells me he thinks they were all covered as we went along. There would be no objection to that general section, to cover any omissions. That would probably be the better way.

Mr. STEVENS: A section at the end covering everything.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the following words be added to section 48.

And any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. ROBB: We will accept that.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 52—Inspection by the public:

Mr. BRISTOL: I have not had an opportunity of examining this bill with special care. Is there in it any provision of this character? As soon as an application for a patent is filed, assuming that a patent is granted subsequently, perhaps one year or two years later, is the patentee protected from the date of his original application or from the date of the issue of the patent? For instance, supposing a patent is taken out in the United States as frequently happens, and an application is not made in Canada until some time later. A Canadian or American manufacturer or some other competitor may manufacture in Canada as fast as he likes until the patent is actually issued. Assuming that a patent is issued a year after the application is filed, can the patentee claim damages during that period, or does the patent simply speak from its date?

Mr. ROBB: From the date of issue.

Section agreed to.

On section 57—Register of attorneys:

Mr. ROBB: This is new. For a number of years there has been a desire on the part of patent attorneys, particularly in Canada, for a provision for the registration of patent attorneys. Since this bill has been introduced, further pressure has been brought to bear to insert in the bill a clause of this kind and the Patent office is in favour of this proposal.

Mr. STEVENS: Is there any objection by any person competent to make an objection as representing the public?

Mr. ROBB: The experience of the department is that to protect the public there should be a register, so that the public may know who the attorneys are.

Mr. STEVENS: That has not been the case in Canada before.

Mr. ROBB: No, but it is the case in all other countries.

Mr. BAXTER: I know from a little experience that a register is kept in the United States, and I can well understand the reason for that. There are, however, some difficulties in the way of a Canadian being registered in the United States as a patent attorney. I think it would be well, not because of any desire to promote hostilities between the two countries, but because of the enormous number of persons who are members of the various bars of the United States, that this clause should be limited to patent attorneys resident in Canada. The department could keep a record of them and find out as to their standing. I agree with the minister that the whole point of this clause is that only reputable persons shall have charge of the prosecution of applications for patents. I do not think this is for the protection of the public; I think it is for what is more important, namely for the protection of the applicant for a patent who, if he gets into dishonest hands, may have very important information given out. The idea of the United States Patent office is as far as possible to guard the applicant so that he will be in the hands of a person trustworthy as to moral character and having some reasonable experience in the business in which he engages. There is nothing, as I understand the matter, to require a man to have an attorney at all. If he chooses to sign the papers himself and to forward his application, he can do so; but if he has an attorney, he must have one who is on the register.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is in accord with the commissioner that there should be a register of patent attorneys. I think, however, I can convince him that it is not desirable that we should limit this to Canadians. I am told that our Canadian patent attorneys are very well used at Washington, the capital of the United States, and we do not wish to do in this country anything that might lead to retaliation.

Mr. BAXTER: All right.

Mr. PARENT: I do not know whether I understand this clause properly; but as I read it, it seems that a lawyer would have to register with the department here in order to appear on behalf of somebody who was applying for a patent. If a lawyer has a right to appear before the Exchequer Court, he should have the right to appear before the commissioner for any claim he might put forward. The clause as it reads now requires that the lawyer must register with the department. I do not suppose that is the spirit or the idea of the law.

Mr. ROBB: Any member of the Canadian bar will be put on this list.

Mr. PARENT: If that is the idea, I suppose there will be no harm in inserting an amendment to that effect.

Mr. ROBB: This is governed by the regulations. It will be put in the regulations.

Section agreed to.

On section 58—Patent agent or attorney:

Mr. ROBB: This is new.

Mr. BAXTER: It is quite right, though.

Mr. ROBB: Then no explanation is required.

Section agreed to.

On section 65—Repeal:

Mr. ROBB: This is new. It is simply to provide for cases of impeachment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the section, 5A, reserved?

Mr. ROBB: That is the section establishing the status of the Commissioner of Patents.

Section agreed to.

On section 67—R. S. c 69 not to apply:

Mr. ROBB: I desire to move an amendment to this section for the purpose of adding the following subsection:

(2) Nothing in this act shall affect any suit or proceeding now pending or judgment existing which may be prosecuted, continued, completed, and enforced, as if this act had not been passed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under section 65 the status of patents already issued stands as established by the laws under which they were issued. They are subject to cancellation, or they may be enforced or upheld by the courts, without regard to this statute but by virtue of previous acts. Section 67, however, provides that on the coming into force of this act patents issued prior thereto shall cease to be subject to the provisions of the Patent Act. Perhaps what my hon. friend has

in mind is that so far as the administration of patents already issued is concerned, that is to say, with regard to the payment of fees, or returns, and so forth, these matters shall be subject to the new law, but that the validity of patents already issued under previous legislation shall stand as established by the laws under which they were granted.

Mr. ROBB: That is the idea.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not expressed clearly.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: To meet the wishes of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) I have another amendment to offer:

Whenever an appeal to the Exchequer Court from the decision of the commissioner is allowed under this act, notice of such decision shall be mailed by registered letter addressed to the interested parties or their respective agents, and the appeal shall be taken within six months from the date of the mailing of such notice.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the use of the word "decision" is unfortunate.

Whenever an appeal to the Exchequer Court from the decision of the commissioner is allowed. . . . notice of such decision shall be mailed.

"Notice of such decision" does not refer to the former "decision", but to the fact that an appeal has been allowed from the decision of the commissioner. That is what the commissioner has in mind, I believe.

Mr. BRISTOL: Is it the intention to give a period of six months within which appeal may be made?

Mr. ROBB: That is the intention.

Mr. BRISTOL: Would that be reasonable? It seems to me that a person is entitled to know, within a reasonable time after the commissioner has decided that the patent is in litigation, that appeal is going to be made. To have it open for six months would be a serious thing for the owner of a patent. Surely appeal can be made within thirty days. No court that I know of gives any such period as six months. Patent rights are not of much use unless they are exercised promptly.

Mr. ROBB: I am told that this is similar to a section prepared by the Justice department.

Mr. BRISTOL: A patent is no good until it is granted, and if an inventor can be held up for six months by an appeal he is going to be seriously handicapped. As a matter of fact, it is a very serious matter now, owing to the congestion that exists in Canada and the United States, to get a patent issued promptly, because new radio inventions are being made from month to month; and if a man cannot get his patent promptly his invention is going to be infringed right away by imitators, so that when he does get his patent, in a year's time perhaps, the invention is no good because it has been copied in the meantime, and he has had to fight the imitators. This is one matter particularly in regard to which the law's delays entail a very serious hardship.

Mr. BAXTER: While we should no doubt expedite the granting of patents, we should not forget on the other hand that many inventions come from people in the community who are not blessed with abundant means, and we ought not to make the act so rigid that a poor man who is the real inventor of any device might be deprived of all right and benefit of his brains because, having to appeal within so short a time, he could not get the necessary money to take action. I quite agree that there should be no unduly long delay in granting a patent, but we should give a man who thinks he has rights a chance to vindicate them; and he may need a reasonable time in which to secure help.

Mr. ROBB: Section 20, already passed, provides:

Every applicant who has failed to obtain a patent by reason of the objection of the commissioner aforesaid may, at any time within six months after notice thereof has been mailed by registered letter, addressed to him or his agent, appeal from the decision of the said commissioner to the Exchequer Court.

This was drawn up especially at the request of the Department of Justice, and the present section follows the same line.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no objection to the section the minister has just quoted. We are trying, however, to find out just what is meant by the section we are now considering. The reading here is:

Whenever an appeal to the Exchequer Court from the decision of the commissioner is allowed under this act—

Mr. ROBB: Permitted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is very much better than "allowed," because the allowance of the appeal generally means the appeal is granted. That is one of the things I was going to point out. The section is improved by the change. It now reads:

Whenever an appeal to the Exchequer Court from the decision of the commissioner is permitted under this act, notice of such decision shall be mailed by registered letter.

Is it notice of such decision, or is it notice of the permission that is to be mailed?

Mr. ROBB: The intention is that the notice of the decision of the commissioner is

to be mailed. If my hon. friend feels that the language is not clear we are prepared to accept any suggestions from him to remove the obscurity.

Mr. BRISTOL: With reference to the decision of the Department of Justice as to the right of appeal under section 20, I think it is absolutely reasonable. That is a case where a patentee has been refused a patent; therefore he is not being oppressed. He is simply allowed further time in which to get help to go on with his appeal. But this is not the case with 67a. I am quite in accord with the amendment made by the Department of Justice, but I do not think it is reasonable that the man contesting a patent should be allowed six months to proceed with his appeal. I think he should proceed promptly—say, within thirty days. After the applicant has been granted his patent he ought to be allowed to go ahead and get the full benefit from it.

Mr. ROBB: Why not make it three months?

Mr. BRISTOL: I am quite content.

Mr. ROBB: I will substitute three months.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the word "six" be stricken out and the word "three" substituted?

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Several sections were allowed to stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 5 was allowed to stand. It is moved by Mr. Murdock:

That section 5 be stricken out and there be substituted the following:

The commissioner shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed upon him by this act subject to the minister and in the absence or inability to act of the commissioner any officer or clerk named by the minister to perform the duties of the commissioner may, as acting commissioner exercise such powers and shall perform such duties.

Clause as amended agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 11 was allowed to stand.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, to meet the desires of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) I beg to move:

That clause 11 be amended by adding after the word "commissioner" in the fourteenth line thereof the following words:

After such notice as he may deem requisite and sufficient.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for South Simcoe had some objections to section 23, which we proposed to amend in accordance with his views. I beg to move therefore that the following words be added:

Any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BAXTER: It would be well to insert some limitation of time.

Mr. ROBB: All these appeals are limited by 67a to three months.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there anything new in this section at all?

Mr. ROBB: The clause is all new. It was put in at the request of the Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this their clause?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 23 as amended carry?

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 30—Assignments in case of joint applications:

Mr. ROBB: I think my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) made some objection to that. What is his desire?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys).

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend raised the objection, I believe.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I pointed out afterwards what the effect of section 29 was; that is all.

Mr. ROBB: There is no objection, then.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought I was helping the hon. minister.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner points out that for fifty years the provision has caused no particular trouble. We might as well put it through.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 40, and the amendment thereto by Mr. Boys.

Mr. ROBB: I would not like to have this passed in the absence of the hon. members for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) and Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). There was an understanding that they should confer with the commissioner with respect to some minor language in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Stand.

Progress reported.

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF FRUIT AND FRUIT CONTAINERS

House again in committee on Bill No. 11 to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 5.—Regulations, publications, forfeiture and penalties:

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): I wish to propose a small amendment to this section, inasmuch as we have no authority to regulate packages of imported fruit. I propose, after the word "prescribe" in the fourth line of section 5, to add the words "packages and". The purpose is to regulate packages of imported fruit.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 9—Fruit overfaced, fruit below grade, notice to packers:

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Subsection (3) has been amended in committee by adding the words "notice of such action having been taken by the inspector".

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 10—Packages:

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Since this bill went through the Agricultural committee it has been brought to our attention that there is a certain demand for cherry boxes of a smaller size than that provided for in the bill, that is the half size or ten-pound box. I therefore move that after the word "inches" in the last line of paragraph (j) there be added the following words "or three hundred and sixty-four and a half cubic inches." That would be the half box of cherries. That "eight hundred and eighty-two" in paragraph (j) should be "seven hundred and twenty-nine," Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN: I do not remember that change.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That was changed in committee.

Mr. LEWIS: Are all these boxes of the regulation size now in vogue in Canada?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They are almost identical except in the case of plum boxes dealt with in paragraph (i).

Mr. HANSON: Was this bill threshed out before the Agricultural committee?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, yes, it was gone into very carefully by the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: While on boxes, did the minister manage to get anything done in the committee recommending that the bottom of a strawberry box should be at the bottom and not half way down?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not been able to get that far yet.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 14—Prohibition:

Mr. LEWIS: Suppose, for instance, you know a person in British Columbia and ask him to send you two or three boxes. Would he come under this just the same?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Before you report the bill, Mr. Chairman, I might answer a half-jocular question put by the hon. member for West York. The berry packages are larger. They are made in conformity with the American boxes and this indentation is only a sort of camouflage to catch the eye of the purchaser.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not like the indentation.

Bill reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INSURANCE OF MORTGAGED PREMISES

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 116, respecting the Canadian National Railways.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon. Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Agreements to restore or make good loss or damage by fire or other casualty to mortgaged premises, and indemnify trustees:

Mr. GRAHAM: This bill provides the machinery for the Canadian National Railways carrying their own insurance, as discussed the other day. When the resolution was before the committee I was asked to furnish information as to the rates of insurance charged by the companies. I have that here.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister might put the statement on Hansard.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is the statement:

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MEMORANDUM RE INSURANCE

—	Name of brokers	Name of firms carrying insurance	Rates
RAILWAYS			
Canadian Northern Railway System.	Toronto Insurance & Vessel Agency.	Western Ins. Co. who reinsured with the following:— Globe & Rutgers London Guarantee & Accident. British American Insurance. Commercial Insurance Co. General of Perth Norwich Union Ins. Co. Royal Assurance Co. Home Insurance Company. Fireman's Fund Hartford Insurance Co. St. Lawrence Underwriters. Pennsylvania Insurance Co.	See Statement attached.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	Hare & MacKenzie.	Union Insurance Co. Lloyd's London Cornhill Insurance Co.	See Statement attached.
Grand Trunk Railway System	Dale & Company	Globe & Rutgers Alliance Assurance Co. Motor Union Insurance Co. London Guarantee & Accident Co. London & Lancashire Fire Union Society of Canton Western Assurance Co. United British Ins. Company. Northern Assurance Co. Liverpool London & Globe Ins.	See Statement attached.
MARINE			
Canadian Government Merchant Marine.	Willis Faber & Co.	Various English Insurance Companies and a small percentage with American Companies.	See Statement attached.
Grand Trunk Pacific Coast Steamships.	Hare & MacKenzie.	Various English Insurance Companies.	See Statement attached.
Canadian Northern Railway Floating Equipment.	Willis Faber & Co. Toronto Insurance & Vessel Agency Dale & Company	Various English Insurance Companies.	See Statement attached.
Grand Trunk Railway Floating Equipment.	Willis Faber & Co Dale & Company. Hare & MacKenzie	Various English Insurance Companies.	See Statement attached.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MEMORANDUM RELATIVE TO INSURANCE

	Total Insurance	Premium for Year 1922	Rate
CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Schedule	112,246,238 00	493,616 00	0·44
Specific Insurance	7,736,314 00	75,638 00	0·98
Fund	34,629,591 00	74,362 00	0·21
Total	154,612,143 00	643,616 00	0·42
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY			
Schedule	23,002,600 00	99,876 00	0·43
Specific Insurance	3,211,780 00	10,176 00	0·32
Fund	7,793,830 00	20,491 00	0·26
	34,008,210 00	130,543 00	0·38
GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM			
Schedule	29,991,931 00	263,715 00	0·88
Specific Insurance	10,249,500 00	25,250 00	0·25
Fund	49,912,207 00	48,153 50	0·09
	90,153,638 00	337,118 50	0·37
Canadian Government Merchant Marine Ltd	41,155,812 00	1,318,448 00	3·20
Grand Trunk Pacific Coast Steamship Co	2,024,750 00	97,487 00	4·81
Canadian Northern Ry. Floating Equipment	1,165,000 00	24,923 00	2·14
Grand Trunk Ry. Floating Equipment—			
Underwriters	3,200,000 00	73,008 50	2·28
Fund	75,000 00	937 50	1·24
Total	47,620,562 00	1,514,804 00	3·18
Grand total	326,394,533 00	2,626,081 50	0·80

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose this clause has been decided upon by the trustees, so that it is absolutely in order and carries out only what we were discussing the other day

Mr. GRAHAM: It is simply carrying out the object which we discussed the other day, and it is in the form agreed upon between the solicitors of the trustees and the solicitors of the Canadian National Railways.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

NATURALIZATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of Bill No. 85, to amend the Naturalization Acts, 1914 and 1920.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definition of Natural-born British Subjects:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend will refer to the notes on the opposite page of the bill as printed, he will find that this simply describes the status of a British subject in order to make our law uniform with the law that was passed by the Imperial parliament in 1922. At the conference that took place between representatives of the Imperial government in Great Britain and representatives of the various Dominion governments, it was arranged to make entirely uniform the status of a British subject, and this clause is an exact copy of the clause in the Imperial statute passed last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like a further explanation from the minister as to the effect of naturalization under this clause and as to the status of a British subject, naturalized or coming within this definition, who comes from a different part of the Em-

pire. What is the effect of the legislation upon his status in Canada?

Mr. COPP: The status would be the same. This is simply bringing into effect the arrangement made between representatives of the Imperial government in Great Britain and representatives of the British dominions, to have a uniform naturalization act. If my hon. friend will read the description of the status of a British subject as given in clause 2, he will find that this corresponds exactly with the Imperial act that was passed last year. This is simply to keep the law uniform as arranged by the different Imperial conferences held fom 1902 down to 1911.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says that the status will be just the same in Canada as anywhere else. Just the same as what? Take for example naturalization papers given in South Africa under their Naturalization Act. What is the Canadian status that is thereby obtained, or is there any?

Mr. COPP: A person applying for naturalization in Canada has to follow the same procedure and reside here for the same length of time as a person has to do in Great Britain. The first subclause is a description of a British subject. If my hon. friend will refer to the notes on the side of the bill, he will see exactly what the object of the bill is. The side note reads:

> The object of this bill is to provide for the continuance, under certain conditions, of the British nationality of successive generations of British descent born abroad.

This was changed, as my hon. friend knows, in 1914 and 1920. This is to bring again into effect the law as it was prior to that time, and to provide that British subjects, who are naturalized in Canada are British subjects the world over, the same as if they were naturalized in the old country. I do not think I can say any more than that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the Minister the Naturalization Act before him? Clause 2 reads:

> Paragraph (b) of subsection 1 of section 1 of chapter 44 of the statutes of 1914, an act respecting British nationality, naturalization and aliens, is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor.

Could the minister inform the committee what paragraph (b) of subsection 1, that is proposed to be repealed, contains?

Mr. COPP: Paragraph (b) of subsection 1 of the present Naturalization Act reads:

> Any person born out of His Majesty's Dominions and whose father was a British subject at the time of that person's birth and either was born within His Majesty's allegiance or was a person to whom a certificate of naturalization had been granted; or had become a British subject by reason of any annexation of territory, or was at the time of that person's birth in the service of the Crown.

That is the whole of paragraph (b) in the original act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Except for the change in subsection 5 which the new paragraph enacts, I do not see that there is much difference. For my part I see no objection to the section.

Mr. BAXTER: One thing puzzles me. I see by the memorandum that in England apparently they have taken a date in 1915 to affect the rights of the second generation. The memorandum states:

> Under the existing law British nationality by descent ends after the first generation (or in the case of persons born before 1915, the second generation) born abroad.

In subclause 5, there must be, the memorandum states, two conditions:

> Any person born out of his Majesty's dominions, whose father was at the time of the person's birth a British subject and who fulfils any of the following conditions—

One of the conditions is:

> His birth registered at a British consulate within one year or in special circumstances, with the consent of the Secretary of State, two years after its occurrence, or, in the case of a person born on or after the first day of January, 1915, who would have been a British subject if born before that date, within twelve months after the first day of August, 1922;

What becomes of those in a similar degree of relationship who were born before the first day of January, 1915? Suppose a Canadian citizen went to the United States and his child was born before 1915, and while the child was still a minor the father took out letters of citizenship in the United States. Does that child's British right still subsist? There is no provision for his registering and he might be at the present time only, say, nine years old. It seems to me that there should be some way for such a child to claim British nationality if he felt that his father had not chosen the better part by becoming an American citizen.

Mr. COPP: Before he comes of age?

Mr. BAXTER: When he comes of age. I am left under the impression that while this subsection is a verbatim copy of the British act there is probably something else in that act which has not been copied into this and which may be needed to make the bill effective. I may be wrong, but the memorandum leaves that impression on my mind.

Mr. COPP: I have the British act before me. My deputy is not here, but I am informed by him that this is an exact copy of the act passed by the British parliament last year.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Repeal:

Mr. NEILL: Apparently this abolishes the system formerly followed of candidates for naturalization going before a county court judge. What is proposed to be substituted now?

Mr. COPP: This is a new section and provides for a different method of application for naturalization. Originally naturalization applications were made to judges of the courts who either issued or refused certificates as they thought fit. But in 1914 a change was made by which persons desiring naturalization were required to go to the clerks of court in the different localities in the various provinces and file with them a petition for naturalization. The clerk posted the application in his office for three months, at the end of which time the applicant would be advised of the date at which the court would meet. The applicant would then present himself personally before a judge who, upon inquiry and investigation, either approved or disapproved of the application, forwarding his report upon the same to the Department of the Secretary of State. The department in the past few years has found in the large majority of cases that after the application had been investigated by the judge a further inquiry was necessary. I may remark here that the applicant pays a fee of $5 when he files his application with the clerk for naturalization. The practice has been for the Department of the Secretary of State to refer the application to the Immigration department to ascertain whether or not the applicant entered the country legally in the first place, and has since spent the required period therein, prior to application. The matter is then referred to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for investigation and report, upon which we act. While I have had personally only one year's experience of this matter, I am informed by my deputy that it has been found almost invariably that these so-called investigations by the judges have been inadequate, and that the department cannot act upon the reports made by the judges without further investigation. We therefore felt that it was in the interests of the applicant as well as of the country that there should be a uniform method of granting naturalization, by providing an opportunity for all those seeking naturalization to make their application direct to the State department. The practice of having judges investigate these applications has proved in the past to be a waste of time. We have found that a great many applicants, particularly in the West, where the bulk of the applications come from, have to drive great distances to the court, and sometimes an applicant fails to receive notice of the day the court is to sit. This method is altogether unsatisfactory and we considered it best to provide that all applications should be made direct to the Department of the Secretary of State, thus obviating the employment of counsel. Under the system now proposed the application form will be filled in and forwarded to the State department and the investigation carried on from that source.

Mr. NEILL: The minister's last words gave me the information I wanted; that is, the man now applies direct to the minister.

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: That is what I wanted to know. I heartily agree with the provision to do away with the old system of applying to the county court judge. It resulted in a great deal of hardship to people desiring naturalization. Not only had they to go once before the judge—very often at an extremely inconvenient time because of the short notice given—but they also had to come again and take some oaths before the registrar, which meant sometimes a journey of two hundred miles twice. And I know of cases where owing to the way the boats ran the applicants for naturalization did not arrive until after the judge had concluded the sittings and would not again hold court at that particular place for another three months. I am entirely in accord with doing away with this system, which was expensive and inconvenient to the alien. I am quite in favour of increasing the restrictions surrounding naturalization, if necessary, but there is nothing to be gained by making it personally expensive, and very often it meant a cost as high as $200 before the applicant could become naturalized.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the cost to the applicant?

Mr. COPP: That is a matter of regulation, and has not been decided. Personally I have felt that the present fee of $5 which is paid to the clerk should be paid directly to the Department of State. These fees would provide the carrying charges for the whole Naturalization branch.

Mr. BAXTER: I think the question I asked is partly answered by referring to sub-section 3 of section 1 of the act of 1914, which provides that—

Nothing in this section shall, except as otherwise expressly provided, affect the status of any person born before the commencement of this act.

But if we see fit to adopt clause 5 of section 1 of this bill, which provides for the registration of birth within one year at a British consulate in the case of a person born on or after the 1st January 1915, members will see that it will affect the status of a person born before the commencement of this legislation. The fixing of time is always an arbitrary matter. In England no doubt their Naturalization Act of 1922 is adapted to the times that were fixed in some previous acts which were being consolidated. I would suggest that the date should read the 1st January 1924, computing the seven-year period from that time so that no person born before this bill becomes law would be prejudiced. The only difference it would make between us and the Mother Country would be the adoption of a later date here; and where we have so many people living in the neighbouring republic whose status would be affected, I think we should be rather careful to keep the door open for British citizenship wherever it is possible to do so.

I would make one other suggestion to my hon. friend, the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp). I think it very unwise to have such a complicated measure as the Naturalization Act partly in one volume and partly in another, consisting of references and cross-references. I am fairly well accustomed to comparing statutes, but in the few moments at my disposal I cannot say that I have got hold of everything bearing on the point I have just dealt with. What does this mean? We scarcely ever have to deal with the question of British citizenship except in two cases: one, to advise whether a particular person is qualified to be the owner of a British ship—and that is extremely important—the other, to decide whether a particular person is entitled to the franchise in this Dominion. We know when we get into the heat of an election all sorts of people will put forth all sorts of opinions with regard to the Naturalization Act. Each side wants to get every possible voter, and I am afraid some horribly unsound law is uttered around election times, but I could readily acquit any reasonable practitioner from trying to serve a party purpose in the opinion he might express on the ground that he would be lost in the morass of provisions that have been repealed or partly amended. Would it not be much more simple to consolidate these acts? The law is not likely to be changed again for a good many years I trust. There are provisions here in regard to the status of alien enemies which I do not want to discuss to-night as I have not found their bearings yet. For all I know the provisions may be quite satisfactory. We could have what is proposed to be the whole naturalization law of Canada consolidated, and so greatly simplify reference to this law, which at best is difficult enough when embodied in one well-drawn statute. At present these statutes are in a very awkward condition for the ordinary practitioner to deal with them.

Mr. COPP: I quite agree with my hon. friend that the acts should be consolidated, and I made a suggestion to my Under Secretary the other day to this end. He told me he had the matter in mind and as soon as this bill was accepted by parliament he would make a codification of the whole law and have it published in pamphlet form for distribution to those who cared to apply for copies.

Mr. BAXTER: I appreciate the intention, but I do not like it. I want to be able to go to the statute myself; I do not want someone else's compilation; and that is the general experience of the profession. A very excellent deputy may pass the work over to a very competent official, but the result will not be an act of this parliament, and conceivably errors may creep in. It is just as easy for the official to prepare a consolidated bill for passage now; then we will have every phase of the question before us. I do not raise this point in a spirit of captious criticism, but I want to get this very important legislation put in the very best form possible, and I would strongly urge my hon. friend to take a little more time and adopt my suggestion.

Mr. COPP: I have no objection if the committee feel it important that the consolidation should be done now, but it seems to me—although I do not wish to press my views upon the committee—that as there are only three or four amendments they might be accepted now and the act could be properly consolidated afterwards. The consolidation of the statutes could not very well be done during the present session.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is no doubt a great deal of force in what the minister says about the consolidation of all the Dominion statutes. This consolidation is long overdue. The work was commenced a year and a half or two years ago, but from information I

have received I would judge that it is proceeding very, very slowly indeed. The last consolidation of the Dominion statutes was as far back as 1906, and when one has to determine a question under the Naturalization Act, the Criminal Code, the Patents Act, the Copyright Act, or any of the dozen other enactments that might be enumerated, it is necessary to have practically a complete set of the statutes from 1906 down to the present if one is to be sure that no amendment is overlooked. The Naturalization Act is one of the most difficult acts we have to interpret, and there is a great deal of force in the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) that a consolidation of the present law be made, to include any amendments the Secretary of State now proposes. I fancy the Under Secretary of State could do it in a day or two; I undertook to do it once as Solicitor General, but that act is not in force now. If that were done we would have an up-to-date act which would embody all the legislation on the subject and obviate the necessity of going into all the enactments as we now have to do when any difficult question has to be determined. Just one other point: the discussion of clause 4 of the bill which we are now considering, will occupy some considerable time. I know that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), who is not in the city to-day, would like to be present when the discussion of this section proceeds. The minister realizes that the present proposal is a subversion of all the past practice in this country in regard to naturalization. I think as far back as our law extends the matter of the naturalization of aliens has been investigated and passed upon before some judicial tribunal. The old system—the oldest I remember—was one under which the applicant made his application to some officer of the court, different officers being named in the various provinces. The application was read in open court on the first day of the court's sitting, and during those sittings any person had the right to offer objections to the naturalization. If no objection was taken during the entire sittings of the court, a formal certificate was granted and a man became a British subject. But it was a judicial proceeding, notwithstanding the informal manner in which it was conducted; it was a matter in which the courts of Canada were called upon to exercise judicial discretion. My hon. friend now proposes to remove from the courts of the country that discretion and practically place it in his own hands. Under section 4 of the bill he proposes to change the whole system of naturalization as we have had it in Canada since confederation and take it into his own department. It is provided that the Secretary of State will be the person to say whether this man or that man shall or shall not be naturalized, shall or shall not have the right to vote for a candidate for election to this House. That is a serious proposal; it would clothe the minister certainly with a great deal of new power. If the present system has proved unsatisfactory in any way; if it has proved costly or expensive or inconvenient, there must be a method of remedying the situation without placing in the hands of a minister of the Crown the sole right to say whether the hundreds of people whom we expect to come to this country shall or shall not have the right to vote. I for one, so far as I understand the matter now, would feel compelled to oppose such a proposal to the very utmost of my power. However, what I would ask the minister at the present time is that he allow us a short time to consider this very radical change in our naturalization law. It may be suggested that we were wrong in the past, but I am not impressed with the conviction that we were nor am I impressed at this time with the propriety of the proposal made in this bill. If my hon. friend will let the matter stand for a couple of days and in the interval consider the question, which is one of great importance, of consolidating the whole law, the bill that we are to pass this session will be one of tremendous advantage to the profession to which I belong as well as to the people generally. I know from a discussion I had with the Under Secretary of State, within a couple of years, anyway, that he could without very much effort, through his intimate knowledge of all these acts, produce a consolidated act which would be of the very greatest advantage to us all.

Mr. COPP: I assure my hon. friend that I do not introduce these proposed changes with any idea of taking into my own hands the jurisdiction respecting naturalization. The clause my hon. friend refers to has been suggested by officials of my department who have had this matter in hand during the last few years and who have, I think dealt with it very successfully indeed. I agree that this is a very radical change from the present system. But I would point out that the Secretary of State has discretionary power to-day either to grant naturalization or to refuse it, and that the Secretary of State under this provision is not taking upon himself any more authority than is provided for in the very act that my hon.

9 p.m.

friend himself was responsible for putting through this House a few years ago. The original system of conferring naturalization was, as my hon. friend points out, through application made to the courts and heard in open court, and the notice was there from the first day of the sitting of the court until the last, so that anybody who wished to object to any application for naturalization might have an opportunity to do so. But the system is changed entirely; to-day the application is made to the clerk of the court and the notice is posted, not in any public place, not by publication in any newspaper, but simply in his own office. It may have been with the idea that any who wished to oppose the naturalization of a given applicant would go into the clerk's office to see whether or not the application was being made. The experience of the department is this: while one judge in a particular locality will hold an investigation, write on his report "approved," and pass it on to the State department, another judge, possibly upon exactly the same evidence, will write on a similar application, "disapproved."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That happens in everything.

Mr. COPP: There is a lack of uniformity; so that the responsibility is placed upon the department of making inquiries for themselves. We have to make that inquiry. The judge's report is practically of no advantage to the department. As to the suggestion of my hon. friend regarding the proposal made in this section, I would not for a moment object to allowing the matter to stand over so that his leader may be here when the discussion proceeds. I am very glad indeed to have had this discussion if only for a few moments, and I would like the members of the committee to think it over whether it is not wise to have this change made; not because I ask the committee to vote confidence in me in regard to naturalizing a man or not, for I hope the department of any government in power in this country would be beyond any suggestion of not acting properly in the matter. I am sure my hon. friend did not mean to suggest that I would use my office to naturalize people who were going to vote in a particular way.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend forgets that according to rumour he may be succeeded very soon and become a judicial ornament.

Mr. COPP: If that good fortune comes to me more quickly than it did to my hon. friend, I sincerely trust that somebody will be selected to fill the position I now occupy who will endeavour to carry out the duties of his office in the same honest and straightforward way that I have attempted to discharge these duties. I have no objection whatever, if my hon. friend desires it, to having the matter stand over until the leader of the Opposition is here, and I would like hon. members of the committee to think the matter over because I feel that the more they do, the more they will be induced to come to the conclusion to which I have come after a very great deal of thought, that this is the proper method of carrying out our naturalization. In the meantime I might say to my hon. friend for St. John that if we could get a consolidation promptly, without delaying the House, if this matter is allowed to stand over I should be very glad to consider his suggestion.

Mr. BAXTER: I am very glad that the hon. Secretary of State has taken that position. I have been trying to run over the statutes now and I think it would not be a very long job. There would not be many sections.

I would not continue the discussion now if it were not that the Secretary of State wants hon. members to think the matter over. There is one subject to which I would like to call his attention in order that he may think it over before he comes here with his proposals. If I gather the structure of what will be the new bill correctly, all the applications through judicial offices will be eliminated and it will simply be an application to the Department of the Secretary of State. I am in entire accord with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) who says that in some cases men have travelled over a couple of hundred miles and been put to great expense in getting their naturalization. I am sure we would all agree that the test in making a man a British subject ought to be his fitness, and not the distance he travels or the expense he is put to. What I want to call the attention of the Secretary of State to is this: By cutting out all that machinery he leaves apparently section 25 of the act of 1914, which puts practically the whole act in the hands of the Governor in Council by the making of regulations. Now I think there are matters there important enough to be prescribed in whatever Naturalization Act we are to have, that is, the functionaries who are to do things and the people who are to make the examination. The department ought to be able, I think, to suggest in the legislation the particular class of functionaries who are to make the examination, whether it is to be by the Mounted Police or whatever body it may be, rather than leaving it to be done by regula-

tion. In a matter so important to people's rights as this I do not think that order in council legislation, as it is commonly termed, is quite desirable. It was perhaps very necessary during the trying period of our country's history, but now in time of peace it is unnecessary to take emergent powers, and there ought to be some plain line marked out in the statute itself to which any intending applicant can refer, and he ought to feel some certainty that that mode will only be changed by the actual deliberation of parliament. I do not say that, certainly not, with the slightest intention of reflecting on my hon. friend. I do not mean that at all, but I do not think it is a proper power to have in the hands of any Secretary of State or of any government, because governments are all liable to temptation, and my hon. friend who appreciates the strenuousness with which political lists are often fought in the Maritime provinces will realize how in a certain province not unknown to us it has been sometimes impossible to get a justice of the peace appointed of a certain political faith while the other political faith held the keys to power. Both have sinned in precisely the same way, and yet we know that to get a man on the electoral list you have to have an affidavit before a justice of the peace. Now if by regulation made by the Governor in Council you could have some particular functionary, and very few of them, you may have just as much difficulty in getting a man to the proper functionary to swear to a simple fact as in the case described by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni where a man had to travel a couple of hundred miles. I do not say the Secretary of State is going to do anything of the kind. We have too much personal confidence in him to think he would do it, but we have not the same confidence that he will be everlastingly in his position. I do not know whether so good a reward as has been suggested is coming to my hon. friend or not. I should be very glad to see him get it, but we do not know who may come after him; we do not know what government may come after him. It may be that some day this party would be rather unwilling to do anything for those on his side of the House, so he had better be prepared.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend's idea is that the officials to whom we should refer these naturalization questions should be set out in the statute instead of the matter being left to regulation.

Mr. BAXTER: I would prefer that.

Mr. COPP: I may say that we have always referred these questions to the Mounted Police in the different sections.

Mr. BAXTER: It would be better to put that right into the bill, whoever it be.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would like a little information from the minister before we leave this question as to whether there could not be co-operation between the Dominion department and the provincial local subdivisions. I understand that the intention is to do away with the present procedure of applying to the district judge for naturalization papers, and that the application is to go direct to the department. I was wondering if it were possible to make use of our provincial clerks or secretary-treasurers. I find that in our western country the applicant for naturalization is usually a foreigner with very little English; he understands very little about writing, or whom to send a letter to, and the initial steps he should take towards getting his naturalization papers. Even though he may have been in the country five years or more he usually goes to the secretary of the municipality, that is the smallest local subdivision, and makes all kinds of inquiries of him as to what he should do and how he should do it. Sometimes he gets this official to do the work for him. Would it not be possible for the Dominion department to co-operate with these provincial units and use the rural secretaries as a medium between the applicant and the department to take the applications and transmit them to the department for consideration?

Mr. COPP: Any official could be referred to. At the present time the work is being done by the clerks of the courts. I do not know that it would be any great advantage to specify that the rural secretaries should take the application. If the applicant wants to get into communication with the department in regard to naturalization and cannot write himself, he must go to somebody. That would be left entirely to himself. The suggestion made in the bill now before the committee is that the application come before the department, and it would not matter whether the application came through a municipal clerk, a lawyer, doctor, clergyman or anyone else whose services were used to make out the application papers. If the suggestion that is now in the bill be carried out, then so far as the department knows the application comes direct from the man himself. He can get anyone he likes to assist in filling out and filing his application.

Progress reported.

NARCOTIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health) moved the second reading of Bill 72, to amend the Narcotic Drugs Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definitions, "drug," "opium," "prepared opium" "imports" or "imported":

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before we go into the sections of the bill, I think it would assist us if the minister told us what is being done by this bill, whether it is a modification of the existing law, or an enlargement, and what the aim of the bill is.

Mr. BELAND: When I introduced the bill I attempted to explain in a few words that this was only a consolidation of the different acts passed by this parliament on four different occasions, I believe. I also mentioned that there would be a slight addition, to which we will come as we proceed with the examination of the bill. The new features are in connection with an appeal in certain cases, and with the identification of those who are detained after a charge has been brought against them, or after they have been convicted. This is provided for at the end of the bill. The other provisions of the bill are mainly a consolidation of the different acts, in an endeavour to make some sections clearer for the interpretation of the courts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice there are some new sections. Does section 2 enlarge the definition?

Mr. BELAND: Subsection (c) gives the definition of "prepared or smoking opium." This provision is designed to carry out a special recommendation of the Opium Conference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is an enlargement.

Mr. BELAND: This part is new and the remainder is the same.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is an enlargement of the definition of "drug." Are you contracting the definition, or making it broader?

Mr. BELAND: We are making it broader. Paragraphs (b), (e) and (f) are the same. Paragraph (g) is new and gives the definition of "Minister" as follows:

(g) "Minister" means the minister presiding over the Department of Health of the time being.

In the former interpretation section, there was no definition of the word "minister," and all through the act we had to make it read "The minister presiding over the Department of Health".

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the Dominion analyst?

Mr. BELAND: That is the same, and the provincial analyst is the same.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is marked new here.

Mr. BELAND: (h) and (i) are new.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Minister may issue licenses, make regulations therefor, and prescribe fees:

Mr. MANION: I think the section should be read.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is new.

Mr. BELAND: It is exactly the same section, except the last two lines, which are added to the former section. I have no objection to the section being read.

Mr. MANION: I think these sections should be read. They are important, and it will only take a moment or two.

Mr. BELAND: By all means.

The CHAIRMAN: The new sections?

Mr. MANION: All the sections.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee the bill should be read section by section?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MANION: The only new part in section 3 is in regard to "smoking opium," is it not?

Mr. BELAND: Exactly.

Mr. ANDERSON: No change in the license fees.

Mr. BELAND: There is no change at all.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Importing or exporting drug without license, etc.:

Mr. MANION: Paragraph (e), is important. I think this is an additional section. I do not think it was in the act last year. That is in regard to whipping. Whipping at the discretion of the judge. That was put in last year, was it not?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: Is this the section referred to by one or two of the chiefs of police as

section 21 of the preceding year? Is it included in this section? It was left out of the bill last year, inadvertently, was it not?

Mr. BELAND: It is further on.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister, I presume, has covered the point in the bill?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Persons to whom drugs may be sold:

Mr. BELAND: There are added to this clause only two words, the second and third word at the top of page 4: "and dated". The balance is the same.

Mr. MANION: Does this prevent the refilling of any prescription by a physician for any of the drugs in the schedule, without another order by the physician?

Mr. BELAND: Unless the prescription does not contain any larger quantity of drug than can be filled lawfully.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does that mean?

Mr. BELAND: That means two grains of opium to the ounce, one-fourth of a grain of morphine to the ounce, one-eighth of a grain of heroin to the ounce, or one grain of codeine to the ounce.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How is that defined?

Mr. BELAND: It is defined in this bill in clause 9. When we come to clause 9, my hon. friend will find the exact description of preparations which, although they contain some of the drugs which are forbidden, can be lawfully sold because they contain only small quantities.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Unlawful for physician, veterinary surgeon or dentist to prescribe, give or sell drugs except for medicinal purpose:

Mr. BELAND: No change at all.

Mr. MANION: The question of what is considered proper for medicinal purposes is left entirely in the hands of the physicians, is it not?

Mr. BELAND: It is left altogether to the attending physician.

Mr. MANION: For example, if a doctor considers that a man who has been addicted to one of these drugs is in such a nervous condition that he requires some of the drug, that is left entirely to the physician?

Mr. BELAND: You cannot prescribe smoking.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Not keeping record:

Mr. BELAND: There are only a few words added to this clause. On page 5 in the first, second and third lines these words are added:

or to furnish to the Department of Health any information required by that department.

This is added to make the clause clearer.

Mr. STEVENS: In connection with this clause, there is just one point as regards which I should like to ask the minister his opinion, because I know the point I raise is a very delicate one. If I read the clause aright, it means that physicians, dentists and such like are called upon to furnish information only when required to do so by the minister.

Mr. BELAND: That is right.

Mr. STEVENS: Has the minister considered the advisability of inserting in the bill a provision that they shall give information when asked to do so by the attorney general of a province or the Crown prosecutor or the police authorities? That may seem to be extending the matter too far; but there is no doubt great difficulty in getting proper information for the local authorities to prosecute and to carry out the provisions of the law satisfactorily. I am not prepared to press for this; but I submit it to the minister, and perhaps he can tell the committee whether it has been considered and what his opinion is.

Mr. BELAND: There is in almost every province a provincial law covering this point. For instance, in Quebec, the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the College of Pharmacists have special legislation of their own which would meet exactly the object raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. STEVENS: I am glad the minister makes that statement, because I was not at all clear as to the advisability. If that is the case, then certainly it would be desirable that it should be made perfectly clear in this act that the police have the right to request the information, especially as this act is looked upon as perhaps, the most important piece of legislation, either provincial or Dominion, of its kind dealing with this class of offence. The suggestion is made that the doctor or the druggist can always be subpoenaed. That is not the point so much, nor is it sufficient that they can get this under some provincial act. The minister, I know,

will agree with me, and I am sure anyone in this House who has been watching the unfortunate progress of this evil, will also agree that everything possible must be done to suppress this traffic. I have noted in some articles and speeches and, I think, in statements by police authorities that there has been considerable difficulty with irresponsible practitioners, not necessarily physicians, but particularly veterinaries. I have heard on several occasions the opinion expressed, or, indeed, the assertion made positively that they were circumventing the law.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend refers to practitioners regularly practising.

Mr. STEVENS: What are referred to in this bill as physicians, veterinaries, dentists, druggists, and so forth. My suggestion is that we should enlarge this clause to provide that they shall give the information when requested to do so, not only by the minister, but by recognized police authorities—I am not particular as to the wording—administering the law in any municipality. I submit that to the consideration of the minister.

Mr. MacLAREN: Would the minister explain a little more definitely what is meant by the words "giving information"? Before taking a step such as has been suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), we should consider very carefully the question of giving up professional secrecy unless the matter is properly safeguarded.

Mr. MANION: I might mention that in Ontario, we are fully covered as regards ordinary medical practitioners, just as the minister explained in connection with Quebec. I cannot answer for the veterinary surgeons or the dentists, but I believe they are covered also in this way. Supposing some medical practitioner or veterinary surgeon or dentist prescribes a large quantity of the drugs in the schedule. Immediately the Department of Public Health writes to him because the druggist makes a report to the department regularly. If a report went in that a large quantity of a drug was prescribed by a certain physician, dentist or veterinary, and from the quantity of the drug prescribed the department were of the opinion that it was not being used for medicinal purposes, then they would write the doctor, veterinary or dentist concerned and ask for an explanation. I believe, therefore, that the act covers the situation so far as Ontario is concerned, and I have no doubt the same thing applies to the other provinces. But suppose a medical practitioner were pulled up by the department and condemned to pay a fine or be otherwise punished for some offence under the act; it would be the duty of the provincial authority mentioned by my hon. friend, the Medical Council, to deal with that practitioner. But so far as reports are concerned, I think the point made by the member for St. John (Mr. MacLaren) is a good one. No doctor would care to hand in to any policeman or police magistrate any information regarding his patients; he would not consent to do anything of the kind unless he were subpoenaed. The department can look into the matter and deal with any practitioner who is prescribing drugs improperly, and can deal with him as they see fit if a satisfactory explanation is not given.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend has perfectly explained the situation as it exists in practice. Subsection (a) covers the manufacturers as well as the druggists, wholesale and retail. As regards the duly authorized practising physician, it is not deemed advisable that he should be subjected to investigation on the part of a peace officer or a policeman. As my hon. friend has pointed out, it is rather an easy matter for the department to ascertain the quantities of drugs a doctor has been able to procure through the wholesale or the retail druggist, and it is always open to the department to institute an inquiry if they have reason to believe that a doctor is dispensing a large quantity of any forbidden drug. If there is some reason to think that he is using it for other than purely medical purposes we can follow him up, and that has been done in many instances. The hon. member for St. John has brought to the attention of the committee another feature of the subject that should be given consideration and that is that medical men be allowed to exercise professional discretion without being interefered with unduly by the powers that be, and I think that the law has been framed to meet such cases. As my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre has said, the law is important as it is severe, the only difficulty being as to where to draw the line. We have attempted, as our predecessors did, to devise legislation that would suppress the illicit traffic in drugs, but our object is difficult of realization. The law as presented to the House to-day contains very severe and drastic provisions and I do not think it could be made more stringent than it is without indeed unduly interfering with individual liberty. At all events, I believe the section covers the points brought up pretty well.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Liniments, ointments, and other preparations excepted:

Mr. BELAND: There is no change in this section, but my hon. friend for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) wanted to know whether the quantities of a certain drug I referred to in a former explanation were to be found in the act. That matter is dealt with in this section, which states that preparations can be sold lawfully though they contain some of that drug.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—Smoking opium:

Mr. BELAND: The penalty under this section is increased from $50 to $100.

Section agreed to.

On section 12—Being in opium resort:

Mr. BELAND: The penalty in this section is increased from one to three months.

Section agreed to.

On section 14—Onus of proof on charge of importing, exporting, manufacturing, selling etc., without license:

Mr. BELAND: This section and section 15 might, I think, be cited in answer to the observations made by my hon. friend for Vancouver.

Mr. MANION: Section 14 provides:

> Where a charge is laid under either paragraphs (a), (d) or (e) of section four of this act, the onus shall be upon the accused to establish that he had lawful authority to commit the act complained of, or that he had a license from the minister authorizing such act. (1921, c. 42, s. 1 (f).)

I am not particularly taking exception to the section but I notice in this country at the present time, and recently too, an increasing tendency to depart from the old British dictum that a man shall be considered innocent until he is proven guilty, and to establish instead the principle that a man shall be considered guilty until he is proven innocent. Now, many of the inspectors, not under this act, perhaps, but under similar legislation, are more or less irresponsible; and any irresponsible inspector can make a charge against a citizen and in this case accuse him of breaking the law, and it will be incumbent upon the citizen to prove that he is innocent of that charge. I believe in a general way that it is a very dangerous thing to put into any law such a provision as that. I think that the good old British dictum of a man being considered innocent until he is proven guilty is better than the opposite principle which is coming increasingly into effect, of considering a man guilty until he is proven innocent. That is the principle in this case. Can the minister tell us how long it has been in force?

Mr. BELAND: It was inserted in 1921 and retained last year. It is now a repetition of two former enactments.

Mr. MANION: Without referring to this clause particularly, I wish to put myself on record in a general way as being absolutely opposed to any change of the old principle. I think that this country and the various provinces of it might well hesitate before changing a rule of law which has been good enough for our forefathers for generations, and which I think is absolutely sound. Let me repeat, a man who is perfectly responsible may be put into a very difficult and expensive position because, with all due respect to my legal friends around me, it costs money to defend one's self against any criminal charge. Therefore I believe it would be well for this and any other department of the government to consider such a clause very seriously before embodying it in any proposed legislation.

Mr. LADNER: I submit from the wording of the clauses it is apparent that the government has considered the point very thoroughly. I think the hon. gentleman would appreciate the necessity of such provisions if he had knowledge of some of the revelations that have been made of late in Montreal, Vancouver, Winnipeg and other of our cities. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that these clauses are absolutely essential, for you cannot catch this class of people unless you enact such provisions. We are not legislating to give such a finesse of protection to the scoundrel who goes about the country creating ruin that is hardly equalled by any other evil-doers. I submit that these clauses should remain exactly as they are. They are quite practical and will serve a good purpose. The general principle here is proved by the exception.

Mr. MANION: I wish to take exception to my hon. friend's remarks because of the implication they contain that some of us are anxious for this "finesse of protection" that he speaks of. I presume there is no member of this House, whatever may be his party affiliations, who is not just as eager as my hon. friend to do away with the illicit use of any of these habit-forming drugs; but I wished to state the principle which should underlie criminal enactments, and I have no reason for retracting any of my words. I

believe that any government should hesitate about insisting that a man is guilty until he proves himself innocent; rather the reverse should be the attitude.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). It is quite true, as has been stated by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner), that drastic measures are needed to stamp out the drug habit, but I understood the hon. member for Fort William to be interposing an objection to taking away the onus probandi from the informant or the accuser.

Mr. MANION: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTELL: It is an old principle of British law that he who alleges must prove. There has been a tendency during the last few years in this House, and also in some of our legislatures, to relieve the accuser or informant of the burden of proof. The old principle of the common law to which I have referred should always be the permanent feature borne in mind in drafting any statute, and should not be departed from except in extraordinary cases. I believe that the protest of my hon. friend for Fort William is well taken. A similar protest was made last year by the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) in connection with the Fisheries Act. Everyone is beginning to realize that the sooner we get away from making convictions easy the better it is for the observance of the law, because we have so much paternal and freak legislation today that people are apt to be considered guilty upon the mere allegation of some official who presses for a conviction because he gets a portion of the fine imposed. While in this case it may be necessary for the minister to have the most efficient machinery possible at his command, yet I think he as well as all other ministers should as far as possible refrain from departing from the old legal procedure.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would the hon. gentleman suggest that this clause should be struck out?

Mr. MARTELL: No, certainly not, because the conditions probably are bad and demand drastic treatment. I only rose in my place to emphasize and support what was said by the hon. member for Fort William whom, I thought, was somewhat misunderstood. I believe he is right in demanding that we adhere to the old British principle. I think the public are becoming sick and tired of paternal legislation.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. BAXTER: There appears to be a slight mistake in the drafting of section 14. Two answers are put in the mouth of the accused by this section. One is that he had lawful authority to commit the act complained of; the other is that he had a license from the minister authorizing such act. The license from the minister would seem to apply to clauses (a) and (e). As to clause (e), I do not think the accused can very well set up that he had "lawful authority to commit the act complained of because the charge is that he unlawfully sells, gives away or distributes any drug to any minor." You cannot have lawful authority to do an unlawful act. I would be very much pleased to see some provision inserted by which a little mercy might be exercised where a man believing he was doing a lawful act sold a drug to apparently a man who turned out to be a minor. But it is unlawful to sell, give away or distribute a drug to a minor. You cannot have the authority of the minister to do that, neither can you lawfully do it. I think there is a mistake in the reference to the subsection.

Mr. BELAND: Looking over paragraph (e) of section 2 I see that "export" or "exporting" means and includes the taking or conveying, or causing to be taken or conveyed, out of Canada of any drug. In order to meet my hon. friend's objection, I think we might very well dispense with the references to (e) in clause 14, and leave the paragraph (a) and (d).

The CHAIRMAN: (a) or (d).

Mr. BAXTER: (a), (b) or (d).

Mr. BELAND: There is no objection to including (b). Section 14 would then read:

Where a charge is laid under either paragraphs (a), (b) or (d) of section 4 of this act,—

And so on.

Mr. LADNER: I would ask the minister to reconsider his decision, for he is eliminating a section that is most important in the interests of our young people—the very one which is taken the greatest advantage of by the drug dealer. If there is a class of men upon whom the strongest penalties should be imposed it is those who deliberately go out and sell drugs to minors. Now the minister is practically giving them a new lease of life, because the chances of proving a case in the event of sale to a minor are very small indeed.

Mr. BELAND: Which subsection does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. LADNER: Paragraph (e) of section 4. I understand the minister proposes to elimi-

nate paragraph (e) so that people who sell to minors—the worst of all these offences, in my opinion—are not subject to the same extent of penalty as those committing other offences under the act.

Mr. BAXTER: The onus should be on the accused to establish that he is not guilty of the offence, because he might not have lawful authority to commit the act complained of, he might not have license to do it, he might not in point of fact have done it. An innocent man should be given a chance to present his real answer, namely, that he did not do it; but you shut that out.

Mr. LADNER: That suggestion may be valuable, but this is a question of shifting the onus of proof, and as the section is now worded a man is not deprived of the privilege of proving his innocence; in fact, it lays upon him the onus of proving it. That is all that section does.

Mr. BAXTER: No, it does not do that. It puts the onus on him to establish that he had lawful authority to do it or had license to do it. But suppose he actually did not do it?

Mr. LADNER: That would not affect him; that would only be a question of evidence. In any event, I strongly urge the inadvisability of allowing those to be let off above all others, who sell to minors.

Mr. BELAND: I confess that the clause could be made to read more smoothly from a strictly legal point of view, but I do not fear any difficulty at all so far as carrying out the spirit of the act is concerned, with the clause drafted as it is, and with the addition of paragraph (b) so that section 14 will cover paragraphs (a), (b), (d), and (e). The hon. member for Vancouver South is right when he says that the sale to a minor is one of the worst charges that could be levelled under this act.

Mr. BROWN: I hope that the minister will seriously consider before he yields to the suggestion to strike out (e). The offence is one of the worst that could be committed under the act, and to remove that clause would be a great mistake.

Mr. LADNER: Would the addition of the words "or did not commit the offence" cover the point?

Mr. BAXTER: Put them in after the word "establish".

Mr. BELAND: Then I would move that the clause be amended so that it will read as follows:

Where a charge is laid under either paragraphs (a), (b), (d) or (e) of section four of this act, the onus shall be upon the accused to establish that he did not commit the offence, or that he had lawful authority to commit the act complained of, or that he had a license from the minister authorizing such act.

Mr. FORTIER: I think the minister is certainly going too far in this amendment. As the clause stands there is no pre-

10 p.m. sumption of guilt; there is only the obligation upon the accused to prove that he had lawful authority to commit the act complained of or that he had a license from the minister authorizing it. We now completely change the clause and put the presumption of guilt upon the accused. I never saw an instance of that kind in any law. A man who is accused of a crime before a tribunal cannot be presumed guilty until he is proved guilty. I know of no case in any federal law where a person accused before any tribunal is considered as guilty before he has had the privilege of putting in his defence. I am against such an amendment.

Mr. MacLAREN: While we agree with the general principle that a man is presumed innocent until he is proved guilty there are cases where that principle cannot be followed. That is particularly the case in the matter of drugs; there are difficulties in proving violations of the act in many cases unless we approach the subject from the point of view of this proposed provision. The hon. member (Mr. Fortier) has suggested that this position has not been taken in other acts, but if the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) were here I think he would tell us that that is the position taken as regards smuggling: that men who are found in the possession of contrabrand can be and are called upon to explain their position. I have no doubt that there are other instances where it has been necessary to approach the matter from this point of view.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 17—Certificate of Dominion analyst evidence of content of drug:

Mr. MANION: Should not the certificate of the Dominion analyst when put in as evidence be put in under oath? It does not say so. If that certificate is going to be accepted as evidence it should be submitted as an affidavit or given under oath.

Mr. BAXTER: I think it ought to be regarded as prima facie evidence.

Mr. LADNER: I was just about to make the same suggestion as my hon. friend for St. John. It is possible that the Dominion analyst was wrong when he gave the certifi-

cate and a man could bring a perfectly good analyst to prove that he was wrong, but according to this section that evidence would not be admissible. I think provision should be made whereby it would be admissible. It says now that the certificate "shall be accepted as evidence." I do not see how you could get around that.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—Power of peace officer to search for drugs:

Mr. BELAND: There is no change here but I would like to move to add the word "vehicle" in the forty-first line after the word "vessel." The word "vehicle" has inadvertently been omitted.

Mr. MANION: Has there always to be a warrant before a search?

Mr. BELAND: Only in the case of a private residence.

Mr. MANION: There must always be in that case?

Mr. BELAND: In that case, but not otherwise.

Section agreed to.

On section 24—Except in cases tried before two justices, no appeals in cases taken under section 4, (a), (d) and (e):

Mr. BAXTER: Why, may I ask, is that provision here? I do not want to throw any safeguards around people engaged in this illegal traffic. On the other hand, I do not want to throw any unnecessary protection around ignorant and prejudiced justices of the peace who sometimes try cases in the courts. No matter what offence a man is charged with, I can scarcely see why an appeal should be allowed to one class of offence and refused to the same man if charged with something different. If he has been wrongly convicted he ought to have some way under the law of getting rid of that erroneous conviction, and if rightly convicted I would not mind if you put a heavier penalty on him through the agency of the court of appeal, whatever it may be. But I do stand for giving a man the right to be heard in a British court of justice against what appears to be error or sometimes intentional wrong-doing, and these small tribunals are not always fit to be trusted with a man's property or a man's liberty. In what I am advocating I do not wish to throw the slightest protection around the drug fiends who are debauching communities, but what I want is to have a little safety for the man convicted in the teeth of the law by ignorant people, by people who seek a victim and believe they have one. Now let us be fair.

Mr. BELAND: Last year there was some debate in this House upon this very clause, but ultimately it passed this House without any division. Unhappily, in my estimation at least, the clause was rejected by the Senate. As I tried to explain last year the presence of this clause in the act is most important. In many, many cases an appeal is taken for the only purpose of extending to some of the most important witnesses a chance to get away out of reach, and it is to meet that very thing that the appeal is denied except on a question of law. An appeal is not permitted on the question of facts if the facts are established before a regular magistrate—

Mr. BAXTER: But this does not make any distinction between matters of law and matters of fact. It does make a distinction between cases tried before two justices and cases tried by a magistrate on the other hand.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend will admit that a question of law can always be discussed without witnesses being present should an appeal be taken, but as to a question of fact, if the principal witnesses are not at the disposal of the Crown prosecutor my hon. friend will realize that he would be at a great disadvantage in case of an appeal.

Mr. BAXTER: I would suggest this: Leave this clause as you have it, but take out the clause taking away certiorari. Certiorari does not depend upon witnesses, but I do not like that quite as well myself, because I do not want a man to escape by a legal technicality. But I do want him to have some better chance than a magistrate who may err in his decision on the facts.

Mr. BELAND: I hardly think it would be possible to do away with this. I might say that a similar provision exists in the Criminal Code with regard to disorderly houses.

Mr. BAXTER: It exists in too many cases. It exists in every prohibitory act in the country.

Mr. BELAND: I suppose I should not say, thank God I am not a lawyer, but I am not versed very much in the science of the law. However, I know that a provision of this kind is to be found in the legislation of many of the provinces. I think it is to be found in the Ontario Temperance Act; it is to be found in the Quebec law regarding disorderly houses, and in the Criminal Code also. My impression is that if we do not afford to those in

charge of this law all possible means of suppressing this traffic we are not doing what we should do. We must afford them all possible means of meeting a situation which is most serious, and I know that my hon. friend agrees with me in that regard. Some of the old principles of English law seem to be denied in this legislation. That is true, but still the case is altogether extraordinary.

Mr. BAXTER: I sympathize with the hon. minister, and I would go further. I would not criticize the section that puts the burden of proving innocence upon the accused, because that is practically necessary in certain classes of offence, but I may say that the tendency of legislation is running a little too far towards taking away an opportunity of correcting an error that may be made by the first tribunal. The minister has spoken of the Ontario Temperance Act. I do not know much about it, but I know something about the prohibitory law in New Brunswick which I introduced and put through the legislature. I have bitterly regretted the fact that I put it through, because instances of undoubted cases of absolute brutal injustice have come to my knowledge, where magistrates convicted innocent men, simply because these magistrates were worse than partisans—they were absolutely blind. No man could come before them who would not be presumed to be guilty and condemned as speedily as possible. That is the spirit in which it has been done, and I have always regretted that I ever allowed my hand to be put to anything that deprived a man of the chance of getting justice. At the same time, I do not want to throw any safeguards around criminals, or permit any loopholes of escape for them in legislation of this character. But I want to see enough in the act to ensure that a really innocent man shall not be punished, and we ought to be able to frame legislation that will affect both of these objects, so that an innocent man shall not be tyrannously punished, and yet that a guilty man shall not have too great an opportunity of escape.

Mr. MANION: I may say, in a general way, that I do not want the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) to accuse me of sympathizing at all with any of the illicit drug peddlers, but I wish to associate myself again, for the reason I gave a moment ago, with my hon. friend for St. John (Mr. Baxter). The minister quoted the Ontario Temperance Act. There are many who think that act has done a great deal of good, but I have certainly seen cases under the Ontario Temperance Act conducted by some magistrates who took exactly the attitude outlined by the hon. member for St John, especially in dealing with foreigners. There has been a tendency amongst some magistrates—I have seen it occur—to too quickly accept the word of some police officer and absolutely ignore the word of a foreigner in this country. I personally have a good deal of sympathy for these foreign people who come to the country and wish to become citizens and have become citizens, when some careless, irresponsible magistrate finds them guilty of an offence, practically without giving them a trial. Let me give an instance to illustrate that. I am not speaking without some reason for what I say. There was an instance—and it had to do with this Dominion government—about a year ago, where an excise officer visited a place, and found a little bit of home-made brew of some kind in the man's house. The man's wife was sick in bed, his children were very young, and they were far from any neighbour; yet the excise officer sent out some Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers and had this man brought into the city. In this case I do not blame the magistrates, but I blame the law that permitted this to occur, because the magistrate claimed he could not come to any other decision than the one he rendered. The magistrate convicted him and sentenced him to pay a fine of $700 which the man could not by any stretch of the imagination pay, and at the same time his wife and children were lying in a shack out in the wilderness. I took up the case with the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) who looked upon the matter in what I considered was the proper light, and ultimately the heavy fine was remitted, and a nominal fine was imposed, because technically the man had committed a crime. We should avoid as far as we can putting on the statute book legislation which, no matter what kind of a crime we are dealing with, too quickly proves the man guilty, and does not give him a chance to prove his innocence in some other court if need be.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Referring to the proposition of placing the onus upon the accused, and of limiting the right of appeal, from a legal standpoint, of course, it is an extraordinary course to pursue. My hon. friend for St. John said, with reference to the temperance law in the province of Nova Scotia, that the right of certiorari has been taken away. I think it has been taken away in probably every province in the Dominion in regard to the Temperance Act, and I quite agree that cases have occurred where the right of certiorari has been taken and an injustice has been done. We all know the circum-

stances under which legislation of that character is enforced, but no one has seriously questioned that parliament did a wise thing when they took away the right of certiorari in regard to cases of persons keeping disorderly houses. These matters are almost invariably tried by recorders or stipendiary magistrates in the cities, who are well qualified to deal with legal questions when they arise and also determine the facts. In regard to this particular matter, whatever we might say in regard to temperance matters, or any other matters that come within the purview of the criminal law, we are all agreed that this nefarious traffic, which saps the mind and body of the people, can only be dealt with in the strongest possible way. I am instructed that in the city of Montreal, out of 68 appeals that were taken, I think, during the last six months, 40 of the appellants, when the cases came on to be heard in appeal, never turned up, which indicates that the parties who were appealing had put up the necessary security merely for the purpose of gaining time, and evading the penalties which the law had provided and were willing to pay the money in order to escape. It is a well-ascertained fact that the traffic which is going on in regard to these drugs is one which, in the interests of the nation, must be dealt with with the same severity as if we had the application of military law. I think the sense of the House and the sense of the committee would be that in proceedings against a physician, or registered druggist, or a veterinary, full rights should be preserved to the defendant in the case, but we are only doing our duty when we declare that no technical objection, or no ground which might be used by way of certiorari should be permitted to interfere with carrying out in a stern way the law which ought to be enforced in the interest of the nation and of our people.

Mr. LADNER: I fully concur with the viewpoint of the last speaker (Mr. Macdonald). In the course of last year, after careful inquiries from reliable sources, I found that practically all the offences which would come under these subsections (a), (b) and (c) of section 4 were committed in the larger cities. That is in Vancouver, Winnipeg and Montreal, but there were very few cases in the city of Ottawa or Quebec; in fact nearly all the cases were in those large cities and just as one hon. member has stated, they generally have lawyers in those cities who are trained men, acting as police magistrates, and they are quite competent to render justice to people charged with these offences.

[Mr. E. M. Macdonald.]

Mr. MARTELL: It seems to me that the accused under this section 14 is absolutely presumed to be guilty at the beginning. Under that section as it has been amended the presumption of guilt is against the prisoner. In fact, he is said to be guilty. When the prosecutor comes into court, it is simply necessary to have the magistrate read the information; then the prisoner pleads not guilty, and he has to proceed and prove himself not guilty. If that magistrate is, as often happens to be the case, a prejudiced person, the accused person is so to speak convicted before he arrives in court, and the man has no right of appeal. If the party does not establish his innocence, the onus of proof being placed upon him, surely the Crown or the informer does not suffer by giving him the right of appeal. He has to put up a bond of probably double the amount of the fine and sufficient security to pay the costs, and he comes before the court. Then the judge has an opportunity of trying the case de novo; he is judge of both the law and the facts. If you take away this right of appeal, you first declare that the onus is on the man to prove his innocence. Then, if he does not establish that to the satisfaction of a prejudiced magistrate—and magistrates in the country are not the same as the trained lawyers we find in the cities and larger towns—he is denied the right of appeal. If you have the man convicted and you have his bond for double the amount of the fine if he is fined, how does the Crown suffer? Then you take away the right of certiorari. In the Nova Scotia legislature some eight or ten days ago a bill was introduced by the provincial Attorney General, who is probably the best criminal lawyer in that province, to give in an application for a writ of certiorari, power to the judge to look at the depositions to see if a prima facie case is made out. Formerly if a conviction was complete and regular on its face, the judge could not look at the evidence; he had to confirm the conviction. By virtue of this bill, if it becomes law in Nova Scotia, where a provincial act is concerned, the judge before whom the matter comes will look at the evidence in order to see if a prima facie case has been made out, and if not, he has authority to make the rule nisi absolute. That is the experience of Nova Scotia under the Temperance Act and other drastic acts of the province. In this case you are taking away the right of certiorari absolutely. If a conviction happens to be a complete conviction on its face, no matter whether there is

evidence enough or not to substantiate the conviction, the judge has no power on certiorari. The man is haled before the court; if he is in the hands of a prejudiced magistrate, he is found guilty and he has no right of appeal. This is most dastardly legislation. It is true that very drastic remedies are required to cope with this drug evil; but they should not go so far as to take away every principle of British justice. While we are all agreed that drastic measures should be adopted in order to stamp out this evil, when you are amply protected, for heaven's sake give the accused a chance for his life.

Mr. SHAW: I remember very well last year when this legislation was before the House, I took the view, as was expressed by several of the other members, that our legislation was becoming rather drastic. It seems to me that the effect of this legislation is to deprive an accused person of a remedy which he might have in law, that is, by reason of the abolition of the certiorari right. We are also depriving him of his right of appeal, so that if he happens to be unjustly convicted, because of a misunderstanding of the facts, he has no remedy, and if there is an error in law, he similarly has no remedy. It seems to me that we should preserve to an accused person some means of satisfying the courts of his innocence, and while I have no sympathy whatever with those who commit offences against this particular act, yet it may be possible, owing to inexperience of justices of the peace, that injustice may be done in which even an innocent man may be foreclosed from securing the right to which otherwise under British law he is entitled. The matter should be seriously considered before even, in this legislation, it is allowed to become part of our criminal law.

Section agreed to on division.

On section 25—Convicted alien subject to deportation:

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Some few days ago while I was in conversation with a party who was very conversant with Chinese matters, he advised me that a convicted alien might be either fined or imprisoned, but that deportation proceedings followed only a term in prison. It looks to me as though clauses 25 and 4 overcome that weakness, if it were a weakness; that by the two clauses 4 and 25, the minimum penalty that a judicial body may impose is both fine and imprisonment, and that deportation is sure to follow on any conviction. Is that the case?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr STEVENS: Why limit deportation to paragraphs (a), (d) and (e) of clause 4?

Mr. BELAND: Those are traffickers.

Mr. STEVENS: Paragraph (b) reads:

Imports into or exports from Canada any drug.

Paragraph (c) reads:

Exports any raw opium or any drug that is not packed and marked in such manner—

And so on. That party would be a trafficker just as much as the other, and it might be possible to catch a very notorious trafficker under paragraph (c) and not be able to catch him under one of the other paragraphs. If he is convicted under paragraphs (b) or (c), I do not see why he should not be deported. Why not say under the whole of clause 4?

Mr. BELAND: It would appear that paragraph (a) would cover all the cases, and (b) is only an explanation of what ports should be named by the minister. When the preparation of the bill was under way, this feature of it was very carefully looked into, and it was the opinion that clause 25, as it is now drafted, would meet all possible emergencies. If my hon. friend thinks the clause should be made broader, I have no objection to adding anything he suggests, but in the opinion of the officials of the department and also of the officials of the Department of Justice, that would cover the cases that we want to reach, that we have in view. I may say further that the administration of a similar clause incorporated in the bill last year did not give entire satisfaction. The principal reason is that under clause 10 (b), I think it is, of the former act, too much discretionary power was left with the magistrate. In many cases where an alien was convicted, deportation could not take place because the magistrate interpreted the law in a different manner from what we thought the intention of parliament was at the time of the passing of the act. Moreover, if I may explain, I think a decision has been handed down by a court in British Columbia. There the court held that a person sentenced to pay a fine and, in default of payment of such fine, to a term of imprisonment, not liable to deportation under the act. I am informed that some 49 cases of deportation have been stopped by that decision of the court. The section which has been prepared is supposed to cover all possible cases, and if the committee will read it carefully with me perhaps my hon. friend will share my opinion:

Notwithstanding any provision of the Immigration Act, or any other statute, any alien, whether domiciled in Canada or not, who at any time after his entry into Canada is convicted of an offence under paragraphs (a), (d) or (e) of section four of this act shall, upon the expiration or sooner determination of the imprison-

ment imposed on such conviction, be kept in custody and deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration Act relating to enquiry, detention and deportation. (1922, c. 36, s. 5, 10B.)

It is thought that this section will meet all cases.

Mr. LADNER: Suppose the accused is only fined?

Mr. BELAND: Under section 4 of this act it is provided that he must not only be fined but also sentenced to imprisonment. My hon. friend will find, in section 4, line 26, that not less than $200 and costs as well as imprisonment is the penalty imposed, and further down it is provided that the court shall have no power to impose less than the minimum penalties "herein prescribed," and shall in all cases of conviction impose both fine and imprisonment. It is assumed therefore that this clause will meet all cases of deportation.

On the schedule:

Mr. BELAND: There is a new drug in the schedule.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

INDIAN AFFAIRS

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

Indians—Nova Scotia, $50,140.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much money was spent under this item for the last fiscal year?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): I am informed that we spent the whole amount last year, $53,140, and we are asking this year, $50,140. The difference is explained in the vote required for the Truro highway which was completed, and a similar amount will not need to be voted this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought we gave a special vote last year of $3,000 for some dyking.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have an item for dyking this year. The vote for Nova Scotia is very much the same as last year, with the single exception that on carefully scrutinizing the estimates some changes will be found which I will deal with as we come to them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The vote for Nova Scotia of $50,140 has been continued for some time I think, but last year the minister brought down a supplementary estimate which added $3,000 to that vote. As he says, that was for repairs to roads and for dyking.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For the last fiscal year $3,000 was voted for the main highway through the Millbrook reserve in Colchester, and as the work is now completed a similar vote is not necessary.

Item agreed to.

New Brunswick, $29,334.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What has been spent on this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not the complete audited accounts of the expenditure, although the amount is exactly the same as we asked last year. It covers practically identically the same vote as formerly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there a balance on hand this year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under the new act the accounts are closed on the 31st March.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can assure my hon. friend that so far as the departmental accounting is concerned we have used all the vote.

Item agreed to.

Ontario and Quebec, $196,635.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the expenditure under this head?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is a very considerable decrease in the expenditure on road building and repairs to roads, bridges and drainage. That is accounted for principally by the fact that last year the good roads' programme in Ontario had passed through a considerable number of reserves. I think that little or no payments had been made for two or three years and it required a very large sum to clear off the account. That has all been paid for and so far as I know there are no commitments. This is arrived at by the estimates made upon the roads which passed through the reserves and payments were made accordingly and certified to by our own engineers. They cut down the expenditure too much, and we will possibly have to ask for an additional sum in the supplementary estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much of this is for roads?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am speaking of the item of $15,900, which last year was $58,180. There is a decrease of $42,280 over last year's appropriation there, and that comes out of the large appropriation for repairs to roads, bridges and drainage. The other items are the same as last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are they?

Mr. STEVENS: The minister is not quite correct in stating that the other items are the same. There is an increase of $15,000 for relief, and while speaking on this let me draw his attention to this most extraordinary coincidence right through. The increased relief in Nova Scotia of $14,000 more than doubles the vote; the relief in Ontario and Quebec represents an increase of $15,000; and in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta the increase for supplies and so on is $18,000, and for hospitals, medical attendance, etc., $16,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The increased relief in Ontario is made up by a corresponding reduction in the general vote. It is a changing of the allocation.

Mr. STEVENS: As far as Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are concerned, that is not so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The increase of $18,962 in Manitoba and Saskatchewan is accounted for by the additional supplies provided to meet treaty obligations with the Indians of the Great Slave and Mackenzie river district numbering 3,000 souls. It is the first time we have issued relief to these Indians who have come in under treaty obligations made by Mr. Conroy some two years ago.

Mr. STEVENS: Why the increase in Ontario?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is a decrease of $15,000 in the general vote. It is simply a transfer for book-keeping purposes taken from the general vote and applied to Ontario for relief purposes.

Mr. STEVENS: How much was spent last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These transfers are confusing and give rise to difficulty in making explanations, but I am told by the accountant that although the $15,000 has not been voted direct for relief purposes it has been paid out of this fund for years. It appears now directly for relief purposes for Ontario and Quebec rather than in the general item number 278.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, in referring to the Indians of Manitoba I do not suppose I am likely to say anything that the hon. minister does not already know, but I think it well to make a statement as to their condition. I live near a reserve, and some twenty miles distant, near Brandon, we have a much larger reserve. The condition of the Indians on these reserves is deplorable; there is no denying that fact. While I was at home at Easter I received a deputation of eight or ten Indians who told me, in a dignified and intelligent manner, the story of the conditions that exist upon the reserves. We hear a great deal about the hard times among the farmers in western Canada, men who have long been acquainted with that sort of work, who come down from generations of farmers, yet are hardly able to make a living. I found Indians on the reserve without stock, without implements, without anything with which they could make a living; yet they have been existing. It seems to me that we are slowly starving these people to death. It is all very well to talk about the Indian and his characteristics, his lack of ability to take care of himself under modern conditions, but that is perhaps a rather hard-hearted way of looking at it. We have come into the country and taken the place of these Indians, people who have been used to a nomadic life, who from generation to generation have lived the life of the hunter, knowing nothing of modern conditions of agriculture. They are put in a reserve and told to make their living.

I remember a statement made to me by the late Glen Campbell, at one time a member of this House. He was commissioner of Indian police with jurisdiction over the Indians from the Great Lakes to the foot of the Rockies. I once had the pleasure of going with him over the Sarcee Indian reserve at Calgary, a splendid reserve, with good grazing facilities, capable of taking care of a great many cattle and stock of all kinds. I remember while admiring the reserve and the desirable place the Indians had there that he made the statement to me that were it not for the red tape at Ottawa he could make all these Indians rich. I wonder if there was any truth in that statement? I do not know, but that was what he said. Perhaps the Indians are ruled a little too much by red tape, without the application of any great knowledge of the conditions that prevail on the reserves. I am satisfied that it is no use to supply the Indians—the ones I know, anyway—with stock and seed and implements and then expect them to take care of their stock and make a good living for themselves. As long as these

reserves are managed and operated from an office the business of which is characterized by nothing more than red tape and accurate bookkeeping, we are going to have a continuance of the present conditions.

Remember, I am not finding fault with any of the officials, nor am I directing any special criticism against the system that exists, but it is not the proper system. The agent on a reserve should be something more to the Indians than an official; he should be their adviser and their friend; even more than that, he should almost be a father to them by giving his advice and assistance in all matters pertaining to their work. As those who know them are aware, the Indians have an almost childlike temperament. I do not say they are deficient in intellect; in fact, in intellectual ability they will compare with the white man. But they lack the white man's persistence, his sticktoitiveness, his going about his work day after day and carrying out his agricultural activities. I also know that if the agent on a reserve has the confidence of the Indians they will take his advice and be guided by it, and until the government appoint agents who will be something more than officials, who will do something more than carry out simply what the law requires them to do, so long will the condition respecting the Indians continue as it is in Manitoba.

I think it is a disgrace that Canada should allow its wards to be in the condition that they are in at the present time. It was almost pathetic to listen to the stories of some of these men. They went back many years and told me of the arrangement made whereby they became the wards of the government. They told me of how loyal they had been; that when the war broke out they sent their young men over to the front some of whom laid down their lives for Canada. Those who returned went back on the reserve; they have made a bad mess of it; they are unable to make a living and it is no exaggeration to say that they are starving; the people who live near them know the facts. At my own place we often feed the Indians because we know they are really hungry and need something to help them along. Now, I want the government to get acquainted with the facts; to look into the conditions that exists on the reserve; and when the inspector goes around, let him do a little more than enter the agent's office and see that the books are properly kept. I would like to see him get in contact with the Indians, find out what their complaints are, learn of the actual conditions under which they are living, and see whether something cannot be done to make life a little more pleasant for them. In the harvest time the Indians will go out and work well for a month or six weeks, and get big wages, but when they get a little money they go into the town and buy all the canned goods they can get hold of. They are improvident, there is no use denying that, and that is why they need some looking after, someone to take care of them. I have no doubt that the minister is aware of these facts and is anxious to do something to help the Indians, but I want to make this appeal on behalf of the Indians as I know them: that the country do a little more for them; that something be done to help them to help themselves and get them into the way of making a fairly decent living and not actually starve as they are doing at present on the reserve.

11 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we should hear from the minister; it is news to the committee that we have starving Indians.

The CHAIRMAN: The item is for Ontario and Quebec.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There may be some in Ontario and Quebec, though I do not know any.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had intended to make a statement with respect to the Indian department generally. The matter is a very important one to which I have given some considerable attention, and I am prepared to say some things with respect to the Indian department that I think the House should know. I am asking for a very considerable increase in the appropriation for Indian education. I believe that is necessary, in view of what I discovered last year in visiting a considerable number of the western reserves. I cannot speak with authority as to what has happened in eastern Canada because I have not visited those reserves. But as my statement would take at least half an hour, I might better give it to a fuller House to-morrow.

Mr. FORKE: I am sorry that I anticipated the minister's statement.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 11.03 p.m.

Tuesday, April 24, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

FOURTH REPORT PRESENTED

Mr. McMASTER presented the fourth report of the special committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions, as follows:

Your committee beg to submit the following resolution which they have unanimously adopted, viz:—

Among the various subjects which have been investigated by your committee, they desire to make a report on the question of ocean freights. It is not easy to over-emphasize the importance of cheap ocean transportation to the Canadian farmer.

Whatever advantage may have accrued to the Canadian people by the millions of money spent on the development of our internal transportation system—the building of railways, the digging of canals, the deepening of rivers—such advantage may be in a large measure nullified if freight rates from our ocean ports to foreign countries are fixed at such figures as to absorb the savings which these expenditures have obtained.

Your committee are of the opinion that upon the regular steamship lines trading from Canadian ports the price of transportation service is determined neither by the law of supply and demand, nor on the basis of cost plus a reasonable profit, but that a combine exists among the various shipping companies, which combine is known as the North Atlantic and U.K. Conference Eastward-bound.

The headquarters of this organization are at 8-10 Bridge street, New York, and it includes in its membership a very great number, if not all, of the principal steamship companies operating regular lines out of North Atlantic ports.

According to the witness, Mr. W. H. Chase, Atlantic freight rates are made in New York the first Thursday in every month. (See evidence of Mr. Chase, page 350.) To this North Atlantic Conference belong nearly all, if not all, of the regular steamship lines running from Montreal, including the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. (See evidence of Mr. W. A. Cunningham, Traffic Manager, Page 211). It will be remembered that the Canadian Government Merchant marine, as well as the Canadian National Railways, is operated under the control of a board, and not by a minister of the Crown.

Subsidiary to this conference there exists a smaller association of steamship men connected with steamship lines trading out of Montreal. This association is called sometimes the Canadian Liner Committee, and sometimes the Weekly Liner Committee. They hold meetings as a rule every Tuesday afternoon at the offices of the companies whose representatives act for the association.

The minutes of various meetings of this association, produced before your committee show that the lines or transportation companies constituting the association are as follows:

Cunard, Anchor Donaldson and Thomson Lines; Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Ltd.; White Star Dominion Line; Intercontinental Transports, Ltd., (with which certain vessels of the Canadian Steamship Lines, Ltd., are associated); Furness Withy Company, McLean, Kennedy & Company; and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited. The object of these meetings was very neatly characterized by Mr. L. A. W. Doherty, the representative of one of these lines, as being "to stabilize or keep uniform the situation of ocean transport."

It was contended by the gentleman who represented the Canadian Government Merchant Marine before the committee that the line merely "sat in" with the rest of the steamship lines at the weekly conferences, and that it was not bound in the same manner as the others were bound to maintain rates.

A careful consideration of the evidence hardly supports this contention. It would appear that during the several years the Canadian Government Merchant Marine has been in existence, it has departed from rates so established on four different occasions—one departure, however, covering more than one shipment.

The manner in which the Liner committee operated was as follows:

The general rates were set at the North Atlantic and U. K. Conference in New York, but for the purpose of united action in regard to these and other matters, a weekly meeting was held, at which representatives of all steamship lines attended. At this meeting, rates were agreed upon, and no member of the line had the right to depart from the rates so established without conferring with and warning his competitors of his intention so to do. An earnestly-worded expostulation would be directed by one member to another if this line of conduct was not followed.

This state of affairs brought about the following extraordinary result. The government of the United States forced the Shipping Board of that country which manages the United States governmentally-owned steamers, to make a very low rate for the transportation of flour to Europe—a rate stated by the shipping companies to be below a commercial rate. This rate applied only to flour ground in the United States. To meet this rate, the North Atlantic Conference Lines established, at a given moment, a rate of 15c. per 100 lbs. on flour ground in the United States, while they maintained a rate of 19c. per 100 lbs. on Canadian flour—a very substantial differential against our Canadian millers. To this agreement, as a member of the North Atlantic Conference, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine was a party.

The committee feel in this regard that the vast sums spent by the Canadian people on the development of a merchant marine were never intended to bring about this result.

The committee desire to bring the facts in this regard to the earnest attention of the House, and would respectfully suggest that the Minister of Railways and Canals should take the matter up with the Canadian National Railway Board for consideration and appropriate action.

It would appear that the shipping combine referred to does not include tramp steamers, which can be chartered from time to time, and among which there exists keen competition. These, however, are only available to those shippers who can load a whole steamer; neither do they take the place of regular lines which are able to effect transportation almost with the regularity of express trains, and which, therefore, offer much greater advantages to those who have to ship perishable articles to a market which wishes to have a regular supply.

The boats of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are not of such construction as permits of their being used as cattle boats, and to convert them for this purpose would be both costly and impracticable.

Evidence was produced showing that since the commencement of the war, ocean rates on cattle had increased by 300 per cent while the price of beef in the British market had only increased 66 per cent during the same period.

Your committee is of the opinion that the continuance of the rates now charged inevitably must have a detrimental effect upon the export cattle trade.

Your committee were also struck with the fact that many of the witnesses connected with trans-Atlantic steamship lines testified that, as a rule, small cargoes

were brought from Great Britain to this country, and that this fact tended to increase freight rates on Canadian-eastward-bound traffic over what would be the case if a fair amount of traffic were coming westward as well as going eastward. Thus any policy which diminishes the volume of trade coming from Europe to Canada, tends to increase the cost of transportation from Canada to Europe. The attention of the House is respectfully invited to this fact, and the attention of the government directed to the situation so created.

The whole is respectfully submitted.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I beg to present several petitions containing about 15,000 names, urging the government to increase the exemption for every child allowed in the Income Tax Act from $300 to $500, to totally exempt the father of five children who has an income less than $5,000, and also urging the government to differentiate between the earned and unearned income. These petitions are signed by members of the Societe St. Jean Baptiste, employees of Dupuis freres, Hudon and Orsali, P. P. Martin and Co., Laporte Martin, Daoust Lalonde & Cie, Hudon Hebert & Co., l'Association Catholique des Voyageurs de Commerce du Canada, the citizens of St. Cesaire, of St. Antoine sur Richelieu, of Waterloo, St. Hyacinthe, Quebec, Montreal, Farnham, Ste, Therese, Longueuil and a number of other places in the province of Quebec.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 132 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Darton.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 133 (from the Senate), for the relief of Minnie Eileen Biggs.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 134 (from the Senate) for the relief of Thomas Henry Bottomley.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 135 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Ritchie Dowd.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the Minister of Finance tell us what day the budget will be delivered?

Mr. FIELDING: I have considered the matter several times but I am sorry to say I cannot make any definite statement at present.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister say whether it will be next week or not?

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. FIELDING: I am hopeful but I cannot make any definite statement now. However, I will give my hon. friend reasonable notice.

PENSIONS COMMITTEE—INTERIM REPORT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ARTHURS: Does the government intend printing the interim report of the Pensions committee now sitting?

Mr. BELAND: A motion has already been made to have 1,000 copies printed in English and 1,000 in French.

THE FRENCH TREATY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FIELDING: It had been arranged, as announced last night, that we would take up to-day the further consideration of the French treaty, but I understand that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) desires that it be postponed, and we acquiesce in that request. I therefore suggest that we take up Order No. 27.

PATENTS OF INVENTION

House again in committee on Bill No. 20, to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to Patents of Invention, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 40—Powers of commissioner:

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): This section was allowed to stand for conference between the commissioner and the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys). I now move, seconded by that hon. member, that section 40 be amended by striking out paragraphs (c) and (d) of subclause 1 thereof, and substituting therefor the following:

The commissioner shall then consider the petition, and if the parties do not come to an arrangement between themselves shall proceed to hear and determine the matter, and if it is proved to his satisfaction that the reasonable requirements of the public with respect to the patented invention have not been satisfied, the patentee may be ordered by him to supply the patented article within reasonable limits at such price as may be fixed by him and in accordance with the custom of the trade to which the invention relates as to payment and delivery, or to grant licenses for the use of the patented invention as may be fixed by him, in either case within and after such time as may be fixed by him and on pain of forfeiture of the patent.

Provided that such an order shall not be made before the expiration of three years from the date of the patent and not less than one year after the passing of this act, or if the patentee gives satisfactory reasons for his default. And provided further, that having regard to the nature of the case, the commis-

sioner may with the approval of the minister, instead of hearing and determining the matter himself, refer the petition to the Exchequer Court, which shall have jurisdiction in the premises and may make such order thereon as the commissioner is authorized to make under this section.

And by adding the following sub-clause to said clause 40:

(2) Any decision of the commissioner under this section shall be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: Will you refer back, Mr Chairman, to clause No. 5? In view of the extended powers just given under this amendment it is necessary to add to clause 5 another section. Therefore I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys):

That clause 5 be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

(2) For the purposes of this act the commissioner shall have all the powers that are or may be given by the Inquiries Act to a commissioner appointed under part 2 thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to section 61 and to move, seconded by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys):

That there be added to section 61 the following clause:

In all cases where an appeal is provided from the decision of the commissioner to the Exchequer Court under this act, such appeal shall be had and taken pursuant to the provisions of the Exchequer Court Act and the rules and practice of the said court.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That amendment does not seem appropriate to section 61, which deals only with costs; it should be a separate section.

Mr. ROBB: It is an independent section.

Mr. BOYS: It was arranged in the conference I had with the commissioner that there would be a heading to it as well, namely, Appeals.

Mr. ROBB: That is marked on the order before the Chairman. The section will be No. 61a.

Section 61a agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, it appears from the records before the law officers that section 21 was not passed as amended.

The CHAIRMAN: It was allowed to stand.

Mr. ROBB: I beg to move the following amendment:

That section 21 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

20. In case of conflicting applications for any patent, the same shall be submitted to the arbitration of three skilled persons, two of whom shall be chosen by the applicants, one by each, and the third of whom shall be chosen by the commissioner; and the decision or award of such arbitrators, or of any two of them, delivered to the commissioner in writing and subscribed by them or any two of them, shall be final, as far as concerns the granting of the patent.

2. If either of the applicants refuses or fails to choose an arbitrator, when required so to do by the commissioner, and if there are only two such applicants, the patent shall issue to the other applicant.

3. If there are more than two conflicting applications, and if the persons applying do not all unite in appointing three arbitrators, the commissioner may appoint the three arbitrators for the purposes aforesaid.

4. The arbitrators so named shall subscribe and take before a judge of any court of record in Canada, an oath in the form following, that is to say:—

"I, the undersigned (A.B.), being duly appointed an arbitrator under the authority of the Patent Act, do hereby solemnly swear or (affirm, as the case may be), that I will well and truly perform the duty of such arbitrator on the conflicting applications of (C.D. and E.F.) submitted to me."

5. The arbitrators, or any one of them, when so sworn, may summon before them any applicant or other person, and may require him to give evidence on oath, orally or in writing (or on solemn affirmation if such applicant or person is entitled to affirm in civil cases), and to produce such documents and things as such arbitrators deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to examine, and they shall have the same power to enforce the attendance of such applicants and other persons, and to compel them to give evidence, as is vested in any court of justice in civil cases, in the province in which the arbitration is held.

6. The fees for the services of such arbitrators shall be a matter of agreement between the arbitrators and the applicants, and shall be paid by the applicants who name them, respectively, except those of the arbitrator or arbitrators named by the commissioner, which shall be paid by the applicants jointly.

Mr. BOYS: The commissioner is now taking more responsibility under the amendments that have been agreed to. So why not let him take this degree of responsibility in connection with conflicting applications? Possibly they would be even more appropriate for his attention in the first instance than some other matters. I really thought that was understood, although I admit it was not discussed this morning between myself and the commissioner. The other day we discussed the arbitration features in the old act and it was generally agreed that they were very cumbersome and led to great delay and unnecessary expense. I would suggest that the section should provide that in cases of conflicting applications for any patent the commissioner should first determine the matter, subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner assures me that it is proposed to simplify the regulations and provide for this.

Mr. BOYS: In view of the statutory provision here that the commissioner must send

the matter to the Exchequer Court, I do not think he could pass regulations defining a totally different practice.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner assures me that he desires this power with a view to bringing the parties together, but that under the regulations he has in mind he will simplify it very much. With that assurance I think my hon. friend might allow the amendment to go through.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the bill as introduced omitted the arbitration sections that were in the former act. When the matter was up on Friday night I moved an amendment to the effect that in the case of conflicting applications and claims the matter in the first instance should be decided by the Commissioner of Patents, and that his decision should be subject to appeal to the Exchequer Court. The complaint against the old system of arbitration was that it was cumbersome, dilatory and expensive, and all parties interested seemed to have confidence in the judgment of the commissioner to decide the conflicting applications, which amount to about 90 per cent of the cases, I understand. It would simplify and expedite matters very much and save considerable expense if the commissioner would decide these cases as they come up. It is not a final decision, because if the parties are not satisfied they can go to the Exchequer Court. In the original bill as introduced by the minister he left out the arbitration clauses, and I think it is a piece of foolishness to seek to restore them now. If that is what the amendment means I am certainly opposed to it.

Mr. ROBB: It is true that the arbitration clauses were omitted from the bill as introduced, but they were restored at the request of many who have business with the Patent office, and who desire to have this privilege of arbitration available to them. I am not sure that it would be wise for parliament to take away the privilege. Why not retain this feature? It will do no harm.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister took it away in the first instance.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, but there have been objections.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the new clause 21?

Section agreed to.

On section 30—Assignments in case of joint applications:

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. ROBB: This section is marked, "stand." It is an old clause. The former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) and the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) offered some objections which they afterwards withdrew, and we understood that the clause had passed.

Mr. BOYS: I think I remember raising a question as to the validity of the assignment. As it stands now, section 30 reads:

> In cases of joint applications or grants, every assignment from one or more of the applicants or patentees to the other or others, or to any other person, shall be registered in like manner as other assignments.

The question arises at once, if it is not registered, is it null and void, or is it only to be null and void as against subsequent purchasers or assignees without notice? The suggestion I made was to draft an amendment which would put it beyond peradventure.

Mr. ROBB: We were leaving this clause in because of its venerable age. The commisioner prefers that it be dropped altogether rather than that it be amended.

Mr. BOYS: I think it would be better to strike it out if it is not amended. It is covered by section 29, anyway.

Mr. ROBB: I move that section 30 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to, and section 30 struck out.

Mr. STEVENS: Before you leave the bill I wish to point out what would appear to be an unintentional error in wording or in arrangement. Section 65 provides for the repeal of the old act, with the exception of 5a, which is not repealed. The object of 5a is to cover the appointment of the commissioner. It says:

> The Governor in Council may appoint a person who has held the office of Deputy Minister of Agriculture to be Commissioner of Patents.

And so on. That means that if the person now holding the position of Commissioner of Patents should leave the office, the Governor in Council could not appoint anyone who had not been a deputy minister of agriculture. I do not suppose we could find anyone who has been a deputy minister of agriculture who would know the first thing about patents, so that that will certainly have to be corrected before section 65 is adopted. The provision is made, quite properly, to cover the case of the present incumbent. There is no objection to that; I am merely pointing out what the effect of the clause will be in regard to future appointments.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner points out that this clause was put in to meet his particular case, and that if to-morrow we were appointing a commissioner of patents he would not have the standing of a deputy minister.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend has not caught my point. Section 5a is retained, and under it you cannot appoint to the position of Commissioner of Patents anyone who has not been a deputy minister of agriculture. That was all right as applying to the present incumbent in the office; there is no quarrel about that, but for future appointments a different provision must be made.

Mr. ROBB: I think clause 3 of this bill covers that point.

Mr. STEVENS: But you are retaining 5a. I do not advance this as my own opinion only; others who have given consideration to the matter have the same opinion—that this calls for the appointment of someone who has had experience as a deputy minister of agriculture. If we are perfectly sure of it, of course my objection falls, but I think we ought to be very sure before the bill is passed.

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner tells me that this has been worked out by the law officers. If in the future we appoint as Commissioner of Patents a man who has previously been deputy minister of agriculture, he comes under 5a; otherwise clause 3 covers the appointment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: With all due respect to the minister, it seems to me that if he retains clause 5a the inference is very strong that the next Commissioner of Patents must have been a deputy minister of agriculture.

Mr. ROBB: Oh, no.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot see it in any other way. Is there any reason for retaining it? Of course if the minister wants to take the risk, we cannot do any more; we have pointed it out.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF FRUIT AND FRUIT CONTAINERS

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the third reading of Bill No. 11, to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 115, to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, Mr. Marcil in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The clauses have all been adopted. Shall I report this bill?

Mr. LEADER: Before the bill passes I would like to ask the minister if he thinks a sufficient amount has been provided in the estimates this year to take care of the necessary expenses under this act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The estimates are based on the assumption that this reduction in compensation will be made. Since the main estimate went through, a supplementary estimate for $100,000 has been brought down for this purpose. I do not think it has yet gone through, but with this supplementary estimate, plus the reduction in compensation, we think we shall have enough to take care of the requirements this year fairly well.

Mr. LEADER: Is it the intention of the minister to withdraw the regulation that calls for at least ten pure-bred cattle before a breeder can participate in the accredited herd plan?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a matter that has been discussed many times. It is a question of how few cattle we will send a man out to inspect at one time. If we reduce the present number of ten to, say, six, the man with only four cattle would think it should be reduced still further to four, and if that were done somebody else would want it reduced still further. There is a point at which it does not pay to send out an inspector, entailing all the necessary expenses, to examine a herd of cattle. Up to the present we have thought that in view of the expense ten was the minimum number we could send out a man to inspect. That is a matter of opinion. I do not feel very strongly on it, for I should like to meet the wishes of the man with the small herd, because after all the man that is starting right will be apt to stay right. There is a good deal to be said in favour of inspecting these smaller herds, but it is really a question of expense of administration. I should be very glad to discuss this matter with my hon. friend. I might point out that my recollection is that the regulation can be changed without any reference to the bill whatever.

Mr. LEADER: I realize that the minister wishes to do what is right in the matter, but according to the figures he gave the House

some time ago there are about 156 applications still on the waiting list for which the government cannot provide inspection. Am I right in that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that is the number.

Mr. LEADER: In view of that I do not feel inclined to protest against the passing of this bill. I belong to a fraternity that I think cannot be said to be altogether selfish, and if the maximum compensation is placed at $200, and that is considered too much, as a breeder I can only give my consent to accepting a lower compensation in view of the fact that the government find it necessary to impose this regulation calling upon a breeder to have at least ten pure-bred cattle before he can participate in the benefits under the act. I happen to know something about this business. When I was at home at Easter I attended a farmers' meeting and this question was brought up. One man in that locality said that he had had an application on file since last fall and could not get the government to act. It was the consensus of opinion at that meeting that the farmers in that district, at any rate, were so anxious regarding tuberculosis in cattle that they would be willing to do without any compensation if they could get the government to inspect their cattle for them. I pointed out to them that they could pay a local veterinary and have the work done in that way, but they felt that they would have more confidence in a test made by a regular government inspector. In view of that I shall not protest the right of the government to lower the compensation.

I am sure the minister would be glad to hear the views of the members of this House and especially of the breeders, on this question, and I would like to take this opportunity to make a few remarks. Last year when this bill was up a similar reduction was proposed. Some of us did not believe that that reduction should be made, and I still believe that the minister was well advised when he agreed to make the maximum compensation $200 instead of $150. The minister has said that it is a general practice with inspectors to give the maximum compensation irrespective of whether the animal is entitled to it or not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend has misunderstood me. That is rather a strange interpretation of what I said.

Mr. LEADER: I think the minister will bear me out that that was the implication of what he said at all events. I wish to state emphatically that as regards Dr. Still and his contingent of inspectors in western Canada, as far as I can find out they have been absolutely fair. I believe they are doing a great work out there, and Dr. Still especially I believe is the right man in the right place. People are becoming greatly interested in this accredited herd plan, and I would be very sorry to see it get a black eye. The minister has indicated that he is going to inaugurate a new system called the free area plan. I am in sympathy with that idea. I believe it is the ideal system, but it is going to cost a lot to clean up these areas and inspect every herd of pure-bred and grade cattle, and I do not think we have come to the point where we can adopt that system on a large scale. There is also a measure of compulsion in regard to it, and some men will always back up against compulsion and will not agree to compulsory measures. I think the best plan for the government in this matter would be the voluntary submission of breeders to the accredited herd plan. I know that it is very popular in the West and has made rapid strides. I would be very sorry for the government to do anything that would give the cattle industry a set back. We in the West and in the portion from which I come especially, have come to the conclusion that we must change our system of farming, change from grain growing exclusively to more diversified farming, and the raising of live stock is the plan we shall have to follow. We are going into that business more and more in the West and are providing facilities to take care of it. In the West already 2,000 silos have been built, and to show the strides this business is making I might mention that 500 silos were built last year. We are trying to supply cattle for the market that is developing in the Old Country and a black eye to the industry at this time would have the effect of discouraging efforts along that particular line. The good health of the Canadian cattle was a very important factor in inducing the Old Country to lift the embargo. In this connection I would quote from a speech made by Major G. Paget, Unionist member for Bosworth, in the British parliament during the debate there on this subject. He said:

> They knew that Canada was extremely free from disease.

I will also quote from the speech of the Right Hon. E. G. Pretyman, Unionist member for Chelmsford, who said:

> That perhaps the strongest plank in the Canadian case was the absolute immunity of Canadian cattle from any form of virulent disease over a long period of years.

In the House of Lords, when the bill was being discussed there, Lord Askwith made this statement:

> On the other hand, it was proved up to the hilt that since the year 1896, and for even a longer period, there had been no really serious disease in Canada, and that the claim for keeping Canadian cattle out was not a good one.

I maintain that if we are going to develop that trade with the Old Country we must not do anything to jeopardize the demand which now exists there for our cattle.

I would like to take a moment or two to deal with another point, because I may not have another opportunity of doing so. The responsibility devolves upon the government of helping the Canadian farmer take advantage of the live stock trade with Great Britain. When we were assured that the embargo would be lifted stock men in this country were advised to feed all the good cattle they possibly could in order to take advantage of the opportunity when the time for making shipments came. The result was that a great many farmers throughout the Dominion devoted themselves to feeding the necessary stock hoping thereby to derive the revenue therefrom that was so badly needed. It was brought out before a parliamentary committee and reported to the House to-day —I do not know whether I am in order in discussing it or not—that a combine exists on the north Atlantic which affects adversely the shipping of Canadian products. The steamship companies, as early as last December, gave out the information that the ocean rate on cattle transported from Canada to the Old Country would be $15 per head. This rate was a considerable reduction from the former charge and was a further encouragement to the farmers to feed cattle for the British market. The fact that the ocean rate for cattle had been reduced to $15 per head was widely distributed and the propaganda carried on by the Dominion authorities, and the steamship companies, was responsible for a great revival of interest in the live stock trade. But what did the producers find when they had their cattle ready for the market? The same old story—big interests in the form of the North Atlantic Steamship combine boosted the rates; shippers of cattle were informed that no space was available for Canadian stock at the $15 rate, but that the rate would be $22.50, then $25, and even $30 has been mentioned as a possible rate. Is it any wonder that the farmers of this country have lost their morale in the face of such unjust discrimination? I think that this government can be fairly charged with negligence in not providing ample space.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What would my hon. friend suggest should be done?

Mr. LEADER: The government should have insisted on reasonable ocean rates being granted in the interest of the primary producers. Indeed we might use a stronger term in the face of the fact that our government-owned merchant marine is a party to the combine that exists, sits in conference in a city in a foreign country and sets the rates that Canadian steamships shall charge to transport Canadian goods. Now the advance of $10 per head in freight rates means a heavy loss for the people of this country. Who will suffer by reason of that extra $10 being squeezed out of the farmer? Every retail store in Canada, every manufacturer in Canada, every bank, every loan company, indeed every man, woman and child is affected by the contraction or restriction of the spending power of the farmer.

I speak for the farmers of western Canada upon whom transportation costs bear most heavily, and I declare that the time has come—indeed it is long overdue—when the government should insist on a fair measure of relief not only for the producers of the West but the producers of the whole of the Dominion. In concluding my remarks I wish to state this: We have a brand new government, with a very capable Minister of Agriculture, and we want a little service. We would expect the late government, who catered to the "big interests," to display inertia in matters of this kind. From the present government, however, we expected better treatment and we are still hoping for an improvement in that regard.

4 p.m.

Mr. WALLACE: In the matter of the restriction of the number of cattle tested, it is likely to operate to the disadvantage of the small breeder who will be unable to sell his pure-bred cattle owing to the fact that they are not tested. I myself would not buy pure-bred cattle unless they were tested. If the minister and the department could see their way clear to the removal of this restriction, which limits the number of cattle to be tested to ten, it would be a good thing because it certainly works out in a way that is detrimental to the breeder who has but a small herd.

Mr. CALDWELL: I find no great objection to reducing the amount of indemnity for pure-bred cattle that are slaughtered after being condemned under the tuberculin test. I would like, however, to urge upon the minister that he should not discontinue the policy of testing

herds for tuberculosis. It is one of the diseases that menaces not only our dairy herds but also the people as well—possibly being transmitted largely through dairy products and the meat of the beef animal. Although I am a breeder of pure-bred stock myself I see no great objection to reducing the indemnity. In fact, as far as I am personally concerned, I would be willing to forego the indemnity for condemned animals if the testing of herds is carried on—that is, if it is necessary to discontinue the indemnity in order to carry on the testing for tuberculosis, I would rather see that take place than discontinue the testing.

With regard to the limitation as to the number of animals, I would also like to urge upon the minister not to put this restriction on the man with less than ten pure-bred animals. For example, in the province from which I come we are just beginning in the pure-bred stock line of business. A great many men there have less than ten head of pure-bred cattle; we are simply beginning to change our methods of farming there, of going into mixed farming and keeping more cattle. A man who is buying pure-bred cattle to-day will not buy from a herd that is not tested. This handicaps a man who has less than ten cattle while his neighbour who, perhaps, is in a better position to carry on stock breeding, or has been at it longer, has the advantage of having his herd tested. I would urge very strongly on the minister to continue the policy of testing cattle for tuberculosis.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince P.E.I.): I would like to support what the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. has just said, the same thing applies to cattle in the province of Prince Edward Island. We have a number of small breeders there and this restriction, I think, would be very hard on them. The small breeder would be prevented from having his cattle properly tested and thereby, possibly, lose the sale of his stock. I am also thoroughly in favour of good grade cattle being given the benefit of testing the same as pure-bred stock. Has a veterinary inspector employed by the Department of Agriculture the privilege of charging the man who applies to have his cattle tested a fee in addition to the regular salary which is paid to him?

Mr. McBRIDE: Hon. members have spoken in connection with the restriction of the number of cattle entitled to be tested to ten, but no one has given any reason why the owners of four or five head—should not bring their cattle together and have them tested at the same time. Some years ago there was supposed to be scurvy among the cattle in the district in which I lived. The man who was to inspect gave us notice when he would arrive and when he came out we had at least 3,000 head of cattle gathered together for him to inspect. Why should the people not help the government in this respect, get the cattle together, notify the inspector and have them inspected at the same time? I see no reason why they should not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: A certain amount of co-operation between these people and the government officials is being undertaken. When we get three or four cattle together, we test them; even if there are only two we test them. I am disposed to accept smaller herds than ten. I think we can cut that figure in two, and perhaps economize in some other way, and help to make up for the additional expense, especially if a little preparation is made, as suggested by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride).

Just running over a few memoranda I have taken, I recall that I was reported as almost making the remark attributed to me by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. What I intended to say, at all events, was that the higher the indemnity, naturally the higher the appraisement would be. There was no question about that. The higher the maximum valuation was permitted in the statutes, the higher the appraisement would be by the veterinarians. That is so logical that it is not necessary to demonstrate it at all. There is another feature about it, and that is that with the natural good-nature and sympathetic attitude of any man who has a heart towards the man who owns the cattle, he will be sufficiently desirous of doing the last thing for the man, without putting up the possible valuation higher than we desire, and I have to thank my hon. friend for taking the moderate view he takes on this occasion. One of the reasons for the shortage of last year's estimate was due to the fact that it was based upon a smaller valuation than finally decided upon in this House. My estimate of the shortage was about $50,000. As a farmer myself, looking at it from the farmer's standpoint, some years ago I naturally would look for as high an appraisement in reason as I could get, but, having to administer the act and being confined to a certain fixed amount of money with which to take care of the work, I can see that if you go beyond a certain point you do not get the maximum results with the minimum amount of money. Furthermore, if you give too high an appraisement there is a temptation on the part of the man to be careless

about the re-contracting of the disease. Another reason why we were short—and I am sure my hon. friend will appreciate this—was because we conducted a certain amount of work of an experimental nature in Manitoba, in my hon. friend's own province, covering three municipalities. That has given satisfactory results and we have obtained valuable information, and a certain number of applicants throughout Manitoba have had to wait longer—

Mr. LEADER: Will the minister not admit that that is an expensive way of doing it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, but at the same time before we can discuss that question with other provinces or municipalities, we must have data. The only way to get the data was to try it out. We have found that there is a less amount of disease amongst Manitoba cattle than we anticipated. Slightly more than 5 per cent of those cattle were proved to be re-actors, and that is very satisfactory, considering the complaints in other countries. So that the extra work done in this direction in Manitoba naturally lessens what we are able to do in other directions. At the same time I may say that it is not our intention to go forward at this time with any additional restricted area, particularly when we have so many waiting applicants on the list for individual herds to be tested. We have got the information, and we can discuss this thing now both with provincial and municipal authorities, with the hope in the not distant future of evolving a scheme that will cover the country—I would not say the entire country, but with the view of taking it up in large blocks, not in intermittent spaces, such as we are doing at the present time.

I do not know whether my hon. friend was in order; but if so I presume I would also be in order; however I do not intend to go very much into the question of cattle space. Obviously, a new business requires a certain re-adjustment of space. The business of shipping stockers to the Old Country, after being suspended for thirty years, has been restored. Nobody could expect the ordinary trade would be able to meet the sudden demand all in a minute. It is rather gratifying to me to find the cattle are there demanding the space, and neither now nor at any time previous have we ever been more than 200 head short of the space requirements. I know there have been a number of interviews in the papers about wanting space for 1,000 head, but at no time has there been a space shortage of more than 200 head. I think that is getting pretty close.

As to negligence, I think the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) should deal with the question of the mercantile marine. But while I am on my feet I might point out that the evidence in the report referred to by my hon. friend this afternoon went to show that the boats comprising the mercantile marine cannot be converted into cattle boats, and that is the only available medium that I know of by which we can increase the space in time to take care of the situation. The cost of changing these vessels from cargo boats into cattle boats would be prohibitive, and in the end we would not have a boat which was suitable for the trade. In the middle of the negotiations and the discussion as to space—just to let my hon. friend and the House know that we were not negligent—if the situation had grown worse, and if we had had demand for space for 1,000 head more than could be supplied, we had the opportunity of negotiating a transaction with a New York firm of vessel owners, who were prepared to put on a fleet of vessels capable of carrying 2,000 head each. That proposition was submitted to us. However, it would have taken some weeks for even that fleet to have got ready, and by that time the ordinary sailings would be able to take care of the shipments.

Mr. MILLAR: Did the minister notice in the press a few days ago a report to the effect that the British people were under the impression that the Canadian government had not adhered strictly to the agreement in shipping cattle? They were objecting that the Canadians were shipping cattle that were finished. They claimed that the agreement called upon the Canadian government to ship store cattle, and they were objecting that the cattle were finished.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think there was room for a little objection on the part of the British authorities there. The shippers of fat cattle were taking advantage of the removal of the embargo and were also shipping stockers, thus giving them two strings to their bow. They could sell them either as stockers, or as cattle ready for the block. The law did not forbid that, and that is the reason the shippers took advantage of the opportunity. It is quite possible there might be some amendment made to the act to remedy that; I do not know about that. But I do not think the public is objecting very much. I do not think there is any violation of the spirit of the act, nor do I think there is any violation of the letter of the act. But that was not what the British dealer had

in mind. It was not the fat cattle, but it was the feeders because there is more profit on the feeders to the farmer than on the fat cattle. I think I have shown that this matter has not been neglected at all. We have been in complete touch with the situation from the beginning to the present moment.

When you consider that this is a new business and that after many years we have come within two hundred spaces of meeting the situation there is not much ground for complaint. As regards the suggestion of someone in authority advising the farmers to feed all the cattle they could and then neglecting to provide space for them, there is no ground for that complaint either. I have not the article by me, but I remember that when the embargo removal was announced I wrote on the subject specifically pointing out that farmers and stockmen must not expect too much from this new avenue of disposition, especially for low grade cattle. I stated that low grade cattle could not carry themselves so far and that if farmers wanted to avail themselves of the new trade they must improve their animals, because only high class well-bred cattle were in demand in the new market. One of the agricultural journals of Ontario reprimanded me, rather gently, I admit, for not speaking more pointedly about the new market instead of warning them that only high class animals were of any use or could carry themselves that distance.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) seemed to be rather apprehensive that we would discontinue the work of testing. Let me assure him that there is no thought of that; we are going to carry on that work as we have done in the past. The second test has been taken care of all spring and it is a very necessary work, because if you neglect it you simply retrograde to where you were before. I may point out that this market has taken up a considerable number of our veterinarians. As I pointed out when the Main Estimates were under consideration, the amount of money we should require would depend in a measure on how many of the veterinarians were requisitioned when the new work of shipping cattle overseas got under way. Inasmuch as one veterinarian must go over with every shipment of one hundred or more, it will require from forty to fifty of these men to attend to the trade, and therefore I may possibly be under the necessity of asking the Minister of Finance to give me more money for this additional expenditure before the end of the term. An hon. member from Prince Edward Island—I forget his constituency—asked what charges were made by the veterinary for testing cattle. If the veterinary is a member of the staff and is sent out in the usual way there is no charge. If however he is not a member of the staff then of course the charge depends on the man himself; we have no control over that. Let me again assure my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie that I appreciate very much his attitude to this bill. I think we shall get better results for less money by giving this amount of valuation than if we were to allow a higher one.

Mr. CALDWELL: I understood the minister to say that he was not discontinuing the testing of cattle for tuberculosis. Is that right?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: I thought that the minister had told us that he was accepting applications but was not undertaking new work.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will go ahead; we are preparing to start now.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister told us that the reason he had discontinued was the fact that he was $50,000 short last year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, that is so.

Mr. CALDWELL: I notice, however, that he has brought down this year an appropriation for $285,000 less than he asked for last year. I see in the supplementaries a sum of $100,000 to carry on with, but still that would leave the minister $185,000 under last year's appropriation.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is another supplementary in prospect.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am only anxious to have an assurance that the minister is not going to discontinue the testing of cattle. If I thought he intended to do that I would oppose strongly the lowering of the indemnity. However, if he purposes to carry on this work, I would want to see it done without too great an expenditure. If he is not going to take on new work, though, I do not see the reason for interfering with the present arrangement, because if you do not test new cattle you are not going to condemn any.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend is suggesting trouble that is never going to arise. No one is proposing to discontinue the testing of cattle at all. The statute provides for certain indemnities, and when the vote in the estimates is exhausted there must be a cessation of work. That is what has happened and I have tried to give the reasons for it. Our intention is to start again, and in fact the work

is being organized now. The work of second testing, what we might call the "follow-up" work, has been going on all the time. In Manitoba the work has been occupying the staff to the full all through the winter, and particularly since the traffic has developed as a result of the removal of the embargo. I have nothing more to say, except to remark by the way that I think I have rather proved my inability to make explanations. From the very outset I indicated that we were desirous of continuing the work and that the situation this year was identical with that of last year. Of course, there has always been a certain amount of hang-over accounts from one year which have to run into the next, and the popularity of this work and the desire for cleaning up herds has increased more rapidly than we have money provided to take care of it.

Mr. LEADER: I desire to follow up the discussion in regard to the trade we hope to develop with England.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out that the bill before the committee is to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. The minister has been asked a question, to which he has replied, with reference to the raising of the embargo. Further debate in that direction would be out of order.

Mr. LEADER: I am prepared to abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but in view of the fact that the health of Canadian cattle is a very important factor in developing trade with Great Britain I thought it might be within the rules to discuss that question a little further.

The CHAIRMAN: The scope of discussion of questions in committee is laid down in the rules, from which I shall quote for the information of the hon. member. Rule 13, subsection 5, states:

> Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Various authorities emphasize the importance of adhering to this rule as closely as possible.

Mr. LEADER: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the minister what attitude the department takes in regard to cattle from accredited herds which are shown at exhibitions? What provisions are made to segregate accredited cattle from untested animals? Does the department insist on the exhibition boards providing isolated buildings for accredited cattle? I might state that a great deal of infection takes place as a result of exhibitions. I have an extract which I shall not read but which bears upon this point. It is a statement by Dr. Mohler, of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry. He states that the island of Jersey in the Channel islands realized the importance of this matter about three years ago when they discovered the appearance of the disease there. I had always understood that there was no disease on that island but it appears that tuberculosis developed and they traced the disease to show cattle taken to England and passed around the circuit. The authorities since that time have prohibited outside cattle going to English shows. Is the minister making any provision to have accredited cattle isolated from those not tested?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The exhibition managers of the boards are becoming more and more anxious to protect their respective members from contagion of this nature as time goes on. Until recently there has not been as much precaution taken in this direction as might have been; the matter has been left largely to the fair managers and the breeders' associations. The same remarks apply to the various pure-bred cattle sales, as well as bull trains and better farming trains. I am of the opinion that now that we have this new trade developed, which can be very easily destroyed by contagion, greater precautions will have to be taken than have been observed in the past. As a matter of fact the question is now under consideration of enforcing such precautions in connection with bull trains and better farming trains and indeed of any of the live stock trains. Hitherto the department, so far as I know, has not interfered except in an advisory capacity with such institutions as my hon. friend has referred to. I have found in my own experience, however, that fair managers and the executive of the various breeders' associations have been reasonably careful in the past in this respect, but not as careful as I think we shall have to be in the future if we are to retain intact our trade that has just recently been opened up with the United Kingdom.

Mr. MILLAR: Do the figures gathered by the department in relation to tuberculosis indicate to any great extent the conditions under which the disease develops? That is, is there much difference between the health of range cattle and that of stable cattle?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Until recently I thought there was a very marked difference and that range cattle were almost exempt from tuberculosis. There used to be that difference ten or fifteen years ago, possibly because we were not so familiar with the trouble and the

necessary precautions were not taken to identify it in the packing plants. But more recently we have found tuberculosis even in our buffalo herds, which are never in the stable at all. Consequently the fact of the animals being always out in the sunshine does not seem to ensure absolute immunity from the disease. It has generally been accepted in the past that T.B. in cattle is a stable disease just as in the human family it is a house disease; but we will have to modify our views in that respect because the disease does attack them to the same extent as it does animals more or less confined to stables. The fact that tuberculosis is more general among dairy cattle, which are kept in the stable more than any other cattle, shows that the spread of T.B. is attributable to stable conditions.

Mr. LOVIE: In the event of a breeder having less than ten pure-bred animals and having enough grade cattle to bring his herd up to the requisite number, would he be entitled to the benefit of government inspection of his herd?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am not sure upon that point. I think he would be, because there would be no use of testing the pure-breds unless the grades were submitted to the same test. Speaking from memory, I think the grades would count as part of the ten.

Mr. LEADER: I know there is great danger of contamination at fairs if the proper precautions are not taken—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no question about it.

Mr. LEADER: —and I realize that unless all the breeders co-operate with the department in carrying out the provisions of this act we will not get the best results from it. A great many of the fair boards in the United States now are adopting the plan of not allowing any cattle to be exhibited unless they can show a clean bill of health in regard to tuberculosis. I think a similar stipulation is very desirable for this country, and I would suggest where exhibition boards are given grants from the federal treasury that they be notified that within one or two years the grants will be withheld unless they stipulate that all cattle shown at their fairs be subjected to the tuberculosis test.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is worth considering.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 112 to amend the Irrigation Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Water areas may be leased for mining purposes:

Mr. STEVENS: I think we ought to have a pretty complete explanation of the necessity of this amendment. While it looks comparatively harmless, it may have a very far-reaching effect.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No difficulty has arisen to date—I am anticipating perhaps that a question will be asked as to the reason for the retroactive clause at the end of the section—but it has been pointed out by the Justice department that difficulty may arise under the Dominion Lands Act. particularly in relation to mining leases. Under section 7 of the Irrigation Act there is possibility of conflict because that section provides:

> Except in pursuance of some agreement or undertaking existing on the thirteenth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, no grant shall be made by the Crown of lands or of any estate therein, in such terms as to vest in the grantee any exclusive or other property or interest in or any exclusive right or privilege with respect to any lake, river, stream or other body of water, or in or with respect to the water contained or flowing therein, or the land forming the bed or shore thereof.

We are advised to do this by the Justice department.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not suppose this has anything to do with the famous Hoppe lease controversy?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. STEVENS: Certain orders have been passed that some people have called in question in connection with that famous controversy, and I was wondering whether this might happen to be of the same stamp.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. Unfortunately nowadays apparently the Hoppe lease figures in any amendments that touch mining regulations.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, it looms up.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One can scarcely conceive of an area of 1920 acres. which is the area granted for a mining lease, in which there would not be a body of water. and difficulties might arise as to the rights of

the lessee to go under that area. This amendment is simply to overcome such difficulties.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is it intended that this amendment shall give the lessee the right to go under the body of water in mining?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, without reference to the Irrigation Act

Mr. STEVENS: Does it affect any other waters besides those under the Irrigation Act? For instance, mining properties frequently go under waters along the shore. Has the proposed legislation any effect in such cases?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Under the Irrigation Act the reference is as follows:

> Any river, stream, watercourse, lake, creek, spring ravine, canyon, lagoon, swamp, marsh or other body of water, or in or with respect to the water contained or flowing therein, or any exclusive or perpetual property, interest or privilege in the land forming the bed or shore thereof.

The amendment has particular reference to section 7 of the old Irrigation Act.

Section agreed to and bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. STEVENS: I would ask that the bill stand for third reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the House.

COPYRIGHT ACT, 1921, AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 24, to amend The Copyright Act, 1921.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Licenses; importation:

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister make some explanation of these clauses that are repealed?

Mr. ROBB: The clauses referred to, 13, 14, 15 and 27 of the Copyright Act of 1921, relate to the importation of copyrighted matter printed in countries other than Canada, particularly in the United States. Although this act was passed in 1921, it was never proclaimed. Certain restrictions were provided by that measure respecting the admission of copyright into Canada, Canadian printers and publishers being given the right, on application to the commissioner and the payment of a license fee, to print the matter so imported, either in serial form or in book form. This, apparently, was contrary to the provisions of the Berne convention. It is contended on the one hand by the authors that the work of the author is the product of his brain and his ingenuity, that it should be his property and that he should have the right to say who should print it, where it should be printed and what sort of book form it should assume. On the other hand the printers of Canada contend that if the work of an author is not printed in Canada they should have the right, upon the work being sold in Canada and upon the payment by them of an adequate royalty, to publish that work either in serial or in book form, without any regard to the method of binding or the style of printing adopted in the book itself. Now, it is the desire of Canada to come in under the Berne convention, but we cannot do that with these clauses in the act; so it is proposed to repeal them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister says we cannot become parties to the Berne convention so long as these clauses remain in our Copyright Act. Will he be so good as to give us his authority for that statement?

Mr. ROBB: We are admitted to the Berne convention through the British authorities, and they have intimated that the act as it now stands will not be acceptable.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My information is that there has been no such intimation on the part of the British authorities, but that a certain individual in the city of Ottawa has undertaken to say that probably there would be objection. This individual has also communicated with certain unofficial papers in Switzerland suggesting that there would be objection. But my information is that no objection has been taken as is suggested. Will the minister inform the committee by whom the objection has been made?

Mr. ROBB: This is the memorandum prepared for me by the commissioners who have the matter in charge, and it seems to me we should accept the statement of our own Canadian officials:

> The authorities of the International Bureau at Berne have definitely stated that the licensing sections referred to are not in harmony with article 4 of the convention, which provides that authors who are subjects or citizens of any of the countries of the union shall enjoy in countries other than the country of origin of the work the rights which the respective laws grant to natives as well as the rights specially granted by the convention. The enjoyment and the exercise of these rights shall not be subject to the performance of any formality.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The memorandum which the minister has just read states that the authorities of the Berne convention have intimated so and so. My instructions are that no intimation has ever been given by the authorities of the Berne convention that this act is not in every way acceptable to them. What official, what functionary of the Berne convention sent this communication and what was the communication?

Mr. ROBB: The intimation was made in the official publication of the Berne convention.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have some information on that, too. The official publication referred to, published an article contributed by a Canadian civil servant, resident here in Ottawa, and that article in what I would call the unofficial organ of the Berne convention is the ground upon which it is now asserted that the act passed by this House in 1921 is not acceptable to the Berne convention. I think the minister should hesitate before accepting an article prepared by a civil servant here in Ottawa as an official communication from the Berne convention that our act is not acceptable.

Mr. ROBB: What evidence has my hon. friend to submit that the information was furnished, as he suggests, by a civil servant in Ottawa?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am merely stating information that has been supplied to me in connection with this matter. I do not know any more complicated piece of legislation which comes before the House than this same copyright question. As far back as I have been a member of the House and long before I came into the House it has proved a very, very troublesome question. Our first attempt to pass a copyright law was in 1888 or 1889, and at that time difficulties at once arose with the Imperial government. The Imperial Copyright Act had been passed many years before and had application throughout the whole British Empire, and the moment Canada in 1888 or 1889 sought to pass an act of its own it was looked upon by the authorities in Great Britain as an infringement upon Imperial rights, and rather strained relations existed between the Imperial government and this country in regard to copyright legislation at that time. Sir John Thompson was then Minister of Justice of Canada, and he entered into a long correspondence with the Imperial authorities on the subject of copyright. They at first were inclined to deny the right of the parliament of Canada to pass any copyright bill at all, having any application, at all events, outside the Dominion of Canada, and it was not until the year 1910, I think, when the late Hon. Sydney Fisher was Minister of Agriculture in Canada that an agreement was come to between the Imperial authorities and Canada and the other self-governing dominions upon the subject of copyright.

In the meantime we had a Copyright Act. The act passed in 1889 had been carried into the Revised Statutes of 1906, as it stands there to-day. The disagreement continued between the Imperial and Canadian authorities, but when the late Mr. Fisher attended the Imperial Conference, in the year 1910 an arrangement was come to whereby the Imperial government agreed that not only Canada but all the self-governing dominions should be entitled to pass copyright legislation of their own, and the Imperial Act passed in the year 1911, the year following the conference, recognized the rights of all the Dominions to pass copyright legislation of their own. In the Imperial Act it was expressly provided that the Imperial law should not apply to Canada or to the other dominions unless the parliaments of those dominions should specially enact the various clauses of the Imperial Act. If we should re-enact the British clauses and bring our law into conformity with Imperial legislation, then the Imperial government undertook to proclaim our legislation in the London Gazette, and that was held to be sufficient to entitle us to become members of the International Copyright Convention known as the Berne Convention.

Well, the act of the parliament of Canada was passed, and there were some clauses in the act which it was said at the time were not strictly in accordance with the Imperial act and might in some way cause objection to be raised to our becoming parties to the Berne convention. The matter came up in this House on two or three occasions in the last eight or ten years, but notably in the year 1921. At that time Canadian authors claimed, as they claim now, and I have very great sympathy with their claims, that they should have absolute ownership in the literary, dramatic or musical works which they produced or composed. I think there is a great deal of force in that contention. These works are the product of their own brains and the ownership should be in them, but when you come to a question of disposing of those rights, this question arises: The United States is our greatest competitor not only in the matter of publications but in many others which could be mentioned. The United States is not a party to the Berne

convention. The United States in its copyright law provides that a work must be published in the United States in order to obtain copyright in the United States. The United States printers are entitled to do the work there and earn the wages. The United States book publishers and magazine publishers are entitled to publish their work there, and unless there is publication in the United States copyright cannot be obtained. There are one hundred and twenty million English speaking people in the United States, the greatest book-buying nation probably in the world. Now the Canadian author is in this position: He finds that his best purchaser in the majority of instances is in the United States and the United States publisher says, "I will buy the United States copyright from you, but you must include with it the Canadian copyright too. If you do, I will become a purchaser." So the bargain is struck and then the work is wholly published in the United States.

In the act of 1921 passed by this parliament we inserted clauses to this effect: If a Canadian publisher desires to publish any copyright work in Canada he may apply to the author for permission to do so, but he cannot publish it unless he offers to pay the author the very highest price by way of royalty that the author has received for the American copyright or the right to publish in the United States. We passed another clause which provided that if the author refused to make an agreement on these terms, the publisher then might apply to the Copyright branch of the Department of Agriculture and the minister was given power to grant a license to a publisher in Canada to publish the work in Canada on payment to the author of an amount exactly similar to the amount which he was paid by his American publisher.

On the face of it that seemed to be a pretty fair arrangement, an arrangement which would protect the author from any financial loss, and would at the same time give the Canadian publisher the right to publish, and the Canadian printer, of course, employment consequent upon the publication. These clauses were inserted in the act of 1921, which was not passed by this House until there had been a very long and involved conference between all the parties interested in this question. There was a committee formed and a conference held at which the publishers, the printers and the authors were represented, and my information is—I do not vouch for the accuracy of this—that they came to an agreement at that conference, and that agreement was embodied in the act of 1921 which this parliament passed. So that the clauses which the minister now seeks to strike out from the act of 1921 were all actually agreed upon by the conference of authors, publishers and printers prior to the passage of the act in that session.

There was a suspending clause in the act of 1921 to the effect that the act should not come into force until it was proclaimed by the Governor in Council. Now the act has never been brought into force. There has been no proclamation of that act up to the present time, but in the meantime it is claimed that someone in Ottawa has busied himself to cause friction as between the Canadian authorities and the authorities at Berne, Switzerland, who control the question of international copyright, and a journal of some kind published in Switzerland, called Le Droit D'Auteur, and supposed to have some connection with the International Copyright Bureau at Berne, contains in its issue of July 15, 1921, an article to the effect that the clauses of the Canadian act of 1921 which provide for publication in Canada and the licensing clauses which I have described to the committee are not in accord with the general international convention's principles as they apply to all the nations which belong to that convention. This is an editorial article in a newspaper. It is not signed by anybody. We do not know who wrote it.

Mr. ROBB: Is it dated from Ottawa?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is dated July 15, 1921.

Mr. ROBB: Is it dated from Ottawa?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not a letter, it appeared in a paper published in Switzerland, but responsible people in Ottawa have given me the name, address and other particulars of the man who is said to have written the article. I do not want the name published, but I will submit it to the minister. I understand the gentleman is still in the Civil Service. He has undertaken to point out that the act passed by this parliament in 1921 is at variance with the principles of the Berne convention. The point I make is that the International Copyright Bureau at Berne has not objected. I have asked the minister, and I ask him now, to lay before the committee any objection that has been taken by the proper authorities at Berne, Switzerland, with reference to this legislation. The British authorities have not objected, so I am informed. If they have I ask the minister to give the committee that information. What is the objection? My information is that this same individual

in Ottawa has started a theory that in all probability the British government will object because there are no license clauses in the British act. Now, I think it is within the knowledge of any man who has looked into the copyright question that there are hardly two nations in the world who belong to the Berne convention who have exactly similar copyright legislation. The English act differs from the Spanish act, and from the Holland act, and from the Canadian act: there are innumerable differences in all these acts. However, the nations mentioned are all members of the convention so that a citizen of a country which belongs to the Berne convention obtaining a copyright in one country automatically obtains copyright in all countries that are parties to the convention. Unfortunately the United States does not belong to the Berne convention. Unfortunately for Canadian authors the United States is probably the best market which they have. That is the difficulty. I do not think that we can get to the bottom of this question in a committee of this House sitting as we are here. I would suggest to the minister that a special committee be appointed to consider this bill and let the persons interested—authors, printers, and publishers—state their views before that committee. I have had communications as no doubt the minister has had, and probably every member of the committee, from printers, authors, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and from publishers. There is a great difference of opinion on the question but how are we going to come to a satisfactory agreement. These several parties did agree in 1921 and we carried that agreement into legislation. Now somebody has started the trouble over again and has intimated that the Berne convention will not accept this legislation. I doubt very much if the Berne convention has passed on it at all. If the minister has any formal objection from the officers of the International Copyright Bureau, or if he has any protests from the proper officials of the Imperial government, I would like very much if he would lay such before the committee, because the inference I draw from the information which has reached me is that no formal objection has been taken. If objection has been taken by the Imperial authorities I can only say they have objected before to our copyright legislation. However, their objections were found to have no foundation and subsequently were entirely waived by the Imperial government. It is quite possible that to-day there are publishers in Great Britain who do not like our present legislation. They did not like our copyright law in 1888 and 1889; they did not like it in 1910 when Mr. Fisher went over to London and carried his point before the British government. It is quite possible they may take objection now, but we want to examine into the validity, weight and force of the objections. We must not recede from our position simply because of the fact that the Imperial government object; it is quite possible that we have the constitutional right to pass our legislation notwithstanding the British government's objection. That was a point which was raised in 1889. I have before me Canadian Constitutional Studies in which this very question is dealt with. The point is this: The British parliament certainly has the legal right to pass such legislation as it may deem proper. It has the legal right to change our whole constitution if it wants to but constitutionally it cannot do so. Mr. Keith in referring to this very question as described in the work referred to says:

5 p.m.

> His (Sir John Thompson's) constitutional claim could not possibly have been resisted for a moment, if seriously examined. To insist that Canada should conform her copyright legislation to that of the United Kingdom, merely to please the publishers in the latter, was constitutionally a monstrous doctrine, nor can it be wondered that the minister described the state of the law as odious and unjust.

The Imperial parliament has the legal right to do as it pleases; constitutionally it has no right to do so. Therefore, I think if exception has been taken by the Imperial authorities to the act of 1921 the law officers of this government should look very carefully into the question to see if the act which we passed is not constitutionally within our rights. If it is then I think we should uphold it. In the meantime my suggestion to the minister in this matter would be, seeing the bill is going to raise a good deal of controversy upon very difficult points, to refer the measure to a small select committee, representative of the different parties in the House, and ask the authors, the publishers and the printers to state their respective claims before the committee. They did so before and they agreed. If they agree on the present occasion let us go ahead and let us test our constitutional rights in the matter.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend and I are agreed on the first principle that the author has rights in his work. My hon. friend has admitted that. The author, primarily, is the person who should determine what will be done with his or her property. Now, having started there I cannot very well see why my

hon. friend should argue against the repealing of these clauses, because he himself admits that these clauses take away certain rights which, as he says, belong to the author. My hon. friend has correctly outlined the position which Canada acquired in 1910 in securing the right to make her own copyright. But may I point out to my hon. friend that having obtained those rights we are morally bound to enact such legislation as will enable Canada to comply with the requirements of the Berne convention, because the memorandum I have shows that there a special protocol was required so as to bring about conditions that would enable Canada to join the Berne convention. The Hon. Sydney Fisher agreed that Canada would, on those conditions, join the Berne convention. The commisisoner assures me that there is in the office a despatch from the Imperial authorities intimating that the act as passed in 1921 does not comply with the requirements of the Berne convention, and we are to-day presenting this amendment in order that we may do so. It has probably escaped my hon. friend's memory, but he must have known that that message had come from the Imperial authorities because this act, which we now propose to amend slightly by withdrawing these few clauses, was assented to in June 1921 when my hon. friend was a member of the government, and he continued to be a member of that same government until December of that year. They did not proclaim the act. Although it was assented to by parliament, it never was proclaimed. I think it is fair to assume the government of the day did not proclaim the act because they were advised that it did not conform to the articles of the Berne convention. The only desire we have is to place Canada in the position where our citizens will enjoy rights in all the other countries and to give to the authors the right which my hon. friend says they are entitled to.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When I say that I think the author has very high rights in the matter, I do not say he has absolutely exclusive rights, and when he asks the privilege of copyright, then we can impose such terms on him as we see fit, but I do not think the terms should be burdensome. I do not think they should be onerous at all. I agree that the author has the first right, but when he seeks parliamentary or government favours in the form of authority to publish his works or to sell exclusive rights, then I think we can impose necessary restrictions upon him. It is true the act was passed in June 1921, and at that time the operation was suspended for this reason: new clauses had been introduced and we were aware of the general law passed in Great Britain in 1911 which provided that if our act were in conformity with the Imperial act the Imperial government would proclaim it in the London Gazette. The London Gazette goes from London to Berne, Switzerland, and is accepted there by the copyright convention. It was natural that we should submit our act to the Imperial authorities before bringing it into force, but I would like to find out definitely what objection the Imperial government has taken to it. The only sections in our act which do not conform to the act of the Imperial government are these license sections. We provide that the author during his lifetime can be compelled to allow publication in Canada on payment to him of the equivalent of what he gets from the American publisher. That is not in the British act, but the British act has another section not approved by the Berne convention. The Imperial act has a provision that if the author dies they can compel his executors to allow publication on payment of royalties, the same as the author received in his lifetime. They have varied the Berne convention, not only in that respect, but in several other respects. The Berne convention deals with copyright where there is simultaneous publication in two countries, and I think every country in the convention, save Great Britain, holds that to be publication on the same day. The British act varies that provision and provides that publication within 12 days shall be considered simultaneous publication in the two countries, and the copyright bureau at Berne has not objected. It is assuming a good deal to suppose that there would be objection to this provision in the Canadian act of 1921. If there is valid objection, I can understand that it is to the interest of Canada to let the clauses go and adhere to the Berne convention. If the objection is merely at the instance of some British publisher, and does not go to the root of the matter, it is not so serious. If it is a vital objection, then it might be proper for us to repeal these clauses and stick to the Berne convention. But I am by no means convinced that these three clauses in question are in conflict at all with the Berne convention. I do not believe they are. I think there is great force in what the publishers and printers say, that this is not a variation of the terms of the Berne convention, and that the Berne convention will accept it; but my suggestion still is that we cannot settle this question in a committee of this kind. Only those who

have gone to the bottom of the matter and have made a real study of it can possibly understand it, and, without any disrespect to the committee, I think that for the most part we are seeking to legislate in the dark. I believe the minister would facilitate the passage of his bill very much and get to the root of the matter if he would ask for the appointment of a small committee, have the various interests brought together and see if we could not get to the bottom of the grievance, as we did in 1921. I think it would shorten the matter and would produce a much more satisfactory result than for us as a committee to pass this clause repealing four important sections of another act, without understanding just what the real situation is.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend admits the value to Canada of the Berne convention, and of our joining in that convention. I take it that the only objection he has to the bill is this provision contained in section 2. I would suggest that we pass all the other sections of the bill, and in the meantime, before committing the government, I would like to consult counsel as to the observations of my hon. friend regarding the appointment of a committee. I would point out however, that we are approaching the time now when we cannot delay legislation. If we pass the minor clause we might let this clause stand for further consideration.

Mr. BOYS: Is it a fact that the publishers and their employees are opposed to the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend had asked me if the authors were favourable to it, I would have said yes. I will say that some publishers have offered objections to it, and representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association have objected to it, but the authors are very strongly in favour of it, and the government has on record representations from men very prominent in boards of trade who are favourable to it and who are congratulating the government on their courage in dealing with it.

Mr. BOYS: I understand the publishers are opposed to it. I at once admit that I am not sufficiently familiar with the subject matter to reach a conclusion at this stage as to who is in the right, but that there may be no misunderstanding regarding the position of the publishers I will place on Hansard a letter addressed to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) which reads as follows:

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN, P.C.,
Leader of the Opposition,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Honourable Sir,—At a regular meeting of the Ottawa Typographical Union held on Saturday evening last, the proposed amendments to the Canadian Copyright Act, introduced in the House of Commons by the Hon. J. A. Robb, Minister of Trade and Commerce, were very carefully considered. We are unanimously of the opinion that the proposed amendments are not in the best interests of the Canadian printers. We most strenuously protest against their enactment and would request you to use your influence to have Bill No. 24 withdrawn.

We also respectfully request that the Canadian Copyright Act of 1921, as it now stands, be immediately carried into full force and effect.

Trusting that you will give this matter your earnest and most sympathetic consideration, and thanking you in anticipation, I am,

Yours very sincerely,
J. A. P. HAYDON,
Secretary.

I am not rising to offer any objection to what the authors think they are entitled to, but it looks as if there was a difference of opinion between these two important classes, and I would like to support the suggestion of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that a small select committee be at once appointed. I do not think it would take more than four or five days and this matter could be fully investigated. I have been requested to ask a number of questions for the purpose of securing certain information from the minister and I would very much sooner ask these questions before such a committee, but if that cannot be done, I suppose the only course would be to ask them here for the purpose of eliciting the information which is sought.

Mr. ROBB: We will allow this item to stand, and I will not give an answer at the moment as to whether we shall appoint a committee or not, but we will take into consideration the observations of members who have opposed this section. In the meantime may I suggest that, as the only objection apparently is to clause 2, we should pass the other clauses and get them out of the way?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Clause 2 is the whole act.

Mr. ROBB: Referring to the letter which my hon. friend has placed on Hansard, I desire to make this observation. It contains two statements, one that the Typographical Union of Ottawa are opposed to this measure, and the other that they are offering indirectly a rebuke to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in that he was Prime Minister from June to December when he had an opportunity of proclaiming this measure.

Mr. BOYS: The leader of the Opposition is well able to answer any rebukes that may be directed to him. I wish he were here to attend to that phase of the matter himself; he could do it better than I can. However, the minister says that he is prepared to let section 2 stand. That section repeals certain sections of the act, and that after all is the vital point.

Mr. FORKE: I am glad that the minister has come to the conclusion to let the section stand, because a good many members do not know what it means, and I should hate to be called upon to vote upon it at the present time.

Section stands.

On section 5—Commencement of act.

Mr. ROBB: This section amends the act by striking out the words "a day to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council" and substituting the words "the first day of July 1923." I think we had better let that section stand.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

INDIAN AFFAIRS

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

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and N.W.T., $714,223.

Mr. EVANS: The minister might explain the increase of $36,000 odd in this item.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): There is an increase of $36,491 in this item.

Of this increase $18,962.00 is accounted for owing to additional supplies having to be provided for, in order to meet obligations resulting from the negotiations of a treaty with Indians of the Great Slave lake and Mackenzie River districts numbering 3,000 souls. The supplies furnished comprise flour, bacon, tea, blankets, ammunition, twine and tools for which tenders will be invited of the trading companies in those districts and contracts awarded in the regular way. There is also an increase of $16,359.00 in the estimate for hospitals, medical attendance, etc. This increase is due chiefly to the urgent necessity of establishing and maintaining a hosptial on the Sarcee reserve in order to alleviate the condition of these Indians. They are in poor condition physically and unless some very thorough procedure is adopted, it is reported that the band will disappear within a measurable time. To remedy this, vigorous prolonged and radical measures are an absolute necessity. The Church of England has consented to close the Sarcee boarding school, and the department is using the building as a hospital under the supervision of a doctor, who also acts as Indian agent, and a staff of trained nurses. There is also an increase of $1,170 in the estimate for triennial clothing which is unavoidable, as a greater number of chiefs and headmen of treaties Nos. 1, 2 and 5 are entitled to suits next year than those of treaties Nos. 4, 7 and 10 who received suits this year.

I promised a short statement yesterday in dealing with this matter with respect to my personal observations of last year on visiting the Indians of western Canada. I stated that I had no personal knowledge of the conditions in the East, and I may remark with regard to the West that I did not by any means cover anything like all the reserves. I simply got an idea of what might be accomplished amongst the Indians of western Canada, particularly if we were able to carry on different educational methods. I am not criticizing the education of the past; far be it from me to do that. The first desire of the various church organizations who were carrying on work among the Indians was naturally to Christianize them; and that is a laudable purpose. Their next object was to give the Indians an education, which in my opinion is not of a character that would change them from their aboriginal habits to the habits of the white man with whom they must enter into competition if they are to make their livelihood in other ways than they formerly followed, namely, of hunting, fishing, and so forth.

I am asking for a considerable increase for educational purposes believing, after discussing the matter with the Oblate Fathers and those interested in Indian education, that we should give to their education a more technical character and, so far as agriculture is concerned, devote more attention to that aspect of our educational activities than has been the case in the past. Let me give an instance of the splendid results that can be obtained where effort has been put forth to educate the Indian, particularly for agricultural pursuits. I refer now to what I observed in Saskatchewan on the File Hills reserve. For a period of upwards of twenty years there have been carried on there educational methods that are now showing admirable results. This work was done under the supervision of the department here, and more particularly I presume under Mr. Graham, who has been in charge of

the Saskatchewan activities for a number of years. There the boys and girls were taken from the schools after having been educated and were placed upon the farms. One of the things I objected to was the fact that there was no provision in the estimates for advancing sums of money to support these young people. I think in most cases, although I will not say in all, success was due to the fact that these people started up as young married couples upon their own particular holdings; in one or two instances I discovered young men who were batching and doing remarkably well. Indeed, from my observation, these young people I found were making as great a success of farming as were their white brothers in the surrounding territory; and one could not expect more than that. But unfortunately this is not the case throughout the other provinces. The work has not been carried on in the same concentrated way. However, what I have described is evidence of what can be done with the aborigine in educating and training him so that you change his mode of life.

It cannot be denied that in northern Ontario, northern Manitoba, and indeed in the northern portions of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the white man is becoming a very strong competitor of the Indian in trapping and in hunting. We are receiving constant complaints from the Indians that they are being driven off their hunting grounds. It is generally conceded that the white man is a much more zealous hunter, covers a greater extent of territory, and takes more fur than the Indian, and is denuding the hunting grounds of the red man to such an extent that it is becoming a serious problem. Indeed, this is true even in the far north where the Eskimos find themselves in a similar plight. Therefore, unless we take definite action to change the mode of life of the plains Indian, and in some degree of the bush Indian, we are within a measurable distance of the time when we will be bound to vote large sums of money for the subsistence of the aboriginal tribes. It is with that thought in mind that I am prompted to ask for increased grants for educational purposes among the Indians.

I am not criticizing my predecessors in office; I need only refer to the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) last year during the discussion of the Indian estimates, when he said that the preceding government had even gone to the point of being penurious in carrying on educational work among the Indians. I think it is only good business that we should attack this problem from the educational standpoint and try, if possible, to give the younger generation among the Indians such a reasonable amount of education as will enable them to take their place along with their white brothers and sisters, and in some cases, going a little further, give them the necessary technical training to enable them to engage in pursuits other than agriculture. That is all I have in mind.

I have a great admiration for the services performed by the various church organizations among the Indians, especially in the way of education. When I visited the Indian school at Kamloops I found the Father and Sisters in charge working under the most discouraging conditions. Although the building was heated with stoves it was freezing cold, the windows being in a shaky condition and almost falling out, and the school being of wooden construction the fire hazard was very great indeed. Yet he and the Sisters were doing their best to educate the Indian children within a hundred-mile radius of the institution. We are asking you this year to vote a sum of money to build a new institution at Kamloops to serve that whole territory. Similar remarks might be applied to many of these schools. The churches have spent a good deal of money in the construction of school buildings, and many of them are in good shape. It will be remembered that last session we asked for a vote to take over one of the newer buildings in order to relieve the religious organization of the capital charges they had taken upon themselves in connection with this work. I do think, Mr. Chairman, that if the religious organizations are willing to help us to the extent of providing the teaching staff practically free of charge to us, it is our clear duty to provide the buildings for the carrying on of their work. It will be my desire to assist and extend those operations among the 120,000 odd Indians so that no Indian child shall be denied the right to a good, decent public school education at least.

There are many and varied difficulties in the administration of the Indian department. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) I am free to admit that in some cases not enough care has been exercised in selecting our local agents. A great deal depends upon the man who is placed upon a reserve and in whose charge the Indians must be. In many cases not nearly enough consideration has been given to the choice of a suitable man, because after all he needs to possess a good tempered, patient and sympathetic disposition, for he meets with a great deal of disappointment in his failure to at once

change the habits of these people. Year by year as subsistence by hunting becomes more and more precarious our Indians must apply themselves to agriculture and other avocations pursued by the white man; otherwise they will be entirely dependent upon grants from the treasury, and capable local agents can help them to accommodate themselves to changing conditions.

Mr. FORKE: I should like to add a word or two, Mr. Chairman, to what I said last night on this subject. I know the minister is very sympathetic towards the Indian and his problem. I think perhaps I would be the last to say anything against teaching the Indian Christianity but I do believe our first duty is to teach him how to make a decent living. We all know how puzzled white people become sometimes in regard to problems of Christianity; well, the Indians get into the same difficulties, only a little deeper sometimes. I remember a good many years ago meeting an old Indian friend, and he immediately informed me that he was now a Christian. He was taking some wood to market that had been cut into stove lengths, and while conversing with him I turned over a few pieces and discovered some dozy lengths underneath. I tried to explain to him that this was not Christian practice. He replied, "Oh yes, the white people all do that." So you see some of the difficulties the poor Indian has to meet in dealing with Christianity. I repeat that I believe the great thing is in the beginning to teach the Indian how to make a decent living.

If we are to have successful Indian agents I endorse what the minister says: they must be of a sympathetic nature and the right stamp of men. An Indian agent must be able to go out among the Indians and settle their little quarrels and encourage them to continue at their work. Until we have such men to look after our Indians I do not care how much money we spend it will only be wasted. At the present time in the little reserve near my home I know there are a great many healthy young men, but they have neither stock nor seed to make their land of any use to them. What are they going to do all summer? There is a problem. The department might provide them with the necessary stock and seed, but unless there is an agent possessing the proper qualifications to look after those Indians and see that everything is done in the right way I think the assistance will be thrown away.

Just a word in connection with the education of the Indian. The Indian is different from the white man in a great many respects. The Indians who live near me sometimes come over to see me about their difficulties. I can talk a little Indian and perhaps I may do so for a time; then I suddenly recollect that it would be better to have them talk English and I tell whoever I am conversing with that unless he speaks English I will not carry on the conversation any longer; and immediately he will commence to talk very good English. But he will not speak English as long as you will talk to him in the Indian tongue. Indians who have been educated at Elkhorn and Brandon will go back to the reserve and in twelve months, unless they are given some attention, you will not be able to tell the difference between them and the Indians who never saw the school, except, perhaps, that they are able to write a letter. I submit again that the Indians, to be properly looked after, must have an agent who takes thoroughly good care of them, who acts as their mediator and their counsellor and friend right along. That is the only way I can see in which we can arrive at a solution of the Indian problem. I really feel sorry for the Indians and their present condition in Manitoba. I would like to see the money devoted to the Indians well spent; I would not be niggardly at all in the matter of an appropriation for this purpose if I only knew that the money was being spent as it should be.

Mr. EVANS: I would like to say a word in support of what the minister has said. I do not think we should be stingy in the matter of voting money for the purposes of the Indians. We owe a debt to these people, and when the money is well spent we are well repaid in the effort. My own experience in connection with the Indians dates back to some thirty years ago, in connection with one of the reserves in Saskatchewan. The Indian agent who went among them at that time found the conditions very unsatisfactory indeed. Since then we have seen that reserve even without an Indian agent, although there are not as many Indians there now as there used to be, and they are in a very fair way. Some of them, I know, have fine herds of cattle, are following the occupation of farming and are living a civilized life in every respect. Their boys and girls are being educated, and they are intensely loyal. Some of them served in the Great War, and one I know particularly has gone out as a missionary to his own people. They are capable of being educated; they are susceptible to uplift, and I think we would make a mistake if we did not do our duty by them.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What is the policy of the department with regard to some of the Indian reserves where the Indians have nearly all died? In my own constituency there are some very large reserves which used to be occupied by two hundred Indians but on which there are now only about ten. Then, there are small reserves which, after being farmed to some extent, were abandoned, and are now producing a splendid crop of weeds, wild oats and so on. Would the department consider the leasing of such land as that? I would ask also if it is the intention to retain the larger reserves where the numbers of Indians have materially decreased, or will the department dispose of some of them, and if so under what conditions?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the land is fit for agricultural purposes and is not required by the band, the practice of the department has been to try to secure a surrender from the band and sell the land to white settlers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to call the attention of the minister to the dissatisfaction which prevails among the Indians on the Blackfoot reserve in Alberta. They have many complaints, the chief of which is that under the terms of surrender agreement they were induced, they say, to consent to a reduction of their rations during the war from seven pounds of meat and seven pounds of flour a week to five pounds of meat and five pounds of flour a week, and a pound of tea, I think, every two months. They were under the impression that when the war was finished they would go back to the old scale, and they are dissatisfied now that many years have elapsed since the conclusion of the war and they are still on the war rations. The minister will realize that adults can hardly be expected to subsist on five pounds of meat and five pounds of flour a week—it seems miserable. If the minister has any explanation to offer I would like to have it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had no knowledge, until the matter was brought to my attention by the hon. gentleman some weeks ago, that there was any difficulty about rations on this reserve. My own idea is that we should carry out to the letter our contract with the Indians; that is the first principle we should lay down. On the other hand, the Indians on the Blackfoot reserve should be rapidly brought to a point where they are self-supporting. They are on splendid land; they can raise cattle; they have every opportunity of getting along well. It may be our fault that they are not self-supporting; I am not saying it is theirs. However, as I have said, I am prepared to carry out to the fullest extent any arrangement that was made with the Indians.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The Indians tell me, through their chiefs, that during the winter and spring they actually go out into the reserve and gather up dead horseflesh and eat it, because they cannot get any other food. Of course, that is obviously improper. There are a number of other complaints that I would like the minister to investigate. One of them dates back to the campaign for greater production. The Indians tell me that they were charged $35 a set for harness that could have been purchased from any mail order house for $16 at that time. I would be glad if the minister would investigate that complaint. There is one other complaint, which is more sentimental than anything else. Some of the minor Indian chiefs wish to have the right to delegate to a successor at the time of death the chieftainship or honour which they may themselves possess. A man named Russa, an Indian brave, was bequeathed by a minor chief his chieftainship; this was about two years ago when the chief was dying. The agent informed the Indians that he had communicated with Ottawa but that no reply had been received; and no reply had been received up to last fall when I was there. Little things of this kind are very keenly felt by the Indian mind. Before I pass from that, may I ask the minister whether he has any knowledge of that particular incident?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. In nearly all the western provinces an Indian chieftainship is not hereditary but elective, so that it would be in direct conflict with the elective sytem to attempt to pass the chieftainship down in hereditary line. We have a great deal of difficulty on the Six Nations reserve about that very thing. They have an hereditary system there and a very strong exception is taken to it by a great many of the Indians on the reserve, and as a result there is conflict going on all the time. With all due deference to the wishes of the chief I might say frankly that I would oppose the hereditary system as against the elective, which I think is much more modern and much more in the interests of the Indian.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The chief did not give me to understand that they desired the hereditary system. I asked the question very pointedly when this matter was brought to my attention: Was the chieftainship delegated to this new man by the will

of the tribe? I was informed yes, and that the agent had been so informed. So it would not be the hereditary system.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no knowledge of that particular case. It would appear that in that case he had been elected by the votes of the band but not confirmed by the agent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Owing to the delay at Ottawa, according to the agent's reply.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is there an amount provided in this item for improvements or extensions to the school at St. Albert north of Edmonton?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. There is an amount of $145,000 for the industrial school at Edmonton, which was formerly the Red Deer school.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is any provision made so that the agent will have power to relieve illness or cases of emergency?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is always done. If there is not a resident doctor, there is a doctor whose duty it is to go to the reserve on call. That is the case with all the reserves.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do I understand the minister to say that the agent has power to allocate to a sick Indian additional supplies of food and so forth?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh yes. That is his duty. He must not allow the Indians to starve.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am glad to hear the minister say that because these chiefs have reported to me that on complaint to the agent at Gleichen they could receive no relief whatever. The agent replied, and I am giving this complaint as I got it, "I have no power. I must get that power from the commissioner."

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Indian is pretty much of a white man when it comes to describing his difficulties. He does not minimize them at all. I discovered that last year when I was on a visit westward. When I brought the officials and the chiefs together I found that the stories I had heard were not borne out by the testimony. I would be very glad to do the same in this particular case, bring the officials and the chiefs together, and if they have legitimate complaints we shall be glad to clear them up.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Thank you. May I ask how much capital was used in the original purchase of equipment, lands, stock and so on in connection with the Blackfoot reserve?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the figures at hand but will give them to my hon. friend.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): You will let me have them?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: Why are the general expenses under this item for Manitoba and Saskachewan so great, much larger than any of the others?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This, of course, covers the salaries of all the agents in the western provinces and the expenses in connection with their offices. It covers the Northwest Territory, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I have the figures in detail, but it would take considerable time to give them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The Indians of the Blackfoot reserve complain of this fact: When their crop is threshed they are compelled by the agent to dispose of all of it except one load, which they are allowed to retain for seed. Some of these Indians have one hundred acres or more ready for crop and one load, of course, will not nearly suffice for seed. The result is, they say, they have to go back to the agent in the spring and purchase at an enhanced price the additional feed required. Would the minister look into that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can hardly conceive of an agent being so improvident as to ask the Indian to sell his grain down to a point where he would not have sufficient left to seed his land. I think when we came to investigate that complaint we would find it was not borne out by the facts. However, we will investigate it. One of the things we are endeavouring to teach the Indian is prudence. Improvidence is his great failing; he does not provide, and that is one virtue we are trying to encourage him in. It certainly would be a very foolish procedure to sell beyond the point where his requirements for feed and seed would be fully met.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That was the way in which it struck me. What provision has been made on that reserve for the education of the children? I understand the school has been closed since July. It was alleged to be closed for repairs, but apparently it has not been opened up yet.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The school was closed simply for the purpose of remodelling and repairs. It is now open again and in operation.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How long has it been in operation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): About two months.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is there any age at which the children are supposed to leave the school? I am informed, but I rather doubt it myself, that when the children reach the age of from thirteen to fifteen they are discharged from school and told to go to work.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can scarcely believe that because those I spoke of who are making such a splendid success in Saskatchewan went direct from the school to carrying on farming operations on their own account. They are kept at the school until the age of eighteen. I can hardly believe that any such order as my hon. friend mentions would have been issued in connection with the schools. I am free to admit that perhaps there is some ground for complaint in Alberta. On the Morley reserve Indian education was becoming expensive and in some cases they closed the boarding schools and attempted to educate these children in day schools. The department, however has abandoned that idea altogether because it seems to be a waste of money. The children are not kept in school regularly and during their absence go back as far as they have progressed practically, in their educational instruction. The only effective way is to get them into a boarding school where you can have some control over them and keep them under supervision until they have had an opportunity to get an education.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have seen two crews of Indians at work threshing last fall. I stayed a week in one district where one of these crews was working and they gave immense satisfaction. They were more satisfactoy even than the white man, and I am glad to say that the employer paid them exactly the wages of the white man. They did splendid work. Can the minister give to the committee the terms of the agreement entered into with the Indians in regard to ploughed land, that is the land left when the greater production schemes ceased?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Where the Indian is equipped and ready to farm the land he is charged at the rate of $6 an acre for broken land, land that is broken and brought under cultivation under the greater production scheme. In regard to what my hon. friend has said with respect to selling supplies, harness, implements, etc., I may say that a considerable proportion was turned over to the younger Indians who gave evidence of a desire to go farming. In some cases these things were sold, but in the majority of cases they were given to the Indians as an encouragement. One of the difficulties I found when I took charge of the department was that as soon as the young people graduated and were ready to begin farming operations there was no provision for loaning or giving money to start at farming; and one of the rather vicious things that was happening was that the Indian would go out and get credit from the merchants in the vicinity. This led to considerable difficulty in getting adjustments made. Now we are adopting another method. The department are loaning sufficient funds to these young Indians to start farming in a moderate way, and in that manner we hope to maintain them on the reserve and encourage them in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In the first place, under the greater production scheme, the land was leased for five years. The chiefs endeavoured to make an agreement for $10 a head—that is $10 for each Indian on the reserve. Objection was taken to that sum, and it was cut to $6, which was accepted. However, on the expiry of that lease the department went ahead and re-leased without asking the consent of the Indians.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil) That is released to white men?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think so. The Indians objected, and subsequently a further agreement was arrived at—with the local agent at any rate, although I think it must have been with the departmental officials—that, in return, the sum of $4 per head would be paid for these second leases. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am afraid not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well, what are the facts?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would like to say to my hon. friend that I cannot speak with authority regarding what has been done in the past, but the policy pursued now is this: The moment an Indian is ready to take this land we are prepared to turn it over to

him. What I mean by that is that none of this land will be leased to white men if there are Indians ready and available to farm it. Just as fast as these young men wish to settle down we will place them on this land, not only on the Blackfoot reserve but on all the reserves on which the policy of greater production was carried on, in order to encourage the Indian to work these farm lands. So far we have not been able to get a sufficient number of Indians to farm the area that was under the greater production scheme. Therefore, we have to lease to the white men temporarily year by year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But is there an amount of $4 being paid to the Indians?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. MANION: No, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask a few questions and if I do so after eight o'clock it will probably be just as well.

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 119 (from the Senate), to change the name of Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo Telephone Company to "Brazilian Telephone Company."—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 120 (from the Senate), respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Denis (Joliette).

Bill No. 121 (from the Senate), for the relief of Fannie Boyle.—Mr. Sheard

Bill No. 122 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Forbes—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 123 (from the Senate), for the relief of Julia Tracey Kay.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No 124 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Philip Roy McCabe.—Mr. Ross, (Kingston).

Bill No. 125 (from the Senate), for the relief of William George Haden.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 126 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gertrude Irene Wood.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 127 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Murray.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton.).

Bill No. 128 (from the Senate), for the relief of James McAllister.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 129 (from the Senate), for the relief of David Albert Clayton.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 130 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hugh Russell Fulton.—Mr. McKillop.

Bill No. 131 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maybelle Elizabeth French.—Sir Henry Drayton.

SUPPLY

INDIAN AFFAIRS

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

Mr. MANION: Has the position of Indian agent at the head of the lakes been filled? I know that the agent was retired a month or so ago but I do not know who has been given the position, if it has been filled.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The position has been filled by the Civil Service Commission, the appointee being Mr. J. Garry Burke.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Burke was never in the Indian service before?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. MANION: Is he a returned soldier?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MANION: I desire to say a few words in regard to the Indians in this country. Ever since the white man entered Canada his race has been pushing the Indians farther and farther back into the hinterland of this country. I do not say that in any critical spirit because I believe that Canada has been treating her Indians probably a great deal better than the people to the south of us have treated theirs, as is evidenced by the fact that throughout the time we have dealt with our Indians there have been practically no difficulties or troubles in connection with them, whereas in the United States the authorities have undoubtedly met with many difficulties in the way of guerilla warfare and so forth. I believe, however, that it is well for us to bear in mind at all times that after all the Indians were the first Canadians; at least they were here before any of the rest of us, not excepting my good friends in Quebec. It should, therefore, be the wish of the Canadian people to show them every consideration possible; and indeed I believe that it has been the policy of the Department of Indian Affairs under all governments to treat the Indians in a reasonably fair way. At the same time the Indians throughout this country, at least in many bands, have been decreasing in great numbers. At the head of the lakes in the neighbourhood of Fort William and Port Arthur there are a couple of bands as well as one at Nipigon

which, from what I have been given to understand, are decreasing to a great extent, this being due mainly to disease of one kind or another. We are all aware that practically every disease to which the white man is subject deals more harshly with the Indian when it attacks him than it does with the white race, probably because the Indian has not become as immune, during a long period of years, as is the white man to such disease. One disease in particular which has been attacking the Indians at the head of the lakes and also in British Columbia, where I understand the Indians are also decreasing in numbers, is tuberculosis. I have watched the progress of these people at the head of the lakes for the last thirty years, and I know that they have been decreasing in numbers to a very large extent from this cause. There are other diseases, of course, which levy a heavy toll on them, even including the comparatively mild disease of measles; and there is another unfortunate evil from which they suffer, which is not perhaps exactly a disease but rather an injurious habit which they have acquired. I refer to the use by the Indians of alcohol. I mention this fact because I fear we have not perhaps been doing enough to protect the Indians against themselves, so far particularly as diseases are concerned. I remember that in conversation once with a Jesuit priest, who lived among the Indians, he told me that they were healthier both physically and morally before they became associated with white people. I believe he was telling the exact truth. The point I wish to make is this. While I understand from the deputy minister that a certain amount of educational propaganda is carried on amongst the Indians to inculcate some of the hygienic laws with a view to preventing tuberculosis or at least the most common forms of consumption, and while through the missionaries of different religious denominations in this country the Indians are being acquainted with the harmful effects of alcohol upon themselves especially—for they are affected to a greater extent by it than are most other races—, at the same time I feel that perhaps we might increase our efforts to educate these people to the importance of protecting themselves, more particularly against tuberculosis. It is important that we should teach them the means to prevent this disease to as great an extent as they possibly can. So far as alcohol is concerned, after all the laws of most provinces, if not of all, protect the Indians, to some extent at least, against the alcoholic evil, so that they can obtain liquor only illegally. As regards tuberculosis, however, while there is a continuous campaign being waged against the disease among the Indians, even in their own dialects, still we might do more for them than is now done. The Indians are really a very inoffensive people in Canada. In the past, it is true, in the early history of the country, they were rather aggressive; but today I think, speaking at least of the Indians whom I have met, and I have grown up in their midst, so to speak, practically in all relations of life they are much less offensive citizens of this country, if they may be so termed, than are the white men. It is for that reason, therefore, that I urge upon the minister the question of considering more active propaganda to be carried on, in whatever ways the deputy minister and the different officials of the department may deem advisable, to educate the Indians to take better care of their health. But there are other reasons besides humanitarian for undertaking work of this kind. For example, there is the point of view of the picturesqueness of Indian life in this country. I believe that the Indian life of Canada is of value to the Canadian people, particularly to those people in this country who have come from lands where Indians, the people we understand that word to designate, have not existed. I wish therefore to impress upon the minister the value that there is in preserving to the people of this country the Indians whom we now have amongst us. They are, as I have said, of an inoffensive character, and from the humanitarian point of view, if, from no other reason, I think we should do more than we are doing at present to take care of them. I think that with a little more money expended in this direction than we are now devoting to the Indians we could protect them against diseases of various kinds; and I should be glad if the minister and the officers of his department would take such steps as would prove in the best interests not only of the Indians themselves but of the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. McBRIDE: I have no complaint to make on behalf of the Indians regarding the minister, but rather I wish to thank him and his deputy for the way in which they have treated the Indians, particularly in the vicinity in which I live. Last year I spoke to the minister and his deputy with reference to the school at Kamloops, which was in a dilapidated condition. That school would have been built years ago had it not been for the war. The minister and his deputy came to the district and visited the reserve last summer. They looked fully into the matter, went through the old school, and were at once convinced

that it was no place for children to be educated in. I can assure them that the people in that vicinity, not only the Indians and the reverend gentleman who is in charge of them, but the people generally appreciate very much the action the minister and his deputy have taken to improve the conditions for the children on the reserve.

Mr. CALDWELL: Owing to the fact that I was on a committee this afternoon when the estimates for New Brunswick were under consideration, I would ask the indulgence of the committee for five minutes to refer to certain conditions in that province. I want to refer to the roads in the Indian reserve in Victoria county, New Brunswick. This reserve is in the neighbourhood of a good-sized town and is situate in a populous part of the country. One has to drive through the reserve to get into the market town, and it is quite a hardship, especially in winter, to pass through the reserve because the Indians are not in a position to break the roads along these three or four miles. There is a great deal of snow in New Brunswick in winter and people experience considerable hardship in passing over that road to get into the town. In summer, of course, the condition is not so bad, but in winter it is very difficult to get over it. Part of the road is dug out of a side of a bank, and when the spring freshets come it is invariably in very bad shape. Will the agent there be instructed to see that the road is kept open during the winter?

Mr. BANCROFT: I would bring to the attention of the minister the necessity of an early settlement concerning the hay lands on the St. Peter's reserve. This reserve is on the Red river just north of the town of Selkirk. These hay lands have been the principal source of supply of hay for the local farmers ever since the district was first settled. They enjoyed this convenience until about five years ago when the lands were leased in a block to a party for speculative purposes, thus of course cutting off the other settlers from their hay supply. The district is only about thirty miles from the city of Winnipeg, the train service is excellent and in every way the conditions are highly favourable to dairy farming, but I am told that since these lands were leased five years ago the number of stock in the locality has decreased by about 60 per cent. This indicates how very detrimental to the local farmers has been their exclusion from these hay lands. The lease runs out next month, and I would impress upon the minister the importance of not renewing it. These hay lands should be available to the local settlers in order that they may be able to build up a stock-growing industry. I have already taken this matter up with the department and with the minister, and I again take this opportunity of emphasizing the importance of this hay supply to the local farmers. I think it is the duty of the government to keep these lands out of the hands of speculators and make it possible for the actual settlers to buy them in small lots. If arrangemets cannot be settled in time to make a sale this year before the hay crop is ready, I would suggest that the lands be leased in small lots to the settlers for this year's cut, and that arrangements be completed for a sale on the lines I have indicated so that the actual settlers may benefit instead of being sacrificed in favour of the speculator. This point of view, I may say, is shared not only by all the settlers in the community but by the residents of the town of Selkirk, which is the largest urban centre in the district.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: What is the explanation of the increase under this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In answer to my hon. friend who has spoken of the scourge of tuberculosis among the Indians, while I would not say that we are taking adequate steps to this end, because it would cost a tremendous amount of money to wipe out this plague amongst the Indian tribes, yet we are trying by propaganda and education among the Indians to make them acquainted with the best methods of combatting the disease. Of course, we have the best chance of success among the children who attend the schools. Undeniably our Indian people, in common, I suppose, with those who have lived as they have lived for generations, are in rather a bad way so far as tuberculosis is concerned. We hope by the means I have indicated and by employing nurses to help the Indians save themselves from this scourge.

In reply to my hon. friend for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) I do not think it is the duty of the agent or of the department to keep open a public road, but in so far as we are responsible as a property holder in the vicinity we will be prepared to do our share both in the construction and the maintenance of these highways passing through the various reserves.

In reply to my hon. friend for Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft), we have had the matter he refers to under consideration. As soon as possible these hay lands will be put up for sale by public auction in small lots. We can-

not guarantee that they will be sold to the local farmers, but at least they will be given an opportunity of bidding upon the various parcels that constitute this rather large hay meadow. In the meantime as soon as the lease expires we will offer this year these various parcels to parties who may wish to lease them and get the hay, as it will be impossible to arrange for a sale before the hay harvest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the land be leased by favoritism or by tender?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We will lease the parcels by tender.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What will be the difference between that condition and what has already prevailed? The present lessee got his lease by tender—he was the highest bidder. I understand that what the hon. member complains of is that the lands are not available for farmers in the neighbourhood. They will not be available to them after the minister leases them by tender this year, nor, after he sells them.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not wish to get into a controversy between my right hon. friend and the hon. member for Selkirk—

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no controversy.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): —But I know of no other system by which the department can protect itself.

Mr. BANCROFT: I would suggest that the lands be leased in small lots, not in one whole block as was done before. In the latter case the lands will inevitably pass into the hands of speculators. If these lands are leased under what is known as hay permits every man who has stock can obtain so much of the land according to the number of his stock. This method would help the local stock-raising industry and would keep the lands out of the hands of speculators.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the tender system; that is the permit system.

Mr. BANCROFT: Well, that is the system the local settlers want.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what the minister says he is not going to do.

Mr. BANCROFT: The people there want the permit system.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Has the minister had any complaints from the residents living near the St. Pie reserve in regard to the fencing of the reserve? A road has been cut through this reserve, and in the fall many of the settlers left their cattle out on the road. Trouble resulted, the cattle straying into the Indian reserve and being impounded by the Indians, which put the settlers to considerable cost and a great deal of inconvenience. I suggest to the minister that some fencing should be done on that reserve. There are very few Indians there, and they have had a great deal of trouble. Has the minister had any complaints?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. HANSON: Shortly after the last election the Indian agent at Perth, New Brunswick, under whose immediate care the Tobique band of Indians came, was dismissed from office without any reason being assigned. I happen to know that he is a man of more than ordinary intelligence and that he was perhaps one of the best Indian agents we ever had in that part of the country. Will the minister inform us why he was dismissed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The information I have is that the services of this gentleman were not satisfactory.

Mr. HANSON: No such reason was ever assigned. But I can tell the minister the real reason; it was because he did not support the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). I do not know that he was very active against him, but that was the reason. Were any complaints against Mr. Wootten on file in the department, and if so, were they investigated by the department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot answer offhand whether or not there were any complaints.

Mr. HANSON: The secretary of the department is right in front of the minister; he knows Mr. Wootten personally.

Mr. CALDWELL: Perhaps I may be able to help the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) a little.

Mr. HANSON: I want the information from the minister.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that this vote is for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories. However, if the committee has no objection I suppose a brief explanation might be made.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No objection.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am surprised to learn that this man did not support me. I understood from him that he did.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. member for York-Sunbury said he was a man of more than ordinary intelligence.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then he should have supported me as a matter of course.

Mr. MARTELL: There was no Liberal candidate, so he was the next best thing.

Mr. CALDWELL: However, the chief of the Indian tribe at Tobique point wrote me something over two years ago stating that green timber was being cut on the reserve without a permit. I reported the matter to the department, and they got in touch with the Indian agent, who reported back that there was no such thing going on. All this will be found, I am sure, on the departmental files. I received a communication to this effect from the deputy minister, a copy of which I sent to the chief, thinking there must have been some mistake. By return mail I received another letter from the chief saying that at least 600 green logs had been cut, as well as a large amount of green pulpwood. I again communicated with the department, and I think they sent an Indian agent from another reserve to look into the matter. They found that it was true that this cutting had been going on, although the agent at that reserve denied it. I am convinced that he did not know anything about it, because I know the man; he is very conscientious and an excellent man in every way—and a very good friend of mine, by the way. As I say, I was surprised to learn that he did not support me in the last election, because a man of his good judgment would naturally, I should think, follow that course. If the minister looks into the files I think he will find that that is the reason Mr. Wootten's services were dispensed with. Mr. Wootten was leaving the locality, I believe; he is up in northern Ontario at present.

Mr. HANSON: He left this month; he was dismissed a year ago. I should like to ask the minister if any complaint was ever made against Mr. Wootten, and if so, whether it was investigated by the department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed that this timber transaction was about the only thing concerning which his occupancy of the position was questioned. I am also informed he did not give his full time to Indian affairs; that he was engaged in other business.

Mr. HANSON: How could you expect him to do so, on the miserable salary you paid him?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We expect to get service, even for miserable salaries.

Mr. HANSON: Not his full time.

Mr. MICHAUD: I know something about this gentleman, and if the hon. member for York-Sunbury wants to know in what respect he did not fulfil his duties, I can enlighten him on the subject. In the first place, the hon. member will know that Mr. Wootten got the position of Indian agent as a reward for his activities as Conservative organizer in the county of Victoria. I know that county very well; I had the honour of representing it for some time. Then, Mr. Wootten was so active as an insurance agent that he had hardly any time to give to the affairs of the Indians on the Perth reserve. As he was not doing his duty in connection with the work on behalf of the Indians, he was, therefore, dismissed for a good cause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would look as though he had been dismissed by the hon. member for Miramichi instead of by the minister. The minister did not know anything about the reason for the dismissal, but—

Mr. MICHAUD: Who is the member for Miramichi, I would like to know?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Restigouche—they are pretty close together.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The Miramichi is an old boat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to ask the minister what is doing and what he proposes doing in regard to the greater production work in the West.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not changed my mind with respect to the matter since last year. With the single exception of the farm near Regina, we propose turning those lands over to the young Indians who qualify as farmers. Of course that cannot be done in a moment; we shall have to continue until such time as these young Indians are in a position to take over the lands. Each year will show, I think, a very substantial reduction in our farming operations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I read in a return brought down in answer to some questions a statement which indicated very gratifying results from the greater production operations. I think it would be well if these were made known to the committee. I do not object to the gradual closing out of the enterprise, but I would not want to see it closed out any more rapidly than suitable Indians were available to utilize the lands that have been brought under cultivation. Otherwise

these lands would be worse than wasted; the cultivation would be harmful instead of beneficial, because the land would all go to weeds. If I caught the minister's words aright, the farm he proposes continuing within the scope of the enterprise is the one near Regina. What is the name of the reserve?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Muscowequan.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About 4,000 acres?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be some time before they are withdrawn.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are always having difficulty in connection with Indian farming. What I mean by that is that almost every year there will be reserves upon which seed will be required, and I think a farm of that character might very well be continued by the department in order to provide the necessary seed. It might be said that there is no reason why these reserves should not provide seed for themselves, and that does happen once in a while. With the exception of that one farm, I think we should close out these farms as rapidly as we have Indians qualified to take them on. Of course we must continue to operate until then, otherwise the lands would grow up in weeds.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are the results so far as they can be known now?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will give that information, which is in the form of answers to some questions that were asked, I do not know by whom. The quantity of grain grown on the Indian reserves in the three prairie provinces during the last five years was 5,363,339 bushels; the proportion of this grown by individual Indians was 3,532,347 bushels; the proportion grown by white settlers 1,100,000 bushels; the proportion grown by the greater production operations was 730,992 bushels; the quantity of grain grown on these same reserves during the five years previous to this period was 5,586,938 bushels; the area summer fallowed and broken by Indians during the last five years was 112,294 acres; area during the previous five years, records not available for breaking and summer fallowing, but total area under crop 1913-1917 inclusive 184,302 acres; amount of rentals collected during the last five years $440,009.88; amount collected during the previous five years $54,324.66.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the amount still due and collectible?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not that here but it will be a fairly considerable amount I imagine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I did not get the minister's figures right. If I understand them properly his figures were wrong as to the amount grown in the previous five years. I have it at about three and a half million bushels, not five million odd. The increase is something over 100 per cent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is quite correct. The quantity of grain grown on these same reserves during the five years previous was 3,586,938 bushels, not 5,586,938 bushels.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister read 5,000,000. There should be about $130,000 due and collectible still, and if so that amount added to the $440,000 which the minister has just given would make a total of $590,000 of direct cash resulting from an investment of about $360,000. In addition, of course, there would be the buildings. They will be used now by the Indians that are coming on to take possession of the land, the tractors and farm machinery that the greater production enterprise has, and as well there would be some outstandings that would still come in, I mean aside from the rentals. So the whole enterprise would be a very profitable one from every standpoint. Of course, I am quite aware that a large share of the profits come from the leases, but even without the leases there is a very gratifying result from the whole greater production enterprise. I would like to know if the minister's ideas agree with mine on this subject or has he something in his mind that modifies or in any way tempers his enthusiasm with regard to the results attained?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was not questioning the results at all, but I do not think it would be wise to continue the greater production of grain enterprise now. I do not see any necessity for continuing it. All I am endeavouring to do is to get the Indians to take over this land as fast as they are able to do so and to get down to one reasonably-sized farm close to Regina, where the work can be looked after by Mr. Graham, and a store of grain be left available at that central point for use as required.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the greater production work is good, but I think the Indian on the farm is better, and consequently while there is an Indian who is likely to succeed standing by ready to take the land I agree with the minister that the right thing to do

is to let him take it, but save for that, and only as the work is invaded by the Indians, I would say continue the greater production operations. In that way some use is made of otherwise almost abandoned land, the very best waste land in the West. There is need of the greater production operations for the purpose of utilizing that land. Why, the minister could get a very considerable sum towards his Indian estimates by continuing this to the utmost degree consistent only with not shutting out any Indian ready to farm, and at the rate of increase of these estimates I would think that would appeal to the minister as a very advisable thing to do.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I just might say in reply that when farming under the greater production scheme you might have a period of years when you would be very successful, and then you might strike a period of years in which your expenditure would far outbalance your revenue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You would hardly strike any worse than we have had lately.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Do not make any mistake. That could be done very easily. These bad cycles fortunately did not strike the greater production area very seriously.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They struck it right between the eyes. The big greater production farms were hailed, and drought came and brought down the yield to about seven bushels per acre on the largest farm on the Blood reserve and on the second largest nearby. I think it encountered pretty nearly everything that western farming encounters and still it has succeeded.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It has succeeded largely because they have been very successful in Saskatchewan. They have been very fortunate in getting splendid crops, and this year again there was a magnificent crop in Saskatchewan; I saw it. But on the whole it is rather a precarious undertaking. These lands were broken at a time when stress was being put upon the government to increase production in Canada, and it was a laudable scheme to enter upon at that time, but so far as I am concerned when my hon. friend points out that this is a way in which we might obtain revenue I would say that we are obtaining all the revenue we can from the rentals of these lands. But after all I am fearful whether this is not a doubtful way of obtaining revenue taking one year with another, breaking up these lands and taking chances on leasing them. I am speaking of lands the Indians would not otherwise be able to utilize. Part of the difficulty complained of by my hon. friend from Bow River arises from the fact that these lands during the period of inflation were leased at high rentals, and the leaseholders were unable to pay. The Indian knows what these lands were rented at and he is disappointed and thinks somebody has been retaining what rightfully belongs to him. I have gone pretty thoroughly into all these matters with the chiefs themselves, and I know that that is partly the cause of their complaint, whereas the rancher, and in many cases the renter, has lost all that he put into the enterprise. Take the case of the leases, the very Gleichen reserve that my hon. friend from Bow River is speaking about. The rancher who had that lease is practically bankrupt owing to the severe drop in the price of cattle and the very high rental he was foolish enough to pay for the lease. Yet the Indian expects to get that money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not so much a matter of what the Indian expects as what is best for him. Suppose the minister does see that he gets the benefit of the money; all well and good. Better do the best that can be done with the land and let the money go to the Indians as far as I am concerned. I would not want to see the land simply given up and the whole enterprise abandoned even if somebody did pay too much. That is always going to happen and, of course, the man who loses has to take his risk. I do not want to see everything simply put aside, the tractors stacked up, and the enterprise left in the lurch, any more rapidly than is necessary to take care of the Indians.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not sure that my right hon. friend realizes exactly what is being done. I assure him that we are trying to make the best use of every acre of land that cannot be utilized by the Indians. I would like to see the Indians out there encouraged, as far as possible, to utilize their grazing land. There is no use blinking at the fact that they have not nearly the number of cattle they had some years ago and we must get busy and encourage them to own and raise their cattle on these reserves. Not only that but we must encourage the young men to engage in agriculture in order that they may maintain themselves. It can be done. I pointed out this afternoon a very clear evidence of that in Saskatchewan where the Indians are making splendid progress, and I see no reason why the same thing cannot be done on every one of these western reserves.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree with the minister in that. I agree with him that the right line of education for the Indian youth—after the three R's are mastered: reading, writing, and arithemetic and no excessive amount of any of them—is to teach him to work, teach him to farm, particularly to teach him to earn a living. I am inclined to agree with the leader of the Progressive party on this subject. I do not think there is any use trying to make a white man of the Indian whether in education or, possibly, in religion; it cannot be done. The thing to do with the Indian is to remember that he is only a few generations from the bush. Keep him in the open as much as possible, children as well as men—that for the purposes of their health—and utilize the funds of the government to teach them to earn their living. I am inclined to think we spend too much money on certain forms of education, and I have doubts whether the additional half million that is asked for in this vote is necessary providing we confine the application of public moneys to the essential educative needs of the Indian. I would be sorry to see any niggardliness in the way of policy as to education, providing it is such education as fits the Indian to help himself. There is no easier way of wasting money than on unnecessary school equipment, teachers, and so forth, and unnecessary curriculum for Indian children. As the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) said there has been a tremendous amount wasted. I do not know what the proportion is but a good large proportion are right under the blanket in a month from the time they get out of the school, and unless some feature of the File Hills work follows the school, the money of the government has gone within a short time after graduation. I think the efforts of the department should be more and more directed to bringing the individual Indian into a responsible working job as he gets out of the Indian school. If such is the policy it is going to bring far better results than to continue him in the school and then abandon him when he gets through. So, while I do not object to the extra grant—providing the officers of the department and the minister have thoroughly thought the subject out—I really, if I had to do it myself, would go over the estimates again and see if the half million could not be struck off, and the moneys already voted—I mean the moneys that have been voted in previous years—applied, perhaps, to curtailment of the academic curriculum to some extent, the balance being used for more practical purposes and for the continuation of the File Hills work.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would just like to say in reply to my right hon. friend that is eactly what I have been trying to tell the committee this afternoon—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I heard some of it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): —and I agree most heartily with it. I think the mistake that has been made is, that we have been trying to educate the Indian and then abandoning him the moment he steps outside of the schoolroom door. I do not see how you could expect any different result. I cannot very well see how it could be different. You have only given him an education; you have not equipped him at all to take his place in a different walk of life and you have spoiled him for the avocation carried on by his people. Now, what else could be the result but that in many cases he would be a failure such as has been depicted by the leader of the Progressive party. With these object lessons in front of us we should endeavour to shape our policy accordingly. I am not anxious to give the Indian a very extended education, but I do earnestly desire to give him a sufficient education in order that he may be able to take his place with the white man in the ordinary avocations of life.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But there is an enormous increase.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My right hon. friend must bear in mind the fact that the late government spent no money on educational institutions during the whole period of the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes. we spent some.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would like to take my right hon. friend to some institutions in which the Indian youth is being educated; I would like to show him some of the institutions in which the work is being carried on. Surely, in all fairness, if we are to do this work, if we are to even make an attempt to do it, we ought to have reasonable places in which to house these children and that has not been the case. I saw some examples of that. I saw some splendid institutions. I saw an institution at Qu 'Appelle of which the Canadian government, or any other government, can well be proud; a splendid building, well conducted, and the pupils that I saw there demonstrated the advantages of an institution of that kind. It is not my policy to build institutions of that character. At the same time I think that much better work could be done in an institution of that

character rather than one in which they cannot keep water from freezing, one in which the floors are worn out and the windows are falling out of the building, and where there ought to be 150 or 175 pupils. That is why I am asking for this money. I am not asking it for the purpose of building elaborate establishments and putting in elaborate equipment. What is proposed is to have a reasonable kind of a building with a very modest 9 p.m. equipment in order that this work may be carried on. If we cannot make any progress in assisting the Indians in Canada through a reasonably educational method, I am afraid that the red man will deteriorate, and that he will be a bigger burden in the way of maintenance upon the people of Canada than he will by trying to make him sustain himself by this method.

Mr. KNOX: In following this subject a little further I would like to say that I have in mind one institution to which I might refer for a few minutes without getting away from the subject. I refer to the boarding school at Duck Lake, where not only educational work is carried on, but agricultural education is given in connection with it. It is under Father Delmas, who is doing exceptionally good work. I was struck by the remarks of the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) a little while ago when he spoke about the good results that had followed a visit from the minister and his deputy last summer, and I would like to impress on the minister the necessity of paying a visit to the Duck Lake institution. I feel sure if he went there some provision would be made for better buildings in that location. The buildings there are not adequate for the work that is being done. They are out of date and getting out of repair in a great many ways. It was hoped that something would be done this year but I understand it is impossible to give the matter any attention just at present. I would like some assurance from the minister that this point will be kept in view for the future and that we may look forward to something being done there.

Mr. TOLMIE: Can the minister tell the committee what is being done in the way of stimulating the Indians in the production of beef cattle on the plains?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Unfortunately the Indians on the plains have not as many cattle as they had ten or twelve years ago.

Mr. TOLMIE: Does the minister know the reason?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, but they had some very bad seasons, and for some reason or other they do not appear to have as many cattle as they formerly had. I think we should endeavour to change that condition. Instructions are given to the farm instructors and agents on the reserves to encourage as much as possible the production of live stock, because it seems to me we should not have to buy beef to maintain the Indians upon the plains. We should not have to furnish beef particularly to bands located where there is plenty of grass in a good grass country. The Indian can very well be taught to take care of his stock. He is perhaps improvident and all the rest of it, but it is part of the business of the agent and farm instructor located on the reserve to assist him in that respect.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is the government doing anything to improve the quality of cattle? What is the government doing in the way of providing winter feed, hay and so on? Is the pit silo used in that country at all?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, we have not had to resort to a pit silo. The Blood reserves in the West have always had plenty of grass and hay to maintain stock during the winter. Indeed they have sold great quantities of hay during the winter, instead of having the stock consume it. But every year it has been the policy of the department to purchase pure-bred bulls for distribution on these reserves where they are required.

Mr. TOLMIE: What prices has the government to pay in the purchase of these bulls?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have to buy them in competition at the sales.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is no limit as to price.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have to pay what the other buyers have to pay.

Mr. FORKE: Will the minister explain that item of $8,145 for the Sioux indians? Nothing is stated except the word "Sioux".

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is a large number of small items. However I may say in reply to my hon. friend for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) that we have had many representations made with regard to the Duck Lake school. We know it is in rather a serious condition, but it will probably take ten years to catch up with the construction and improvement of the various schools throughout Canada for Indian education, and we will attend to those just as fast as we can afford to do so.

In reply to my hon. friend for Brandon (Mr. Forke) I would say that the estimate of $8,145 is made up as follows: the Birtle agency got $15 worth of flour, $30 worth of bacon, $10 worth of tea, $1 worth of rice, $1 worth of rolled oats, and medical attendance $75. The Portage la Prairie agency got $30 worth of bacon, $12 worth of flour, $10 worth of tea, $2 worth of rice, medical attendance $200, medicine $150, and $50 was given to relieve unforeseen cases of destitution. The salary of the constable at the Sioux village was $60. Then the Griswold agency item is made up in the same way.

Mr. FORKE: The Sioux Indians are not treaty Indians. They are only getting this as a grant, I think, from the government. I think that grant of $8,000 will probably cover a good deal more than 1,000 Indians. You can figure out how much is coming to an Indian from the government when you consider it in that light. It will be understood that there is no treaty money paid to those Indians, and this is all they get. I think it is therefore plain why the condition of these Indians is such as it is to-day. The government practically does nothing for them. They supply the agent and that is all. The flour and feed that is handed out amounts to nothing. Although they are not treaty Indians, they have lived for 60 years in Manitoba, and I think they are entitled to just about the same treatment as the other Indians in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know that they get any different treatment from the Indians on the plains.

Mr. FORKE: Do the Saskatchewan Indians not get anything in the way of treaty money?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Five dollars a head.

Mr. FORKE: The Manitoba Indians do not get that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Sioux Indians.

Mr. FORKE: No, I do not think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister read an item for medical services. Is it a fact that the appointment of doctors for the reserves has been taken away from the Civil Service Commission and is once more under patronage?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not that I know of. There has been no change, so far as I know. If a medical officer is appointed permanently, he is appointed by the Civil Service Commission, but, as formerly, where it is a case only of payment for attendance by the doctor residing in the village, he is paid for the visit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the case at Portage la Prairie? Which class does he come under?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He is not a permanent official. He gets $200 and his fees.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So that he is under patronage?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, I suppose he is under patronage, if that is the definition of it. But I may tell my hon. friend that that would not be the definition I should place upon it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It very distinctly applies—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me ask my hon. friend this question: If it were necessary to appoint a permanent official he would be appointed by the Civil Service Commission, but if it is not necessary to appoint a permanent official and he is simply paid for his visits, does that indicate that there is patronage?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I was just going to indicate why it was patronage. The minister has fired the incumbent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At Portage la Prairie?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was not aware of that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and he has appointed another. The incumbent who was there was one of the leading physicians of the town. He was a married man with a family and his two partners were returned soldiers. They had been partners for some time and are still, and the minister has appointed in the place of this man a gentleman who had no connection with the militia or war in his life, so far as I know, nor has he any partner who has had such a connection. In other words, the minister has virtually taken the position from returned soldiers. Of course, he has given it to a leading Liberal, and if such a man could be called eminent the adjective might apply. That is the indication of patronage.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is the present incumbent not a medical man?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, he is a medical man. I did not dispute the fact of his being

a medical man; indeed, I said that he was in a leading position so far as Liberal medical men are concerned.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Then the implication is that a Liberal could not be eminent?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I am not saying that at all. What I am complaining of is that the minister by the exercise of patronage has taken the advantage of the work from men who were entitled to it under what is supposed to be government policy, or at least is alleged to be such, of giving the preference to returned men. That is what I complain of. Does the minister think that is right? If so, on whose recommendation was it done? Perhaps I should apologize for asking any question about Portage la Prairie.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was going to ask the hon. gentleman if he was speaking on behalf of the people of Portage la Prairie or on behalf of the representative of the district.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am speaking for the public, the great people. Will the minister let me know why that was done and on whose recommendation.

Mr. FORKE: I would suggest that we send for the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader).

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot answer my hon. friend because apparently any changes of this character must of necessity, in the opinion of hon. gentlemen, be changes brought about by patronage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It looks like it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say to my hon. friend however that there was good and sufficient reason for the change, although I have no recollection now of its having been made. Undoubtedly I am responsible for it. but I cannot give any information in regard to the matter because I do not now recollect how it came about. It is very evident, of course, that it was not brought about at the request of my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Perhaps the other representative asked for the change?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do the minister's officials not know any reason why a medical man who was giving good service was dismissed?

Mr. McBRIDE: I might say a word in connection with a medical man appointed in my district.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had better get through with this one first.

Mr. McBRIDE: I might inform the committee that one of my strongest opponents, a lifelong Conservative, was appointed and no one had any objection to offer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister not ascertain any reasons at all for the change that was made in this case? Are we not entitled to know whether or not the public interest was considered in the matter, or whether the change was made from purely party interest? What is the House for if the minister can simply say he does not know and no one else knows? That does not help us very much.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All I can say is that I have not been in the habit of dismissing people for partisan purposes. I have no recollection of how the change came about, although I assume that I knew all about it at the time. I assume also that the Indians are getting the same kind of service now that they got in the past. I do not think it is incumbent upon me to give further reasons.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about the returned soldier phase of the question? Does not that appeal to the minister?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Almost in every case, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why not in this case?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have already told my hon. friend that I have no recollection of the change having been made, but no doubt it was quite in order and proper. If it was not, why, I have no information to give about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why the minister qualifies his remarks with the phrase, "no doubt." Has his deputy no recollection of the change at all? I can scarcely think he has not. I think the change was wrong. I do not want to be understood as complaining about the medical qualifications of the new appointee; not at all. But if the government really consider the returned soldier in matters of this kind, they should not have made that change; and in any event, when they made the change they should have made it so that a returned soldier would get the benefit.

Mr. JACOBS: It might be consoling to the leader of the Opposition to know that firing good men seems to have been epidemic in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. GOULD: Can we ascertain from the figures given by the minister regarding the total productions of reservations during the past year, which reserve showed the best returns? Are the various amounts given separately? I have in mind the White Bear reserve in my own district, and it seems to me that these Indians should be given better school facilities on the principle laid down by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox). Last year I believe the minister did make visits to many reservations throughout the western country, but I find that the White Bear reservation was passed over. He did not honour that reservation with a visit. There are many things there not altogether connected with the Indians that might come under the department. There are three or four questions correlated to the Indian reservations, such as pleasure resorts and so on, which the department might consider. I might state that on that reservation the Indians have, in my opinion, facilities for production which are better than can be found on the average reservation. They have an open area for the growing of cereals as well as a bush which provides pasturage facilities for the raising of cattle, an industry which the Indians go in for extensively in that locality. The public make one complaint particularly in regard to that reservation. There are large sloughs on which there are vast quantities of hay, but outside of that area there is very little. The white people, when the Indians do not show any desire to put the hay up, endeavour to rent these hay areas from them, but in all cases they have been refused, with the result that hundreds of tons of hay are frozen each year in these sloughs. I do not know whether the minister has any jurisdiction in this matter, or whether the agent is wholly responsible. However, I rose merely to say a word for these Indians. I think it would be found, if the various returns were segregated, that per capita the White Bear reserve stands well to the head of the list in the matter of production; and when Indians show such a state of progress I think they should be given greater consideration in the way of school facilities than is evident now in the quality of the buildings that are to be found on that reservation. While I am about it I wish to extend to the minister a hearty invitation to come this summer and pay this reservation a visit.

Mr. KNOX: Is there any expenditure on what is known as the Round Plain band of Sioux Indians north of Prince Albert?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have an expenditure in the Carleton agency of $552 in respect of that particular band.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister contemplate any reorganization of his department in the West? Has he in mind any change of status of any of the inspectors out there?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not at the moment. The inspectors appear to be doing good work. I speak particularly of the two who operate from Regina. I think some change might be made which would be beneficial to the service, but I have not arrived at a definite conclusion about it yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to say this, and it has to do with what the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) impressed upon the minister a few moments ago in relation to the improvement and the multiplication of cattle upon the reserves and the general farming success of the Indians. Every thing, or nearly everything, depends upon the efficiency, energy and fidelity of the agent. Our Indian agents are appointed by the Civil Service Commission, and I think, taken all through, the commission are as likely to get efficient agents as the minister would be if the appointments were made in his hands—in fact more so. They are just as liable to make a mistake—no more so; but they are not subject to the same pressure to apponit some one who is not efficient. But unless there is an official of extraordinary competence, and not only a good judge of the success or failure of an agent, but with the backbone to see that the agent does his work or, if not, to recommend to the minister that his services be dispensed with, there will not be any multiplication of Indian stock and there will not be any improvement of Indian farming. I have in mind, of course Mr. Graham. I learned to know something of the actual work of Mr. Graham in that regard, and the minister is very fortunate indeed in having a man who has the mastery over agencies that Mr. Graham has. An agent who fails should be discharged, because a whole lot results from his failure, and consequently there should be no principle of mercy whatever in dealing with him.

An agent ought to succeed or he ought to be discharged. The minister himself cannot, nor can a deputy or anyone else in Ottawa, be a correct judge of the work of an agent. You can tell a lot, I know, from the reports sent here, but it is only by being in constant touch with the reserves themselves

that the quality of the agent's work can be gauged. This work is under observation from month to month and from year to year by the inspector, and the agent is aware of this and knows the inspector is going to visit him. Unless that is the case there is likely to be lassitude and lethargy on the part of the agent and poor results will follow. That is the suggestion I make to the minister.

He states there has been a diminution of Indian stock in the last ten years. I believe that is correct. But what I think is also correct is that up to the time the jurisdiction of Mr. Graham was extended, about five or six years ago, the diminution had gone on pretty rapidly. In certain agencies where effective men were in charge, and as the drones were one by one moved away and better men put in their places, there was an improvement in cattle production. I do not know what the result has been this last year or two. I would not think the improvement had continued, because, as everyone knows, there has been a general diminution of stock all over the West, and the Indians may have had the same experience as others; the depression may have operated among them with the same result as it has operated among the white people. But, subject to that consideration, there was an improvement for some little time, and the minister will never be able to continue the improvement or advance upon it unless he succeeds in weeding out poor agents and getting efficient men in their stead.

Item agreed to.

British Columbia, $269,850.

Mr. MacKELVIE: What has been done regarding the appointment of an inspector of agencies in southern British Columbia to succeed the late Major McGraw?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is still before the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MacKELVIE: And Kamloops?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The same.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the explanation of the increase of $2,730?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Statutory increases of salaries to the officials.

Mr. LADNER: How many Indians are at present in jail on account of pot-latching?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed there are not any.

Mr. LADNER: I saw by the press a few days ago that Magistrate Halliday of Alert Bay had sent down some Indians.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil: We have no report.

Item agreed to.

General, $147,500.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know whether under this item I can ask the minister respecting the sensational reports that appeared in the newspapers a few days ago regarding the expulsion of certain halfbreeds from Caughnawaga reserve near Montreal. It was reported that some of these people who had been living for a considerable time on the reserve were expelled without notice and were becoming public charges on the adjoining municipalities.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have rather a lengthy report on this matter. The purport of it is that a white man married a native woman on the reserve, and an arrangement was made with the Indian father-in-law under which the white man undertook to maintain him in return for a lease of his holding. This arrangement the white man did not carry out to the satisfaction of the father-in-law, who wished to have the agreement cancelled. The outcome was that the council of the Caughnawaga Indians took action by resolution asking for the removal of the white man from the reserve, and in compliance with that request a constable was sent down to remove the man. In the meantime he disappeared across the boundary and unfortunately his wife and children, who by marriage forfeited their right to remain on the reserve, had to be ejected at the request of the council. That is all that happened; there was nothing sensational about it. It was merely carrying out the request of the council itself. There is no intention of going any further with the matter or of removing anybody else.

Mr. JACOBS: The newspaper report was highly sensational; it stated that about 2,000 people were ejected by this expulsion.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I notice in this item the sum of $50,000, payments to Indians surrendering their lands under certain provisions of the Indian Act. In connection with the St. Regis reservation, certain islands in the river St. Lawrence were held under long-term leases, which in the last few years have expired. What islands are there in the St. Lawrence near the St. Regis reservation the leases of which have expired, and what is the policy of the department in that connection?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This question is before the courts for decision and in the meanwhile we cannot give a very direct reply.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): What islands are involved in the controversy?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not that information, but we shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend and send it to him to-morrow.

Item agreed to.

Indians—Indian education, $1,943,702.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister explain the increase of over half a million dollars?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This appropriation is for buildings, and includes the following: new school building at Edmonton, $145,000; Blood reserve, residential school, conducted under the auspices of the Church of England, to be rebuilt at a cost of $125,000. Coqualeetza industrial school, improvements, $115,000. This institution has had a most successful career under the auspices of the Methodist church; it enjoys popularity among the Protestant Indians in British Columbia. Keeseekouse, a Roman Catholic school which has been closed for some years is to be reopened at an expenditure of $40,000. We are spending on St. Mary's mission school, British Columbia, $20,000. Birtle school, at Birtle, Manitoba, new wing, $15,000; Cross Lake, northern Manitoba, addition to main building, $10,000; Portage la Prairie, additions to main building, $5,000. We are also constructing barns at a number of the schools. There are also two items, one of $35,000 and one of $27,000, with which it is proposed to purchase, from the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian churches, two Indian residential schools in Saskatchewan. These buildings are adequately equipped and modern in every respect.

Mr. MANION: The minister spoke of a school being reopened. How did the Indians get along without that school, and why is it that just at the present time it requires to be opened? I am only asking for information.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There have been a number of cases in which day schools have been found to be entirely ineffective because you could not get an attendance. That applies in connection with the reopening of this particular school. The department attempted to carry on the educational work on some of these reserves by day school, but it was found that proper results could not be obtained except by the boarding school method.

Mr. MANION: The teachers are mostly white girls and men, are they not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. They are practically all qualified teachers.

Mr. MANION: Some of the Indians have taken teachers' courses and are teaching in the schools?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Some in Ontario, but none in the West.

Mr. MANION: The cost of building materials is now from 60 to 70 per cent in excess of pre-war prices. There is no doubt that within the next two or three years these prices will drop very considerably. In many parts of Canada both private and corporation building is being held up for that very reason, and I was wondering whether, by occupying other buildings temporarily for a time, there could not be a great saving to the country by not proceeding with these building operations just now. I do not suppose the prices will ever come down to a pre-war basis, but they will undoubtedly be reduced by 30 or 40 per cent in the next two or three years. It would be well worth while, I should think, for the minister and his department to consider holding these buildings up for the present, when costs are so very high.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have exactly the same ideas as my hon. friend, but this is an acute situation. I have pointed out to the committee that not since the beginning of the war have any improvements been made to any appreciable extent to any of these buildings. As to the building at Kamloops I am sure my hon. friend would not house his stock in the building there in which they are attempting to carry on educational work, and I think my hon. friend for Calgary will bear me out in that. I examined the building myself. Many of these appropriations that I am asking for so far as buildings are concerned are being asked for because the buildings are absolutely tumbling down. I have no reason to doubt the word received by letter from a good Catholic priest who is doing a splendid work in northern British Columbia when he declares that the building there will not stand for another year, that the work has been put off repeatedly and the school is likely to fall down upon them at any time. I did not see that building myself, but having seen some of the others I am willing to take his word for it. In the

case of Edmonton, the Red Deer school has been closed with the promise of a school at Edmonton, and we have to provide the accommodation. All these are cases of the utmost urgency or I would not have asked for these appropriations.

Mr. MANION: I quite understand the minister's position, and I do not doubt his word for a moment. I also quite understand that in some outlying sections, say in northern British Columbia, it may not be possible to get other quarters temporarily, but it would seem to me that in a large city like Edmonton it should not be very difficult to obtain temporary quarters in which to carry on until the prices of materials come down and the buildings could be built more cheaply. I do not intend to raise any further objection, but I would suggest to the minister that in the larger centres such as Edmonton, where no doubt temporary quarters could be obtained in which to carry on this school work, the department should postpone erecting buildings until prices reach something like a normal figure. I do not want to suggest, because a little while ago I was taking the part of the Indians in a general way, depriving them of the necessary education they require. I would be the last to do that, but I believe that under certain circumstances and in certain centres the same education might be given in temporary quarters until such time as prices reach a normal level.

Mr. McBRIDE: I have been engaged in the building supplies trade for twenty-five years and I can see no prospect of building material coming down. When you talk about building material coming down I say that expenses and taxes have got to come down first. In pre-war days my taxes at Vancouver were less than $1,100. Now they are over $12,000, and that has to be added to the cost of the material. That is only one item. Indeed I can see no chance of building material coming down.

Mr. MANION: I admit that what my hon. friend says about building material is true to a certain extent at any rate but wages are being paid to-day which are materially higher than we paid before the war and I hope for the sake of this country that even the cost of materials may come down and that at least wages will come down below one dollar an hour which is being paid to certain trades at the present time. I hope that will happen for the good of the country, and I think it will happen in the next few years. I have had the privilege recently of reading the opinions of men who have given this question life-long study, and it is their opinion and advice in the case of any large buildings involving a considerable expenditure to wait for prices to come down.

Mr. JACOBS: Change your immigration regulations and then I think you can go on with the work.

Mr. MANION: They are not mine.

Mr. WARNER: While I have sympathy with the position taken by my hon. friend for Fort William, I happen to know the conditions at Edmonton. It is almost impossible at the present time to get quarters for the white children in the city, and it would be impossible to get any quarters in the city of Edmonton for an Indian school. I believe that it would be the part of wisdom to postpone expenditure on buildings where temporary quarters could be obtained, but this cannot be done at Edmonton. They have carried on under such difficulties that I believe the department is justified in going ahead and building this school for the Indians who have been moved to Edmonton from the old Red Deer school.

Mr. JACOBS: Would the minister explain why the change is being made from Red Deer to Edmonton?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot give my hon. friend full information because it was done prior to my coming into office, but I am told that the reason was in part that Edmonton was more central, easier of access and better for the children.

Mr. JACOBS: I thought it was perhaps for the same reason that Sam Hughes ordered the arsenal to be brought from Quebec to Lindsay.

Item agreed to.

Indian Affairs—salaries, $149,380; contingencies, $19,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: Will the minister explain the increase in this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is made up purely of statutory increases. There is no change in the number of officials.

Item agreed to.

Further Supplementary Estimates, 1923—Department of Indian Affairs—salaries—

To provide for one Accountant, Grade 3, at $2,580 in lieu of one Accountant, Grade 2, at $2,460	$ 120 00
To provide for one Accountant, Grade 1, at $1,620, in lieu of one Senior Clerk-Book-keeper at $1,560	60 00
To provide for one Senior Clerk-Book-keeper at $1,380, in lieu of one Clerk-Book-keeper at $1,110	270 00
To provide for one Senior Law Clerk-Stenographer at $1,365, in lieu of one Law Clerk-Stenographer at $1,320	45 00
Contingencies—further amount required	1,000 00

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Are these permanent employees?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, they are nearly all temporaries. Increases are being provided by the Civil Service Commission as follows: $120, $60, $270 and $45.

Item agreed to.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Pensions—European War and Active Militia, $32,500,000.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): I suppose that hon. members would like to have a few statistics placed before them as to the number of pensioners and other matters.

Mr. MANION: May I interrupt the minister for a moment. I do not know whether my point will be well taken or not but this is one of the paramount questions before the country to-day. There is also the fact that a royal commission has been sitting and taking evidence in the matter of pensions, and its interim report has not been altogether favourable. I am just suggesting this to the minister in the interest of his own department, in the interest of publicity and in the interest of making the soldiers throughout the country understand the conditions: I suggest that he might hold this item over and make a statement regarding pensions—giving the statistics he wishes to give and explaining any regulations which may have been changed—before a larger House, and perhaps earlier in the day, when the discussion would receive a certain amount of publicity which it would not get to-night. I say that in the interest of the minister himself and of his department. I suggest that it would be well to hold up this item until we can get a report from the royal commission which is sitting. Would the minister mind telling me if he is expecting to have the final report of the royal commission shortly?

Mr. BELAND: The interim report of the commission was laid on the table some two or three weeks ago, and it deals with pensions and the Returned Soldiers Insurance Act. No feature of the Pension Act will be referred to in the final report whenever it is submitted. It is somewhat doubtful whether the commission will be in a position to submit that report before the session is over. What I consider to be the main portion of the commission's report—that is the part which bears upon pensions and returned soldiers insurance—is dealt with extensively in the report that has been brought down. I have no objection at all to postponing the consideration of this item, but may I point out that in consequence of the recommendations made by the commissioners regarding pensions and insurance, amendments to the Pension Act and to the Returned Soldiers Insurance Act will have to be introduced into this House before the end of the session. Then, of course, full opportunity will be given for hon. gentlemen to discuss the report. The estimate which is now submitted for consideration was prepared under the direction of the Board of Pension Commissioners for the year 1923-24. I hardly think this would be the proper occasion to discuss the Pension Act. The proper time, if I may be permitted to express the view, would be when the amendments to the Pension Act are introduced.

Mr. MANION: May I further interrupt the minister for a moment? I would agree with him to a certain extent except that when the amendments to the Pension Act are introduced it will probably be—so far as one can see now—towards the last of the session. Suppose the session should be over by the end of May; some of us think it may be over by that time.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. MANION: I am expressing my personal opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am too.

Mr. MANION: Suppose the session should be over by that time, then the amendments to the Pension Act would be brought in probably in the dying days of the session, as the favorite expression is, and would probably be rushed through in such a manner that there would not be an adequate opportunity for the discussion which may be desired upon this question. If the minister will look around he will see that the vast majority of the members are not present, and I do not suppose there is any member who does not wish to mention perhaps some particular suggestion regarding pensions—I should think at least, that one-half the members of the House may have some remarks to make upon the subject—and I would like to suggest to the minister, while I will not hold the item up otherwise—that it would be wise to delay this matter. After all, this is the item upon which members should discuss pensions in general—not the Pension Act but pensions in general. I would therefore suggest to him that he should hold the item over until there is a fuller attendance of members. I would remind him that there are a number of committees sitting to-night, notably the Banking and Commerce committee which is consider-

ing the Bank Act. This committee requires the attendance of a large number of members and will be sitting for some time yet.

Mr. RINFRET: It will probably sit until about the end of the session.

Mr. MANION: Possibly. A better opportunity for bringing this matter up would be earlier in the day when there is a much better attendance of members. I suggest that in all fairness to hon. gentlemen the minister would be well advised to hold this question over and in the meantime go on with some other item.

Mr. HUMPHREY: There has already been one report submitted by the commission appointed to investigate certain charges against the pension commissioners, and as that report has not yet been printed and circulated I would also respectfully urge the minister to hold this estimate over until those of us who desire to do so have had the opportunity of digesting it. Personally I would like to go into the report of the commission thoroughly with a view of bringing out certain suggestions regarding the vote that is before us tonight. I would respectfully urge the minister to defer this item as I am well aware there are many hon. members, some of whom are not now present, who wish to go into the question very fully.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should also like to join in the request which has been addressed to the minister. I have had resolutions forwarded to me by the Great War Veterans' Association in my own constituency relative to this matter and I cannot intelligently present their views until I have the report of the commission before me.

Mr. BELAND: I have not the remotest desire to curtail the discussion on the question of pensions. On the contrary I invite the fullest discussion, the fullest expression of opinion; I think it would be beneficial to the department generally. On the other hand if those hon. members who are now present take this opportunity of expressing their views it would occupy us until pretty late this evening. The only reason, I think, that can be invoked for not proceeding with the estimate at the present time is the fact that hon. members have not been able to peruse the report that has been laid on the Table, owing to its not having been printed and distributed yet. That will be done, I presume, within probably a week. I have no objection at all to holding this item over till later in the session. I am an old member of the House and hon. members may take my word for it that the nearer we get to the end of the session the less time is devoted to the discussion of questions which are of general interest to the members.

10 p.m.

Mr. MANION: The statement the minister has made gives exactly the reason that I desire to adjourn the discussion on this item because his proposition was that we should carry this item and then have the discussion on the amendment to the Pension Act, which will probably not come till later in the session. My suggestion would be—and I have no desire to hold up the item—that at the closing of the House on some particular day, the minister tell us that he will go on with this item the next time we are in Committee of Supply. The members who are attending the Banking and Commerce committee will be aware of the fact that the question of pensions is to come up on the following day, and if they do not choose to come in and discuss anything they wish to discuss, it is their responsibility.

Mr. BELAND: May I ask whether to-morrow would suit the hon. member?

Mr. MANION: It would suit me quite well.

Mr. SHAW: I want to join most heartily with those who are anxious to get the report of this special commission before discussing the pension matters. I have not seen an exact copy of the report, but I have seen little sections here and there. I think it is highly important that we should have that report in our hands and have an opportunity of perusing it before this particular item can be discussed intelligently, and I would, therefore, suggest that the matter be left over until we have an opportunity of perusing that report.

Mr. BELAND: This is a reasonable request after all, and I hope the report will be distributed within ten days or possibly a week. As soon as members have had time to peruse it, we will submit the item for the consideration of this House. I would move that the consideration of this item be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

Item stands.

Marine Hospitals, including grants to institutions assisting sailors—further amount required, $20,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister give us an explanation of the item?

Mr. BELAND: This supplementary amount is required for the last fiscal year. The amount voted last year was $95,000. Hon. members will probably remember that, when we passed the main estimates of the Health department this session, we provided for an

amount of $115,000 for, I think, marine hospitals. We found that we were short about $20,000. The amount is made up of unpaid accounts, $10,000; salaries of port physicians, $5,200; and estimated amount of account for hospital treatment, etc., that will be used before March 31, $5.172. The reason for the additional amount is the increase in the number of vessels which call at the different ports and consequently the larger number of sick mariners who have had to be attended to, hospitalized and cared for. Referring only to the number of vessels which call at Grosse Isle, below Quebec, during the year 1922, we had 903 vessels calling there from foreign ports or from ports from another province, which means the same under the Shipping Act, and in the year previous only 709 vessels had called at that quarantine station. There is a difference of 200 at Grosse Isle. But all over the country the number of ships has increased, and that is the reason why $20,000 is required for the fiscal year just ended.

Mr. STEVENS: This has to do with the sick mariners dues?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. The amount of course is paid in to the Receiver General.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada—additional amount required, $2,000.

Mr. BELAND: This is a small amount required by the Board of Pension Commissioners for contingent expenses during the fiscal year.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—Unemployment Relief—further amount required to provide assistance to unemployed Pensioners and to their dependents in the amounts and under the conditions laid down by the Governor in Council in Order in Council P.C. 721, dated March 31, 1922, as amended by Order in Council P.C. 911, dated May 3, 1922, and amendments thereto; and to provide for salaries and other expenses of administering the provisions of said Orders in Council, $400,000.

Mr. MANION: Will the minister explain that item?

Mr. BELAND: This covers the relief that is extended to returned soldiers who come under the supervision of the department. In other words, it is relief extended to pensioners or disabled soldiers entitled to receive a pension. The amount is greatly reduced from the vote of the previous year. In 1921-22, $2,100,000 had been voted for the unemployment relief of disabled soldiers. Out of the appropriation, $1,764,000 in round figures was spent.

[Mr. Beland.]

In the year 1922-23, $500,000 was voted. As in the previous year, the amount was totally inadequate to meet the situation, and at the end of last session $150,000 was voted in the Supplementary Estimates. We find that $400,000 more will be required to cover the expenditure of the year ended 31st March last. In other words the total amount required will be $1,050,000. The amount actually expended is $1,019,000 a reduction over the previous year of about $740,000. I do not know whether the hon. member wants to know by unit the amount expended.

Mr. MANION: Yes, but there is another point. Has the minister any figures regarding the number of soldiers who were unemployed during the past winter as compared with the year before? I know that the number was smaller because there was less unemployment generally.

Mr. BELAND: For the year 1921-22 the total number of times men were granted relief was 132,597; in 1922-23 it was 71,175, a considerable reduction. Giving round numbers, the amount spent in Montreal for 1922-23 was $191,000; Halifax, $57,000; Ottawa, which is a unit, $38,000; Toronto, $427,000; London, Ontario, $20,000; Winnipeg, $73,000; Regina, $18,000; Calgary, $43,000; Vancouver, $101,000; St. John, which is a sub-unit, $25,000.

Mr. MANION: Has the minister any figures in that connection for Port Arthur or Fort William?

Mr. BELAND: I have not those details; they are included in Winnipeg unit, $73,000.

Mr. MANION: As a matter of fact, I do not think there was any expenditure there, but I wanted to find out definitely. I may be wrong, but I do not think there was any expenditure.

Mr. BELAND: I am ready to accept my hon. friend's word.

Mr. MANION: The minister did not give me the number of men who were unemployed during the past winter.

Mr. BELAND: The figures I have would apply only to disabled pensioners. I have given the total original issues of relief.

Mr. MANION: The minister, I take it, has not the figures in reference to the unemployed soldiers who were not disabled.

Mr. BELAND: No, I have not got that.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Did I understand the minister to say that a little over half a million was spent last year for relief?

Mr. BELAND: I said $1,019,000; that was for the year just ended March 31st.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What proportion of that went for administration?

Mr. BELAND: In round numbers, $55,000. I may point out that all the men employed in the extension of this unemployment relief are returned men, mostly disabled. This is the way in which we extend the relief; we employ the men.

Mr. STEVENS: Does this item include the assistance given to the Red Cross Society? There is a place in Vancouver where provision is made for a number of disabled soldiers. Does this item include a grant to that institution?

Mr. BELAND: The hon. member is referring to the workshops?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: No; that matter was provided for in the Main Estimates.

Mr. MANION: Did the item of nearly a million dollars in the Main Estimates carry? This is a supplementary estimate.

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is being done by the government in the way of securing employment for returned men? I know that in British Columbia during the past winter a large number of disabled returned men were out of employment and some of the newspapers found it necessary to put on a campaign for the purpose of securing work for them. The campaign was fairly successful and it showed what can be done in that direction. In former years under the previous government I believe that the minister's department took active steps in this connection and did endeavour to secure employment for returned men, particularly those who were disabled. Is the present government continuing that work, and if so, what is it doing?

Mr. BELAND: Up to a recent date employment was secured for disabled soldiers through our own offices in every unit in Vancouver, Calgary, Regina, Winnipeg, London, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Halifax, and St. John. We have decided to hand over this section of our work to the government employment bureau in every province. At present in British Columbia, which perhaps interests my hon. friend more than any other province, the provincial employment office has a handicap section whose duties consist in procuring employment exclusively for disabled soldiers who make application there. From that handicap section a man goes out and covers the ground as completely as possible with a view to finding a job that will fit in with the disability of the particular applicant. This we think works more satisfactorily than the previous system because naturally the employers would place their request for labour in the employment office of the province; and each province is willing to have a handicap section in its midst. Every job is first of all offered to disabled soldiers. If a disabled soldier is qualified to take the position, he is of course awarded it. We make it a point to give the preference to returned men. This I think works out quite satisfactorily.

Mr. BOYS: This vote takes care of the situation to the 31st March last?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: Have there been any requests for relief since that date?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. It is covered in the Main Estimates, but there is a decrease of $150,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What do the two orders in council refer to?

Mr. BELAND: These orders in council were passed last year, one to extend the relief in the month of April, and the other in the month of May. The relief ceased during the summer months.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does the Dominion government contribute to the expense of keeping up the provincial employment offices?

Mr. BELAND: That is mainly a question for the Minister of Labour to answer, but I think I am within the mark when I say that 50 per cent is contributed for the upkeep of these offices. As far as the handicap section is concerned, we as a department pay the whole cost.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What supervision has the Dominion government over the employment officers of the province to see whether they are carrying out their duties satisfactorily?

Mr. BELAND: In every unit we have special officials to attend to this supervision. I am not able to speak for the Labour department, but I presume they have their representatives also in every capital.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is meant by every unit?

Mr. BELAND: The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment has a unit in most of our important cities, including Vancouver, Calgary, Regina, Winnipeg, London, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax, and sub units at Victoria and St. John, N.B.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does the minister get reports from these units?

Mr. BELAND: By all means, and very often, too.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Are these reports available?

Mr. BELAND: Any public document is available for any hon. member. All he has to do is to make a motion for its production. If my hon. friend wants to see these reports, and will go to the department, I am sure he will be afforded every facility for their inspection.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Civil Government—Health—salaries, $152,950; contingencies, $70,400.

Mr. MANION: What is the increase in this item?

Mr. BELAND: There is really no increase. It will be seen on referring to page 88 that there is a reduction of $600 in the contingencies. In civil government the increase is $5,642.50, made up as follows: Statutory increases $3,822.50; promotions and adjustments, $1,220; one temporary clerk—heretofore paid out of contingencies—now made permanent and paid from the civil government vote, $600. We have not one more employee in the department than we had last year.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What particular work is done by the department?

Mr. BELAND: I think my hon. friend must have been out of the House when I passed my main estimates. I then gave in detail the work of the department. We look after the supervision of all the quarantine stations, the medical inspection of immigrants, and the adminstration of the Food and Drugs Act, the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, the Housing Act, and we are engaged in other activities as well.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I notice that some of what the minister describes as statutory increases are increases of $240, $260, and in one case $360. Surely those are not statutory increases?

Mr. BELAND: We could not pay them any other way. I have no authority to grant an increase to any permanent employee in my department; he must be classified by the Civil Service Commission and receive the salary attaching to his position. I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend the details in each case, but I think the increase varies in proportion to salary. $240 is an ordinary statutory increase for a certain salary.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I think possibly I am right, Mr. Chairman, in thinking these increases are not statutory. I notice here one principal clerk at $2,400. This must be a promotion?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Some of these are promotions?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): The department is responsible for the promotions, but the Civil Service Commission is responsible for the statutory increases; is that the way it works out?

Mr. BELAND: No promotion can be granted an employee unless the Civil Service Commission vouches for it.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Exactly; but the department asks for it in the first place?

Mr. BELAND: I think the employee asks for it.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Does the employee get an increase when he asks for it?

Mr. BELAND: If an employee has been in the service for say, thirteen, fourteen or fifteen years, and at the age of forty, say, has reached his maximum of perhaps $1,600, and he asks to be promoted to a higher class, that is a legitimate ambition for any man in the service. Then if he qualifies to the satisfaction of the Civil Service Commission he is promoted to another class and gets a yearly increase until he reaches his maximum.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I notice that the statutory increase involves a certain relatively small sum each year, but promotion may involve anywhere from $200 to $300 or even more. I quite understand the minister's explanation, but is there any rule which the department follows under which an employee who has served a certain length of time is entitled to promotion if there is a vacancy in the class above?

Mr. BELAND: I do not know that there is any specific time. The deputy head would in such a case make a recommendation to the minister that a certain employee who had rendered faithful service and had been at his maximum salary for a number of years should be promoted. That is submitted to the commission, and if they approve they classify him accordingly and he gets the higher salary; if not, he remains where he is. I know of cases where civil servants have applied for promotion and the application has been refused.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Were any of these promotions made by transfer to the higher grades from other departments, that is, other than within the department itself?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Do I understand the minister to say that this department has charge of the Housing Act?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY: What are the duties of that branch at the present time?

Mr. BELAND: I have not the details before me; that explanation was given when the main estimates were under consideration. It is one of the smaller activities of the department.

Mr. ARTHURS: How many officials administer the Housing Act?

Mr. BELAND: I do not believe we have any outside the accountant.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What proportion of employees in the Health department are returned men?

Mr. BELAND: I am unable to say. The department, of course, comes under the Civil Service Commission. As my hon. friend is aware, under the Civil Service Act preference is given first to returned men, disabled men being given the first consideration. This rule, I think, is applied strictly to my department whenever we have an appointment to make, but very few appointments are being made at this time.

Item agreed to.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Atlantic ocean—Canada and Newfoundland, steam service or services between, $35,000.

Mr. GARDINER: I suggest that the minister allow this item to stand. Certain members are much interested in these matters and would like to discuss them; they were unaware that the minister's estimates would be brought forward to-night.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): It was intimated last evening that these estimates would come up to-day. I would like to make some progress: If there are any special matters that hon. members wish to discuss they can deal with them subsequently on items which we will hold over for the purpose. I imagine we will not get through them all to-night.

Mr. McBRIDE: I do not see why these items should be held over simply because certain members do not feel like attending here regularly. It is the duty of every member to be in the House when estimates come up.

Mr. CALDWELL: I believe the Banking and Commerce committee is sitting this evening, and a large number of members are in attendance. I just came from there myself.

Mr. STEVENS: There are no new items, are there?

Mr. ROBB: If we come to any new items they can stand.

Mr. STEVENS: I have looked over the first page and there do not appear to be any new items. If the minister will make an explanation of these, and, as is the custom, reserve an item so that any points that come up may be discussed later, that seems to me to be a reasonable way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. GARDINER: The committee could very well proceed with items 179 and following, "local services."

Item stands.

Local services—Charlottetown and Pictou, steam service between, $8,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: Steamship rates and all prices along that line have been falling during the last two years, but the government are apparently asking for the same sum this year at last. Is there no reduction in any of these items on this account?

Mr. ROBB: In most cases the amount is the same as last year. As a matter of fact, representations were made that in some cases the amount should be increased. With respect to this particular item, No. 179, I imagine we shall have to give an increase for that service. They lost some money last year, in fact they have been losing money for a number of years, and were going to discontinue the service.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is that true of all these services?

Mr. ROBB: No, very few of them.

Mr. ARTHURS: Are these various services under contract with the steamship companies at a specific sum?

Mr. ROBB: These local services that we have under consideration are under contract renewed from year to year and subject to the amount being voted by parliament.

Mr. ARTHURS: Does that apply to all these items?

Mr. ROBB: No, to some of these local items. These services are largely to provide transportation for Canadian citizens who have no railways to serve them, and it is very much cheaper for the country to provide this service than it would be to build railways for them.

Mr. BROWN: Does this include carrying the mails?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, the mails are carried free.

Mr. ARTHURS: The minister's previous remark would apply only to certain services, not to the Canada-New Zealand service, Prince Rupert and San Francisco, and so on. Are these also under contract from year to year?

Mr. ROBB: Those items are standing for further consideration.

Mr. ARTHURS: They are all under the same heading and I was just asking for information.

Mr. ROBB: Some of these contracts run for a number of years.

Item agreed to.

Grand Manan and the mainland, steam service between, $15,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: What is the population of Grand Manan approximately?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Are these steamships privately owned?

Mr. ROBB: Privately owned.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Can the government's boats not be used on any of these services?

Mr. ROBB: Not many of the government boats are suitable for these services.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What were the Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats built for? They do not seem suitable for anything.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is in part correct with regard to some of the smaller vessels. Some of them are hardly suitable for upper lake traffic or for coast traffic.

Answering my hon. friend for Parry Sound, I have not the figures but my recollection is that the population of these islands is about 7,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: My recollection is that it is very much under 4,000, and at that figure it would mean that we are paying $4 a head for this sevice, which to my mind seems excessive.

Mr. ROBB: Even if my hon friend is correct and there are only 4,000 Canadian citizens on these islands producing products, does he think the government should not provide transportation for them?

Mr. ARTHURS: I do not suggest that for a moment, but I think $15,000 is quite a large amount, and we have many places in Canada where there are 4,000 Canadian citizens who do not get as good a mail service.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister remarked just now that there were four or five thousand people in this particular district that required transportation. Does the minister mean to apply that same principle to the outlying parts of northern Ontario, Quebec and the Northwest Territories, where people are living fifty and sixty and one hundred miles from a railway?

Mr. ROBB: Generally speaking it has been the policy of governments in the past to provide transportation so far as possible for its citizens. These people are among the oldest settlers in Canada and are living in probably the oldest part of Canada. They are somewhat differently situated from people on the mainland. They live on islands or along the coast.

Mr. ARTHURS: Does the minister say that this amount is for the purpose of providing transportation facilities for these people? The estimate is for post office and mail service.

Mr. ROBB: These ships carry the mails free.

Mr. ARTHURS: Then this $15,000 is to provide transportation for these people on the island?

Mr. ROBB: For the transportation of their products and carrying the mails.

Mr. ARTHURS: In other words, as the minister says that they carry the mails free, this item is to provide transportation for these people back and forth to the mainland. How does that come under the Post Office Department?

Mr. ROBB: It is part of the contract that in addition to providing transportation for the products of the district the mails and a certain number of government officials shall be carried free.

Mr. ARTHURS: I cannot for the life of me see how an estimate should be required for the post office when the mails are being carried free, and I do not see why this amount should be asked for providing mail service for this particular district when other people in other districts have to go in some cases a hundred miles without any subsidy.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not mean to imply that these people should not be supplied with transportation facilities. I am satisfied that they should have some means of communication provided, but I maintain still that it is just as essential that people who are living, and have been for twenty or twenty-five years, from sixty to eighty miles from a railway should receive equal consideration. That is the point I desire to make.

Mr. ROBB: It is very reasonable.

Item agreed to.

Halifax and Newfoundland, via Cape Breton ports, steam service between, $5,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): How long have these services been going on?

Mr. ROBB: Many of them for a number of years. They are all voted from year to to year; that is the local services.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Have they been going on for twenty or thirty years?

Mr. ROBB: I could not say just how long.

Item agreed to.

Halifax and West Coast of Cape Breton, calling at wayports, steam service between, $6,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is there competition in the case of most of these services? Do the vessels belong to separate companies, or are they largely owned by one company?

Mr. ROBB: The service is performed by different companies although they have an interchange of business; it is arranged that that shall be done. Some of the vessels do not run through to the port of Halifax, others do not run through to Cape Breton, and they may have an interchange of trade so that the shipper can ship right through from one port to the other.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Has the minister any control over rates?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, the rates are subject to the approval of the minister.

Item agreed to.

Mainland and islands of Miscou and Shippegan, service between, $3,300.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I presume part of this money is paid for the carriage of mail alone.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Has the minister, or his department, ever made any estimate as to what would have to be paid for the carriage of mails alone, regardless of what is paid in the form of subsidy?

Mr. ROBB: I do not know that any such estimate has been made. In the case of some of the items I have a record of the amount of mail carried. When we come to one of them I will tell my hon. friend what that record is.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Yes that would give us an idea.

Item agreed to.

Mulgrave and Canso, steam service between, $13,500.

Mr. BANCROFT: This seems to be a large amount for a service across the strait between these two points?

Mr. ROBB: This service is from Mulgrave to Canso. There are certain deductions made when the vessel does not make the regular trips specified. Now here is a record in connection with this service. In 1914 they carried 3,724 bags of mail. In 1922 they carried 6,183 bags of mail.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this a daily service?

Mr. ROBB: A daily service.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The minister's answer, I think, is very satisfactory. It shows that quite an appreciable amount of the subsidy would have been paid for the carriage of mail if paid on that basis.

Item agreed to.

Mulgrave and Guysboro, calling at intermediate ports, steam service between, $9,500.

Mr. ROBB: This service indicates that we have been carrying all along from 1,783 to 3,000 bags of mail.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Who owns the boat?

Mr. ROBB: The Elaine Steamship Company, Limited, of Halifax.

Mr. BOYS: On what basis is the subsidy granted, on a basis of so much per mile per trip?

Mr. ROBB: On a basis of so much a season with a penalty clause. If they do not make the number of trips specified they are penalized.

Mr. BOYS: I mean comparing one service with another. The vote for one service is $9,000, on another $8,000, on another $6,000 and so on.

Mr. ROBB: The services are arranged on a basis of getting the work done as cheaply as we can. The same contractors have been doing this work for a period of years; it is very seldom there is a change. Sometimes the contractor fails and we have to advertise for new tenders, or make the best arrangement possible in order to provide a service.

Mr. BOYS: Are the contracts for a period of years or yearly?

Mr. ROBB: These contracts are all signed each year and are subject to the vote of parliament.

Item agreed to.

Pelee Island and the mainland, steam service between, $11,000.

Mr. BOYS: There ought to be lots of traffic there?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, there is some traffic there.

Mr. BOYS: That is where most of the Ontario native wine comes from, is it not?

Mr. ROBB: I am told it is very good wine.

Mr. BOYS: Oh, excellent.

Item agreed to.

Pictou, New Glasgow and Antigonish county ports schooner service between, $1,500.

Mr. CHURCH: I understand that these vessels which get subsidies from the Dominion are privately owned and that there is no control over the rates which they charge. In view of the evidence which has been brought out before the commis-
11 p.m. sion which was inquiring into matters of shipping on the Great Lakes, is it the intention of the government to have these services and the rates charged by them placed under the control of the Railway Commission?

Mr. ROBB: In view of the subsidy granted by the government the contract provides that the rates charged shall be subject to the approval of the minister and the mails are carried free.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Boys.]

Port Mulgrave, St. Peter's, Irish Cove and Marble Mountain, and other ports on the Bras d'Or lakes, steam service between, $8,000.

Mr. CHURCH: Is it the intention of the government to do anything towards regulating the rates on water-borne traffic in the way of controlling passenger and freight rates on boats that receive a subsidy from the government? I think they should be under the control of some public body, such as the Railway Commission. Of course the boats running from Toronto to Niagara which charge such high rates for freight and passengers do not get a subsidy I admit, but other boats do receive a subsidy and I think there should be some control over boats doing government work, and even over boats not doing government work. There should be some public control over the freight and passenger rates of these ships but at present there is no control. An inquiry has been held recently in regard to the rates on the Great Lakes and it shows that the companies have been getting together and fixing rates and that a huge monopoly exists. I think the boats on the gulf and Atlantic coast that receive a subsidy should be under the control of some public body in regard to their rates; in fact whether they get a subsidy or not, I think their rates should be controlled. The time has come to place them under some control, so that the public shall not be held up by the high rates, both freight and passenger, charged to-day not only by the boats that receive subsidies but by those that do not. It might not be in the department of the minister who is in charge of these estimates but he might let us know what the government intends to do regarding this monopoly.

Mr. ROBB: There is some force in the argument of my hon. friend, but that matter comes under another department. We control the rates on the subsidized lines, and the other lines are not now under consideration.

Item agreed to.

Pictou, Souris and the Magdalen islands, steam service between, $24,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: How many boats are employed on this line?

Mr. ROBB: The contractor for this service is the Magdalen Transport Limited. The contract was entered into in 1921, and runs from the opening of navigation in 1921 to the close of navigation in 1925, but this is one of the services that did not pay, and the contract was cancelled at the end of 1922 as the service did not comply with the tender and specifications. We invited tenders on the 16th March.

Three steamers offered for the service, but the inspector, Mr. Tupper, reported against one of the steamers as unsuitable for the service, and the other steamer was on another route, but we did the best we could for the people on the Magdalen islands. I might say right here that in addition to the subsidy voted by this parliament, these people also receive a subsidy from the province of Quebec. The Magdalen islands are 120 miles out in the gulf, and there are, I think, nine or ten thousand inhabitants, largely fishermen, their product, of course being largely fish. The best we could do for them this year was to make arrangements with the former contractors to carry on for this season. Advertisements are now out inviting tenders for a new service. We are advertising for two services, one from Pictou to Magdalen islands, and one from Magdalen islands up to the port of Quebec, and when the tenders are in the department we will consider which of the services will be the most economical and of the greatest advantage to the people of the Magdalen islands, because, after all, they are the people we want to serve. I might say in passing that I recall one year, I think the year before last, when the government was compelled to send a special boat there to take in supplies to carry the people over the winter; otherwise they would have been out of flour and provisions.

Mr. BANCROFT: It is not the intention of the department to maintain the two services?

Mr. ROBB: No, we will decide which will be the better, after consultation with the people of the Magdalen islands.

Item agreed to.

Quebec, Natashquam and Harrington, and other ports on the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, steam service between, $85,000.

Mr. BOYS: This item is increasing rapidly. I have been looking at the estimates for the preceding years, and I notice that in 1921-22 the amount was $50,000 and I see now that it is $85,000. What reason is there for that very large increase?

Mr. ROBB: The service was extended down much further, I forget the mileage. I think it went down 80 or 90 miles further, almost to the point.

Mr. BOYS: Quite a different service?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, and the only way we were able to secure this service was by giving them a contract for a period of years. There is a development along there of lumber mills and pulp mills, and the people require provisions. Prior to this service they were served at the lower point from the island of Newfoundland and now the business comes up this way.

Mr. CHURCH: Does the minister intend to extend the subsidy policy for water-borne traffic to the boats on the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes that might perform similar services for the Trade and Commerce department? I should say that this policy might be extended to the Great Lakes. At the present time there is a monopoly on the Great Lakes. All the small boats are frozen out, with the result that high freight and passenger rates are being charged, particularly for package freight. I think the department should extend the principle of granting subsidies on similar terms to boats on the Great Lakes. There are many people who would take advantage of the work the department is doing along that line. I think the department should do all they can to encourage water-borne traffic and thus obtain cheaper rates for carrying mail and everything else.

At present operating on the lakes is a steamship monopoly and it is working in with the railways. The people on the north shore of lake Ontario, between Toronto and Belleville, used to have water-borne traffic and the advantage of small boats going up and down, and they regulated railway rates for six months of the year. The same condition prevailed at Sarnia, at Owen Sound, at Oakville and in the Niagara district. A steamboat merger froze them all out and left those places at the mercy of the railways.

I think there should be equality of treatment and if the Maritime provinces are going to get the benefit of steamship subsidies, then Ontario and the Great Lakes and the other provinces in central Canada should have the benefit of them also. The people on the Great Lakes should be considered. In the United States to-day the principle of subsidies has been recognized, and has been applied on lakes Erie, Huron and Ontario. There is a boat coming into Toronto belonging to the Kirkwood line; that is run without a subsidy. They are carrying freight cheaply from the Maritime provinces up to Hamilton, Toronto, Cobourg and other places, and are conferring a great boon in regard to package freight on the wholesale and retail merchants who are getting cheaper rates from that Kirkwood liner. They are doing a great deal to benefit trade and commerce. There is a small boat running up to Toronto and these places I mentioned, and the retail man is able to get his goods on time, and is able

to get bargain freight rates as a result of dealing with this particular line. Many retail merchants are asking for this privilege and I hope the minister in the recess will look into it, and see if there is not some way of extending this very admirable system of steamship subsidies to many boats on the Great Lakes so as to enable them to regulate and bring down freight and passenger rates. Competition by water traffic is one of the most important factors in the problem of solving transportation in central Canada to-day, and I believe that we can extend this principle to the head of the lakes. It would confer a boon on the public generally.

Item agreed to.

Quebec or Montreal, and Gaspe and ports on the south shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, steam service between, $30,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): There are cases parallel to this in northern Alberta. There are large sections of the country there served by river steamers in the summer months, one company covering over three thousand miles. Are these companies entitled to the subsidy?

Mr. ROBB: I am aware that there are steamers plying in the North on the Mackenzie, but there is no record in the department of any request for a subsidy. We should have to be satisfied that any such request was reasonable, and if my hon. friend can give us that satisfaction we shall be glad to take the matter into consideration.

Item agreed to.

St. John and Bear river, and other wayports, steam service between, $2,000.

Mr. BOYS: This is a new service.

Mr. ROBB: It was established last year.

Mr. BOYS: There are one or two members who want to speak on this item.

Mr. ROBB: We will let it stand.

Mr. BOYS: I will ask that item 208 be allowed to stand too.

Item stands.

St. John and Digby, steam service between, $15,000.

Mr. GARDINER: There seems to be a duplication between this item and the next.

Mr. ROBB: The two items relate to diferent services. One goes to St. John and Digby and the other runs up to Annapolis and Grenville.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this the Canadian Pacific line between St. John and Digby?

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. ROBB: Yes, the contractors are the Dominion and Atlantic Railway Company.

Mr. MARTELL: Is this the subsidy for the boat that goes from St. John to Pictou along the Bay of Fundy and into the Minas basin to Windsor, in Hants county

Mr. ROBB: No, that is another item.

Item agreed to.

St. John and ports on the Bay of Fundy and Minas basin, steam service between, $8,000.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for Simcoe wishes to have this item stand.

Mr. MARTELL: I understand that this is the item that refers to the service between St. John and intermediate ports to Windsor. If so I should like to have a report from the minister as to how it has been performed. There has been some complaint from the merchants of Windsor and the people of that place that the service is not satisfactory.

Item stands.

St. John, Westport and Yarmouth and other way-basin, steam service between, $8,000.

Mr. CHURCH: Does this item come under the British North America Act? Is it a work for the general advantage of Canada? I think that the provinces should contribute in part to work of this local character. I am glad to see the Maritime provinces get all that they can because they deserve as adequate transportation facilities as can be provided them. At the same time, however, I think that the principle of subsidizing steamboats in the Maritime provinces should be extended throughout the country generally to the head of the lakes. It may be argued that this is work for the general advantage of Canada. If so, is it the intention of the government to extend it to Ontario, where there are many towns along the Great Lakes that have no railway facilities, and many flag stations? A steamboat service on the Great Lakes is one that is badly needed from the standpoint of coal supplies and from the point of view of the farming interests. Owing to the lack of proper transportation facilities the crops in these localities have to lie on the ground and the result is there is under-production, rural depopulation and unemployment, with consequent economic distress. It has been stated by transportation people that the cure for this condition in the central provinces is the extension of the principle of transportation by waterway which is nursed and provided in the Maritime provinces by federal subsidies. I have no objection to the subsidizing of these Maritime

province boats because they are necessary, but I think the government should look into the question as to whether the work is really for the general advantage of Canada. I think personally that the provinces should contribute something to it. This service is a necessity; it is not by any means a luxury; and if these subsidies are necessary in some of the provinces then undoubtedly the principle should be extended to Ontario and the Great Lakes as well. There are many towns on the north shore of lake Ontario and in central Ontario on the lakes which are dead simply because of the lack of transportation facilities. A few years ago they had a steamboat service but they were unable to continue. Boats used to cross lake Erie, lake Ontario and the Georgian bay to international ports and as well to various ports on the Great Lakes within our own border. But this service has been cut off, with a result that many towns have declined in population. I am not urging that there be any curtailment in respect of the Maritime provinces, but I think that the whole policy of cash grants to those provinces should be extended to the provinces of central Canada, especially for the benefit of those small towns along the Great Lakes that are now suffering because of the lack of water-borne facilities. Take Picton, in Prince Edward county, for example; this used to be a large steamboat town but this winter not a single ship wintered there. Because of lack of transportation facilities the farmers of Halton—Mr. Drury's own constituency—cannot get their crops to market. I am surprised my hon. friends of the Progressive party from the province of Ontario are not standing up and asking for equality of treatment for their province. No part of the Dominion is suffering so much from rural depopulation to-day as is the province of Ontario. Therefore I am urging on the government the extension of this policy to the other cities and towns on the Great Lakes. In the United States from Buffalo all the way down to Toledo and Detroit every community is served by water transportation, and I think we should adopt the same principle and extend it to the head of the lakes.

Mr. MacLAREN: Do not these services carry mails?

Mr. ROBB: The subsidized services.

Mr. MARTELL: This item is for a subsidy for boats carrying mails and general supplies from New Brunswick to Nova Scotia. Therefore it is in the interests of interprovincial trade, and I cannot see how the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) are applicable, much as I appreciate him. When my hon. friend asserts that the great province of Ontario is entitled to the same consideration as the Maritime provinces, I have no dispute with him; but if the people of the Maritimes, particularly the people of Nova Scotia, are to carry on trade they must of necessity get federal assistance.

Mr. CHURCH: If my hon. friend thinks I am objecting to this vote he is mistaken.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not saying that my hon. friend is objecting—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MARTELL: I am only making a plea from the standpoint of Nova Scotia, and in spite of all the cries of "carried" I will not be forced to take my seat until the Chairman declares me out of order. The other day an associate of my hon. friend's party in Nova Scotia—and I have no fault to find with that party, except to say that I disagree with its members and think they are usually wrong—moved in the legislature that Nova Scotia should secede from the Dominion. There are many people in the province who hold that view. The premier in moving an amendment said, "We are not anxious to secede, but we do demand lower tariffs, lower freight rates and greater facilities for trade." That is the platform on which I stand, and I want to tell the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Church), whom I regard as a great personal friend, that if that secession feeling is not to grow to an alarming extent we must of necessity get our just demands in Nova Scotia. I believe the object of these subsidies is to encourage interprovincial trade, at least in the Maritime provinces. Nova Scotia suffered by confederation more than any other province, and Ontario profited most; and as far as I am concerned, whether my political life be long or short, I shall raise my voice at all times and on all occasions to demand that proper treatment be accorded to Nova Scotia—that we be given lower tariffs, lower freight rates and the best possible terms that can be secured for any province under confederation.

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to correct my hon. friend for Hants (Mr. Martell) in the statement he made; it would not be right to let it go unchallenged. We had been patiently letting these items pass when he interjected his inaccurate observations. He stated that these were subventions for the promotion of interprovincial trade. Some of them are; most

of them are not. My hon. friend built up a very elaborate, picturesque and imaginary argument upon that hypothesis, which was wholly wrong and I merely wish to make this correction.

Item agreed to.

Inspection of subsidized steamship services, $4,500.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the reason for the increase of $500? A similar question was asked in regard to the increase of $6,000 on item 212, but the minister did not give an answer. Perhaps he will now furnish us this information on both items.

Mr. ROBB: The service between Sydney and Whycocomagh—item 212—was temporarily suspended owing to the old boat having foundered during the year, and we had to give an additional subsidy for a new steamer. The increase in item 214 is for the inspector of the steamship services.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Wednesday, April 25, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

VACANCY—NICOLET

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received notice that a vacancy has occurred in the representation in the House of Commons of the electoral district of Nicolet in the province of Quebec, the sitting member thereof, Arthur Trahan, Esquire, having accepted an office of emolument under the Crown. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ for the election of a member to the said electoral district.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

FOREST DESTRUCTION BY FUNGI AND INSECTS

Mr. LADNER:

1. Has the government any information relative to the amount of damage which is being caused in the forests of Canada and the industries related thereto; (a) by fungi; (b) by insects?
2. Does such information relate to the forests under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government and separately to the forests under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments?

[Mr. Stevens.]

3. If so, what is the nature of the information whether in reports or otherwise and does such information disclose damages in percentage of trees destroyed or the value of the same?
4. What steps, if any, are being taken to ascertain the extent of the losses due; (a) to fungi; (b) to insects?
5. Has the government any men on the scientific staff or in the departments engaged in the study of the causes and control of damage caused by fungi and insects generally and if so, how many?
6. How many men are engaged in the study of the causes and control of damage caused to forest trees; (a) by fungi; (b) by insects?
7. Does the government consider such a staff sufficient to cope with the loss to such a great natural resource as the forests of Canada?
8. Is it the intention of the government to extend the scientific study of the causes and control of damage and to take practical remedies for the preservation of the forests of Canada?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. (a) and (b). The government has a considerable amount of information with regard to insect injuries and fungi from many parts of the Canadian forest. This information has been collected by the division of Forest Insects of the Entomological branch and by the division of Botany of the experimental farms of the Department of Agriculture in co-operation with the Dominion Forestry branch of the Department of the Interior and the various provincial forest administrations.

2. This information relates to all Canadian forests wherever insects and fungous outbreaks develop and are studied.

3. Information on injury caused by forest insects has been published in several bulletins and circulars by the Entomological branch of the Department of Agriculture and further information will be found in the annual reports of the Dominion Entomologist.

Information on fungous injuries will be found in the reports of the Dominion Botanist for the years 1921 and 1922. Further detailed information concerning both these subjects is available in the files of the Department of Agriculture.

Records are kept of important forest insect and fungous outbreaks and detailed reports upon the injuries are prepared in all cases studied by our officers. These reports give the cause and course of the injury with its details and where possible the extent of the injury is determined, although accurate estimates of this kind are sometimes very difficult to obtain.

4. (a) The division of Botany of the Experimental Farms branch conduct field examinations of forest areas with a view to ascertaining the damage due to fungi and the most feasible means of control. Extensive surveys have been conducted in connection with the white pine blister rust in British Columbia and eastern Canada.

(b) In connection with all important forest insect outbreaks the officers of the division of Forest Insects in the Entomological branch conduct special forest insect surveys, often in co-operation with the dominion and provincial Forestry branches, in order to determine the cause and extent of the injuries. Extensive surveys of this kind have been made during the last two seasons in connection with the pine bark-beetle outbreaks in British Columbia and with the spruce budworm outbreaks in eastern Canada.

5. The Entomological branch has 39 permanent technical officers on the scientific staff and provision is being made for 55 temporary and seasonal assistants this season.

The division of Botany has 14 permanent technical officers and provision is being made for 33 permanent and temporary assistants this season. All these officers are engaged in the study of the causes and control of damage caused by fungi and insects generally.

6. (a) The division of botany employs one technically trained forest pathologist and in adition 6 temporary assistants are to be employed this summer.

(b) The division of forest insects in the Entomological branch employs 7 technically trained officers engaged solely in investigation of forest insects and their injuries and control. Five of these are stationed in eastern Canada and two in British Columbia. In addition these officers are assisted by permanent or seasonal assistants according to their need.

7. The government is fully aware of the fact that as far as forest pathology is concerned, considerably more work should be done, and is ever ready to give careful consideration to the representations made by the industries concerned in order to assist in the solution of these serious causes of losses to our forest resources.

8. The Entomological branch has extended its investigations of the dying balsam and spruce in eastern Canada, with a view to determining the cause and rate of deterioration of the dying and dead timber and the degree to which it can still be salvaged.

A great amount of work in connection with the natural control of spruce budworm by means of parasites bred and distributed from the entomological laboratory at Fredericton, N.B., has already been performed This work has now been placed directly under the charge of the division of forest insects. A report on past work in this connection has been practically completed and will shortly be published. A scheme of co-operation is also contemplated between the owners of some timber limits and the division of Botany whereby the services of trained forest pathologists will be available for the particular study of various diseases affecting balsam and spruce in the eastern forests.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT SALARIES, 1913-22

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What was the total expenditure for Civil government salaries for the fiscal years 1913, 1916, 1919, 1922, including any bonus to such Civil Servants?
2. How much was spent as above by each department?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

The information desired is covered by an order of the House made several days ago, and the return will be brought down in due course.

MR. JOHN CAMERON STUART

Mr. JONES:

1. When was Mr. Campbell Stewart appointed to his present position in the Department of Agriculture?
2. What salary did he receive when first appointed?
3. What salary is he in receipt of at the present time?
4. What are his duties and is his time fully occupied in the carrying out of said duties?
5. What amount, if any, has he received as travelling expenses each year since his appointment?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. No one by the name of Mr. Campbell Stewart is employed in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. John Cameron Stuart is employed as a district live stock promoter in the Live Stock branch, which classification he received April 1st, 1919.

2. Mr. Stuart's initial salary as District Live Stock Promoter was $1,920.

3. $2,160.

4. Organizing a system for the local marketing of live stock and live stock products in cities and towns throughout Ontario and Quebec; assisting in the drafting of municipal by-laws for the regulation of such marketing; attending meetings of farmers' organizations for the purpose of organizing the selling of farmers' produce at municipal markets; attending meetings in cities and towns of consumers' organizations is connection with the purchase of meats and other produce; compiling meat bulletins, particularly for the information of consumers; conducting special inquiries, under direction, regarding domestic marketing problems. Mr. Stuart's time is fully occupied in carrying out such duties.

5. 1919-20, $2,566.97; 1920-21, $3,417.78; 1921-22, $3,536.30; 1922-23, $3,256.40.

MR. LEONARD COOKE

Mr. JONES:

1. When was Mr. Leonard Cooke appointed to his present position in the Department of Agriculture?

2. What salary did he receive when first appointed?
3. What salary is he in receipt of at the present time?
4. What are his duties and is his time fully occupied in the carrying out of said duties?
5. What amount, if any, has he received as travelling expenses each year since his appointment?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Transferred to the Live Stock branch, July 1st, 1921.

2. $2,280.

3. $2,400.

4. Mr. Cooke's position is that of transportation specialist. In this capacity he has charge of preparing cases for live stock shippers and exporters in connection with applications for reduction in freight rates or improved service for presentation to the Canadian Freight Association or to the Board of Railway Commissioners. He arranges for informal interviews with railway officials for the purpose of securing improved rates and of eliminating delay in the transportation of live stock; he checks the accommodation provided by the railways in the way of cars and equipment in connection with the transportation of live stock to domestic markets or for export; he arranges for interviews with steamship companies for the reduction of ocean freight rates on live stock and live stock products; he supervises the movement of exhibition stock to and from our larger exhibitions; he answers numerous inquiries from live stock shippers re rates on live stock and checks rates charged; he addresses live stock meetings re transportation problems, and as a result of his work numerous resolutions have been received from various live stock associations commending in the highest possible terms the service that Mr. Cooke has rendered since the transportation service in the Dominion Live Stock branch was initiated. Mr. Cooke's time is fully occupied in carrying out said duties.

5. July 1, 1921 to March 31, 1922, $1,972.56; April 1, 1922 to March 1, 1923, $3,372.60.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. What are the salaries of the members of the Soldier Settlement Board?
2. (a) What other amounts have been paid to these officials for the years 1921-22 and 1922-23, and (b) for what were these amounts paid?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Major John Barnett, $7,000; Major E. J. Ashton, $5,000; Mr. S. Maber, $5,000.

2. (a) 1921-22: Major John Barnett, $1,049.24; Major E. J. Ashton, $795.40; Mr. S. Maber, $381.37. 1922-23: Major John Barnett, $744.29; Major E. J. Ashton, $2,292.28; Mr. S. Maber, $606.75. (b) For travelling expenses.

FINES UNDER INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. MAYBEE:

1. How much was collected in each province, in penalties, for violation of the Income Tax Act, each year since its imposition?
2. Is the Government prepared to consider a variation in penalties in connection with the Income Tax Act; (a) as between first offender and subsequent offenders; and (b) according to the duration of time the taxpayer is in default?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1.	1920	1921	1922	1923
Nova Scotia	$ 2,382 62	$ 7,758 02	$10,634 15	$12,542 38
New Brunswick	1,822 65	5,190 97	5,132 31	6,941 76
Quebec	4,457 75	28,714 86	24,332 39	25,603 02
Ontario	14,468 47	77,229 53	73,533 69	90,955 31
Manitoba	7,759 88	20,621 90	20,298 37	13,841 90
Saskatchewan	936 00	12,172 48	14,919 27	21,940 84
Alberta	1,082 73	12,936 24	11,871 97	10,687 51
British Columbia	1,959 87	13,775 36	15,899 36	19,015 39
Yukon	32 66	375 09	261 18	212 40

2. A revision of the penalty clauses in The Income War Tax Act is under consideration.

ARICHAT WHARF

Mr. HANSON:

1. What was the total cost of the repairs to the Arichat, Cape Breton, wharf (a) in 1921; (b) in 1922?
2. What amount of lumber was used?
3. What were the various sizes and dimensions of lumber used?
4. What was the cost for each size or dimension per thousand?
5. Who supplied the lumber in question?
6. What amount was paid to each party for lumber so supplied?
7. What was the total amount of money paid in wages, and at what rate?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. No repairs were made to the wharf at Arichat during the fiscal years 1921 and 1922.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 1.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

TORONTO SUBURBAN RAILWAY

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all orders in council, letters, agreements, telegrams, and other correspondence relating to the sale of the Toronto Suburban Railway or any part thereof by the government of Canada or the Canadian National Railways to the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario or the city of Toronto.

THE SINGLE TRANSFERABLE VOTE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): In view of the fact that the House, without a division, approved of the principle of transferable votes in single-member constituencies, is it the intention of the government to bring in a bill during the present session to carry that idea into effect?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I spoke of this matter the other day but I am afraid my hon. friend was not in the House at the time. I asked the chief electoral officer of the government to prepare an amendment to the Elections Act to meet what my hon. friend has in mind. I have received his report; I find it will involve the amending of a number of sections of the act as it stands. It is not the simple matter which my hon. friend imagines it is, of a clause or two; it will necessitate amending the existing act in many particulars. The government is not desirous of adding to the legislative programme of the present session by bringing the Elections Act into the House for purposes of amendment if no special immediate need for this appears on the surface. Under the circumstances, our present intention is to allow any amendments to the act to remain over until next session.

MR. DUNCAN MARSHALL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HARRIS: I would call the attention of the government to an article appearing in the Toronto Daily Star of Monday, April the 23rd, under the caption "Eager crowds watch emigrants depart." The article says in part:

Duncan Marshall, Chief of the Colonization department, came to see the party off.

The article declares also that a large number of people who purposed coming to this country changed their minds at the last moment. I might ask the government whether Mr. Duncan Marshall was on business of the department at Stornoway or has he been transferred to the Colonization department? When was such transfer made? Or is this a case where a disappointed politician is receiving just a little joy ride to Stornoway?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the first intimation I have had of any transfer of the kind.

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS REPORT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Does the government intend to have copies of the interim report of the special committee to inquire into Agricultural Conditions printed and placed in the hands of hon. members? This is a very important report and hon. members should have an opportunity of studying it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is printed in the Votes and Proceedings.

PRIVILEGE—MR. GOOD

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On the 1st of March my veracity was inferentially questioned by the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) who, in reference to myself spoke these words:

He quoted the Hon. Mr. Raney as his main authority, I would say to justify his resolution. I am not sure that I shall surprise the hon. member for Brant, but I may tell him this, that the Hon. Mr. Raney has never asked for any such amendment as the amendment my hon. friend now proposes to this House.

And a little further on:

Mr. Raney never asked that we should repeal section 2 of article 235 as the hon. member for Brant now proposes.

I had not at that time the definite information which would enable me to give a categorical denial of that unfair charge, but I wrote to Mr. Raney immediately afterwards—on the 3rd March. Unfortunately, owing to his illness, I did not secure permission from him to use his letter until a short time ago. I wish to read a paragraph of Mr. Raney's letter to me in reply, in which he says:

You stated the situation very fairly in your speech winding up the debate—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would remind the hon. member that under the rules it is not permissible to read a letter referring to the current debates of this House.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, all I have to say is that what I had intended to place on record emphatically and distinctly confirms my statement and proves beyond a shadow of doubt that I was speaking the truth when I stated Mr. Raney's position.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I regret I was not in my seat when my hon. friend rose. I simply said that I would perhaps surprise him when I declared that I had received a communication from the Attorney General of Ontario asking for a certain amendment which I would introduce. I never pretended that he was not speaking the truth in what he said to this House.

NATURALIZATION ACTS AMENDMENT

House again in Committee on Bill No. 85 to amend the Naturalization Acts 1914 and 1920, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the minister anything to report to the committee since this bill was before us on a former occasion? He was to consider whether he would not have the various naturalization acts consolidated.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): The suggestion made by my hon. friend for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) for the consolidation of our naturalization law was referred to the officials of the department. While many arguments might be advanced in favour of the consolidation of this and other legislation, owing to the fact that a very large number of forms have been already printed under the title of the present act, and would have to be scrapped if we proceeded with consolidation, involving a waste of something like $15,000 or $20,000, I do not think the advantage that would accrue from such consolidation would warrant this heavy loss, especially bearing in mind that the consolidation and revision of our Dominion statutes is under consideration and will be taken in hand within a very short time. Therefore it seems to me that we might very well defer the consolidation of our Naturalization law until the consolidation of our statutes generally is undertaken.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The reason given by my hon. friend for not bringing in a consolidated bill at the present session does not appeal to me as very important. I remember that two or three years ago the same reason was given by the Under Secretary of State in relation to this same act—I think it was in 1919 when we were down in the old Museum building. This very bill was brought up and the question of consolidation of our naturalization law was objected to then on the ground that a lot of forms would have to be scrapped; and I think the Under Secretary of State had had new forms printed on that occasion. That does not seem to me to be a very substantial reason for postponing an absolutely necessary work if we are to understand our naturalization law as we should understand it. My hon. friend says that the work of consolidation has been considered, and I think he says it will be undertaken. I suppose he means in connection with the revision of the Dominion statutes. That work has been going on for some time, and I think we might reasonably expect it to be completed within the present year at all events. Therefore would it not be well for my hon. friend to allow this bill to stand in the meantime? No great injury and no great inconvenience will be suffered in the next few months by allowing this bill to stand until this consolidation takes place. He will agree with me, I am sure, that what he proposes now is a very radical departure from the practice in the past in regard to naturalization. I am satisfied that a good many members will desire to discuss the question, and as the session is fairly well advanced now for a measure of this kind, I would suggest that it stand over until a consolidated bill can be brought in and passed.

Mr. COPP: I should like very much to agree to my hon. friend's suggestion if I thought it would be in the best interests of the country and parliament to do so. He will remember that this bill was introduced last session after strong requests, amounting almost to demands, from different portions of the Dominion that some changes should be made in the act generally as well as in the administration of it. Under the conditions then prevailing I felt that we would be justified in allowing the bill to stand over until this session, but now it has gone forth that these amendments would be re-introduced and considered I think we should proceed with the bill. The amendments are only two or three in number. I agree with my hon. friend that in one particular instance the change is in a way somewhat radical, but I am sure that if he will give his attention to these amendments —and I know his legal knowledge and ability will stand him in good stead in doing so—he will agree with me that they are desirable and will be of great advantage to all portions of the Dominion. After giving this matter my very best consideration, and after conferring with the officials of the department who have had charge of the administration of our Naturalization law long before 1914, I am confident that the suggested changes will be of very great advantage as affecting those who desire to become naturalized citizens of Canada. We open our doors to people from other lands; we give them to understand that our country is ready to receive them and that after residing in Canada a certain length of time they will be entitled to become natur-

alized Canadian citizens. So that with due inquiry as to their fitness, we should remove all annoying restrictions upon applications for naturalization. The suggestions I have made in this bill are of the simplest character and should, I am sure, meet with the approval of the committee.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Will the minister explain what the changes are?

Mr. COPP: I assume my hon. friend was not in the House the day before yesterday when I explained the proposed changes. I shall be glad, however, briefly to restate them. Prior to 1914 all applications for naturalization were made to the local judges of the courts in the different provinces. The application was presented to the court on the opening day and if no objection was made during the entire sitting of the court and the judge was satisfied that the applicant was a fit and proper person to become a Canadian citizen, the application was granted. In 1914 a change was made; it was provided that naturalization certificates should be issued, not by the judges of our courts, but by the State department. The applicant files his application with the clerk of the court, where it remains on file for three months. It is not published in any way; it may be hung in the clerk's office behind the door or the safe. At the end of three months, notice is supposed to be given to the applicant; he then appears before the court in person and the judge inquires into his qualifications for citizenship. Formerly the judge at this point had the decision in his own hands, but by the act of 1914, amended in 1920, it was provided that the judge should simply report to the Secretary of State whether he approved or disapproved of the application, and if the Secretary of State found the applicant to be a fit and proper subject for naturalization the certificate issued from the State department. My hon. friend, in discussing this matter the other day, suggested that it would be giving any minister very great power to leave wholly to him the decision whether or not applicants for naturalization should be given certificates. But by the present act, irrespective of the report made by the judges, irrespective of whether they approve or disapprove of the application, the Secretary of State has absolute discretion to say whether or not the application should be granted. In other words, I am taking no more power than we have under the present act, but I am asking that we do away with the provision under which a man's application is held up for three months while it is posted, perhaps, behind the door or elsewhere in the office of the clerk. I do not suggest for a moment that the clerk would secrete it purposely, but there is no publication given to it and there can be no advantage in holding the application up in this manner for three or four months. The committee will agree that upon careful inquiry being made into his qualifications, it is our duty to give to an applicant for naturalization a reasonable opportunity of becoming a citizen of Canada without undue delay and that, so long as we provide reasonable safeguards, we should remove as many stumbling blocks as we can from his path.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What investigation does the minister propose to substitute for the investigation that has been made by the county court judges? It is very necessary that someone should have the opportunity of coming in personal contact with the applicant. The minister says that the Secretary of State under the present law can issue a naturalization certificate irrespective of the report made by the county court judge. I suppose the minister would not suggest that the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary of State would completely disregard the report of the county court judge. I believe that we should give naturalization to proper persons, but we should also safeguard the right to become a naturalized British subject because that right carries with it certain privileges which later on may become troublesome. We have had cases of that in British Columbia. We have found that naturalization certificates were issued without proper investigation. That was previous to 1914, and we have found since that time that naturalized British subjects who were improperly naturalized are demanding and insisting on certain rights to which they claim they are entitled because of their citizenship. I say it would be a great mistake to grant naturalization in a purely formal manner, long-distance naturalization, as it were, naturalization granted here in Ottawa perhaps three thousand or more miles away from the person who is applying for naturalization. I think the strictest kind of investigation should be made, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that investigation should be made by county court judges; I think they are eminently proper persons to conduct the investigation, and that they perform their duties in a very conscientious manner. I think it would be a great mistake for the Secretary of State at Ottawa, whether the present incumbent of the office or anyone else, to grant naturalization without some kind of personal examination of the applicant by some person who is qualified to

make it. I ask the minister what is he going to substitute for the investigation which has been made in the past by the county court judges, or is he going to have it all done here at Ottawa by correspondence? Is he going to take the recommendation of someone who says that the applicant is a fit and proper person to become a naturalized citizen of this country, or is he going to have a proper investigation made to see that the applicant is really entitled and is a proper person to become naturalized?

Mr. GERMAN: All I know about this bill—

Mr. McQUARRIE: I should like an answer to my question.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, the minister will answer the question.

Mr. GERMAN: I quite agree with the minister that three months is quite too long a time for an application for naturalization to be held up in the office of the clerk of the county court. It really does not give the general public any notice that application is being made because the general public does not visit the office of the clerk of the county court. But I cannot agree at all with the minister when he suggests that the investigation should be taken out of the hands of the county court judge and placed in the hands of an officer of the Mounted Police. If the minister is impeaching the integrity and the wisdom of the judges who are appointed by the Dominion government I would like him to say so, but how any person can imagine that a member of the Mounted Police is more fitted to make an investigation as to the qualifications of a man to become naturalized than a county court judge I cannot possibly understand.

In our Niagara district we have very many foreigners from whom there is a continual stream of applications for naturalization. The notices are posted as the law requires, in the office of the clerk of the county court for three months. I say that is altogether too long, I cannot see the necessity for that length of time at all. What I would suggest is that a person who desires naturalization should go before a judge of the county court and be examined by him. The examination is not made in open court but in the judge's chambers. The applicant should submit himself to examination there, and if the judge of the county court reports to the Secretary of State that the man is entitled to naturalization, then he should become naturalized. That is a simple process, it is an inexpensive process, and it is a speedy process. If on the other hand you have the investigation made by officers of the department, though I am quite sure that an officer of the department would make a very thorough and proper investigation, the investigation would be expensive, and you can see the time that would be lost if notice has to be sent to Ottawa and an officer of the department sent up there at the expense of the country to examine the applicant. Why should that expense be incurred when you have a judge of the county court there who is eminently capable of making the examination, is entirely impartial, and can make the examination at once?

To talk about an examination by an officer of the Mounted Police I submit is absolutely absurd. It is wrong; it should not be allowed. It is not even to be made by the officers; it does not say "officers", it says by a member of the Mounted Police. I know that the Mounted Police is a very good force composed of good men, intelligent men, but they are not by their training or their position fitted to make such an examination as is required in this case. I think it would be a great mistake if the department takes this examination out of the hands of the county court judges, who are appointed by this government. Let them reduce the time, let the investigation be made at once by a judge of the county court. He will make an impartial report, an intelligent report, a report that will have the confidence of the people of this country.

Mr. COPP: In answer to my hon. friend for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) who asked what we proposed to substitute for the investigation that is now held by county court judges, I would say that we do not propose to substitute any investigation for the investigation that is now made by the judges. From the experience we have had since this act has been in operation, the report from the judge is of absolutely no use to the department.

Mr. BOYS: Why does the minister say that?

Mr. COPP: I will tell my hon. friend if he will have patience.

Mr. BOYS: I have seen a good many examinations take place in court, and they are very thorough and reliable.

Mr. COPP: I have too. I do not say that all the reports are not of some use. The act under which we are now working, the act passed in 1914, for which I am not responsible, provides that this investigation is to be held

by the judge. Now from the reports we receive, the investigation that is held by the judges is not of such a character that the department which is charged with the responsibility of issuing the certificate can act upon it.

Mr. MARTELL: Why?

Mr. COPP: First, because the judges are only supposed to hold a very cursory examination under the act. Second, during the first years of the operation of this act the judges were paid for doing this work, and at the present time they are not being paid for doing it. That takes away a very great deal of the interest that the judges—for they are only human after all—might otherwise have in making the investigation if the whole responsibility were upon them. The Judges' Act precludes the judges from being paid any remuneration for doing this work, and under the act they realize that their examination and investigation is only intended to be cursory, and the report that is made by the judges contains a few remarks, approved or disapproved.

I would draw the attention of my hon. friend for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys), and my hon. friend for Welland (Mr. German) to this, that irrespective of the judge's report the same investigation has to be carried on by the department under the act. I appreciate the views my hon. friend holds and, to some extent, sympathize with him, because when this matter was first brought to my attention I thought it was a very proper thing to continue the investigation by the judge; but having had fifteen or sixteen months' experience in the administration of the act I find this procedure to be an absolute waste of time and of money. When the report comes from the judge we have to make a specific inquiry into the character and standing of the person who had applied for naturalization. What do we do? We first apply to the Department of Immigration and we find out when the man entered the country, whether he entered legally, whether his name is on record at the port of entry, and whether he has been a resident of Canada long enough to become naturalized.

Mr. MARTELL: The judge should find all that out.

Mr. COPP: He does not do so and the department has to get this information. We have to find out the character and standing or reputation of the applicant during the time he has been a resident of Canada. In addition to making inquiry from the Department of Immigration we may also conduct an investigation through the Mounted Police.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are they scattered all over?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): In every province?

Mr. COPP: Yes. We also correspond with the local police, if necessary, in order to learn the required facts. Now, what I say to my hon. friend—and I think any legal gentleman will agree with me—is that in many cases a judge in a certain part of the province of Ontario, for example, after making an inquiry and examination will approve of an application, whereas a judge in another part of the country, with the same evidence before him, will disapprove of it. The department, as I say, makes this examination and inquiry and in many cases, notwithstanding that reports have come in from the judges approving of naturalization, we, after our own inquiry turn down the application and refuse to issue naturalization certificates. In other cases when the judges have sent in a report disapproving of the application of a man to become a British subject we, after careful inquiry, have been convinced that he is a fit and proper person to be naturalized and issue the certificate accordingly. Therefore, I contend that the time occupied in making this inquiry through the judge, under the law as it now stands, is absolutely wasted; the matter comes back to the department in the end. Such, at any rate, has been the experience of the department during the years that elapsed since 1914. The department must take the whole responsibility and it is entirely in its discretion to say whether the naturalization certificate should be issued or not.

In the larger centres the same difficulty does not arise, but it becomes a serious matter in the case of an applicant in the West who may reside from one to two hundred miles away from the place where he has to make application to the court. Under the law as it stands to-day the application has to be made to the clerk of the court and it is hung up in the clerk's office for three long months. The clerk may fail to send the applicant notice of the date when he has to be present to substantiate his application, but whether he notifies him or not the fact remains, that the applicant may have to travel from one to two hundred miles for that purpose because he has to be present in person to be examined by the judge.

Mr. MARTELL: When that application is made at the opening days of the regular session of the court, supported by an affidavit, is it not a fact that the application remains open until shortly before the closing of the court so that it may be open to any person who desires to do so to take objection; and does not the judge make a thorough inquiry into the qualifications of the applicant to become a British subject? Is not that the case and is it not a fair procedure?

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend is labouring under the delusion that we are still acting under the old Naturalization Act prior to 1914.

Mr. MARTELL: That was a good act.

Mr. COPP: But it is not the law to-day.

Mr. MARTELL: The procedure under that act was all right.

Mr. COPP: But the law has been entirely changed. Now, to continue with my statement. The applicant, as I say, may have to travel one or two hundred miles in order to reach the appointed place where he is to be examined by the judge. During my experience of the administration of this act we have had hundreds of complaints from applicants who declared that they had made their application in due and proper form but had heard nothing more about it, and wrote to inquire why the naturalization certificate had not been granted. Now, under the present law, when a clerk refuses, or neglects, to forward the report of the judge to the department matters are held up. Then the department has to undertake its own examination, and that has frequently happened in my experience. But the point is, that upon the applicant the responsibility is very often placed of travelling very long distances in order to appear before the judge and prove his case. So that, to have a proper national Naturalization Act the only thing to do is to bring into force the amendments proposed, and I am convinced, from the experience which I have had that they will prove of great advantage to the country and will be most advantageous in the administration of the act.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the minister not think that a better title for this legislation would be "An Act to abolish lawyers and establish more red tape in Ottawa"?

Mr. HANSON: I have had some considerable experience in dealing with the naturalization acts of 1914 and 1920 and I beg to assure the committee that I have never met with any of the difficulties that have been enumerated by the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp). In addition to the posting of the notice of the application in the office of the clerk of the county court, as I recollect the statute, it is necessary that a copy of the notice should also be posted in the post office in the place where the applicant resides. That provision may have been repealed.

Mr. COPP: It was repealed two years ago.

Mr. HANSON: Very well. It may be questionable as to whether three months is too long. I do not think it is. However, it may be open to debate. Some reasonable notice should be given. The vital thing about the act of 1920, in my judgment, is the investigation made by the county court judge, and if these judges have not done their duty in the past I must express very great surprise. Personally, I believe the county court judges have gone into this matter and have made these investigations, in so far as they have come under my observation, in the province of New Brunswick with the very greatest care, and I do not think for a minute that the question of pay or no pay has ever entered into the matter. If it has, such has not been my experience. Now, what actually happens? At a time appointed the applicant does appear, and it is a most vital thing that he should do so, and is put upon the stand. He may or may not employ a solicitor to act in his behalf. I say, without any reservation, that he should have such legal assistance in order to guide him. The first thing determined by the judge is the applicant's knowledge of either of the two languages of this country and he is in a much better position, than officials sitting behind a mahogany desk in Ottawa, to ascertain a man's knowledge of either the English or the French language. With all due deference, that is one thing the Secretary of State, or his officials, could not nearly so well determine, and it seems to me that an adequate knowledge of one of the official languages should be a sine qua non of citizenship. What I think has been the difficulty with respect to investigations by county court judges has been that the reports have not been elaborate enough. That is a very simple matter to cure. If a letter were sent by the Secretary of State to any one of the county court judges asking him to make a proper report, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred a proper report on the applicant would or should be sent back. In addition to that, the applicant is subject to cross-examination by the county court judge acting as a sort of King's proctor. I have seen that invari-

ably done. I remember on one occasion an applicant was put through a series of questions with respect to what he knew about the method of government and politics in this country. I understand on one occasion an applicant was asked how he would vote at the next election, and he said that he would vote for the party which gave him the most money. In that case naturally the county court judge refused to grant naturalization.

Mr. COPP: The hon. member would be sure of his vote on that occasion.

Mr. HANSON: I was not looking for the vote. I do not have to buy votes. The hon. member himself belongs to a party which has done more to corrupt the electorate in New Brunswick than any other party in the history of this country. He only needs to go back to the records of some of his leaders in regard to that matter.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member should discuss the matter on its merits.

Mr. HANSON: I will, but I did not start this; I am not seeking to lower the plane of the discussion, I was citing that only as an illustration of a case in which a county court judge refused to make a favourable report. In addition to the examination and cross-examination of the applicant, county court judges whom I have seen operate under the act, have required that at least two reputable citizens in the community in which the applicant resides, should attend and give evidence corroborative of the character of the applicant and his fitness for British citizenship, which, after all, should not be regarded cheaply. My hon. friend and some hon. members to my left have stated that it is a hardship to ask a man to travel a hundred miles to attend an investigation personally before a county court judge. If British citizenship amounts to anything, if it is a thing of value, it is worth a journey of a hundred miles.

Mr. FORKE: That may not be necessary.

Mr. HANSON: It is worth a journey of a hundred miles to go before a county court judge, where a personal investigation may be made, where the applicant may be seen by a judicial authority who has an open mind and who is prepared to hand out even justice. I would deplore if this measure should carry if it has the effect of abolishing the investigation before a county court judge. I want to say a word for county court judges. I believe the county court judges in my province are men of honour and integrity, and that they will do their full duty as citizens under any statute that may be imposed upon them, without regard to the petty questions of a fee or a mile. My hon. friend says that the examinations are cursory. He produces no proof of that statement. He cannot possibly know that of his personal knowledge. What he probably bases that statement upon is the shortness, the meagreness of the reports sent in. That is probably true; but that is a matter which, as I stated a moment ago, can and should be corrected. There is no reason why a county court judge should not make a full and true report of everything that transpires before him. As a matter of fact, now that there are, in most cases, stenographers in the county courts, there is no reason why the reports should not be accompanied by a transcript of the shorthand records taken of the examination. In New Brunswick, so far as I know, these examinations are never conducted in chambers; they are done in open court, and I believe it would be a distinctly retrograde step if the investigation before a county court judge were done away with, especially in view of the fact that there is nothing to take its place except the ipse dixit of some official in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. FORKE: I think I value the privilege of British citizenship as highly as any one. My hon. friend (Mr. Hanson) has referred to the fact that a man should be willing to travel a hundred miles in order to become a British citizen. I agree with him, but it may not be necessary to travel a hundred miles to do so. Consequently, if you can make this easier, so much the better. I am not very much interested in what happened in the past in regard to naturalization of citizens in this Dominion; I am more interested in what is going to happen in the future. Hon. members on different sides of the House seem to take a great interest in informing those who have newly come here just how iniquitous this matter was in days gone by. Well, we are looking for better times. I have had some little experience as regards naturalization papers, and I cannot subscribe to the idea that the judges have been negligent in their duties. I have always found judges willing and ready to make the necessary examination and to see that an applicant receives his citizenship if he is entitled to it. As regards asking questions to find out whether applicants are fit for citizenship or not, I am just as well pleased that that is not applied to all voters who would vote, because they would sometimes be in a pretty difficult position if they had to answer questions as regards what qualifies a man to vote and his fitness to vote. I do not, however, believe in making the test too easy.

Mr. HANSON: There is no test under this legislation.

Mr. FORKE: I am not saying anything about that; if the hon. member will have patience, I will, maybe, come out all right in the end. I think this puts too much power in the hands of the minister to give naturalization papers. Large blocks

4 p.m. of foreigners might be waiting to be naturalized, and it might be convenient—ministers are only human—to have those men naturalized at a certain time. It would be more advantageous and better for the country if some examination should take place before a county court judge, who, I am satisfied, would do his duty in the matter. I have no doubt that the minister's intention is all right to simplify the matter and to do away with extra trouble; but after all, if an applicant is really anxious for British citizenship, he will take the trouble to get his application in to the clerk of the court, to go through the necessary preliminaries and to come before a county court judge, in order to get his British citizenship. I would certainly be in favour of having something between the applicant and the minister, in order to prevent the applicant from receiving naturalization unless he was thoroughly entitled to it. I have known several cases in which applicants have filed their applications in the county court, gone through all the preliminaries and got their citizenship without any extra trouble. It might be all right to have some method of getting an examination made of a man or woman who wanted to be naturalized and who was living at some distance from the county court, so that the evidence might be submitted to the judge. I do not know whether that would be a feasible plan or not. But, after all, most county court judges hold sittings at not such very great distances from people residing in a county. In the older provinces, like Manitoba—because Manitoba is getting pretty old now—there is no hardship at all as regards any applicant going before a county court judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understatnd the minister to say that under the present law, no matter what the judge's opinion may be, the Secretary of State has absolute discretion to grant or refuse naturalization?

Mr. COPP: I will read the clause to my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have read it.

Mr. COPP: This is the provision:

> The granting of a certificate of naturalization to any such alien shall be in the absolute discretion of the Secretary of State—

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the minister reading from?

Mr. COPP: I am reading from subsection 3.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of what act?

Mr. COPP: I am quoting from page 58 of the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of the 1914 act?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

> The granting of a certificate of naturalization to any such alien shall be in the absolute discretion of the Secretary of State and he may, with or without assigning any reason, give or withhold the certificate..... and no appeal shall lie from his decision.

That is the law to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the origin of the section my hon. friend is reading? He has read from a pamphlet. From what act does he get that section?

Mr. COPP: The Imperial Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But we are governed by sections 23 and 24 of our own act, which the hon. member wants to repeal.

Mr. COPP: Section 24 reads—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear; that is the one.

Mr. COPP (reading):

> The Secretary of State of Canada may thereupon, in his absolute discretion, issue a certificate of naturalization and send the same to the clerk of the court to whom the application for naturalization was made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now I should like to argue the matter with the minister.

Mr. COPP: That section is eliminated by the proposed amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the minister read before was not the law; what he has read now is; and that is the law he wants to repeal. It is not, however, the law that he cited to the House. The Secretary of State under the act to-day has not the discretion to grant or refuse, no matter what may be the judgment of the county court judge. If he receives a recommendation from the county court judge in accordance with section 23, he may act upon that recommendation or he may not, but the recommendation is one for naturalization. If the county court judge after his examination finds that the applicant is a fit and proper person for naturalization he so certifies, under section 23, to the Secretary of State, and then section 24 applies. "The Secretary of State may thereupon, in his absolute discretion, issue a certificate."

Mr. JACOBS: "May."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, he "may."

Mr. JACOBS: And may not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But, unless he gets a favourable report from the judge he cannot issue it. That is the point. But if these two sections are repealed the Secretary of State is lord of all he surveys in relation to naturalization. Without these sections he could issue certificates by the thousand the week before an election and place them in the hands of candidates in various counties. That could be done; he would not require the endorsation of a judge at all. He would not require recommendation from anyone; he would be simply master of the situation. Surely the minister does not solemnly propose that to the House of Commons.

Mr. COPP: I am doing it now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is not. I should like him to produce to this House a case in which he has issued a naturalization certificate without the authority of a judge under section 23.

Mr. JACOBS: He can withhold it indefinitely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, he can decline to issue a certificate, but he cannot issue one without the authority of a judge under section 23. And he wants that barrier removed so that he may be able to do as he pleases and issue certificates here, there and everywhere at his own discretion. Now, surely he does not contend any longer that he can, without the authorization of a judge, issue a certificate of naturalization. Let me read section 23:

> If the court decides that the alien is a fit and proper person to be naturalized and possesses the required qualifications a certified copy of such decision shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the Court to the Secretary of State together with the application, and such other papers, documents and reports as may be required.

Under section 24:

> The Secretary of State of Canada may thereupon, in his absolute discretion, issue a certificate of naturalization.

That is, he may or he may not. But he neither may nor may not unless section 23 has been complied with and a judge has made his report. Surely the minister would not argue anything different from that. I am satisfied his deputy would not, in any court of justice. What is the effect of the word "thereupon?" This word means, upon section 23 being complied with; and section 23 is not complied with until a judge has reported to the effect set out therein—not a negative report but such a report as is described in the section. He places this report in the hands of the Secretary of State, and with that report favourable to the applicant in his possession the Secretary of State may or may not grant the certificate.

Mr. COPP: Suppose it is unfavourable?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then he has no power to grant the certificate at all, because he has not such a report as is referred to in the section. In fact, the judge does not need to make an unfavourable report; if he makes such a report it is wholly something that does not affect the power of the Secretary of State at all. The Secretary of State must have a favourable report in accordance with section 23 before he can exercise any discretion at all. Having that report he may or may not grant the certificate. Now, I really should like to hear the minister's argument if he thinks that I am not correct.

Mr. COPP: My deputy informs me that after the report of the judge has been received, many a time inquiry is made and a certificate is issued irrespective of whether the judge reports for or against the applicant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read the authority.

Mr. COPP: I may say to my hon. friend for York (Mr. Hanson) who made a few remarks—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Surely the minister does not want to let this matter go at that and say that the department has been doing as he suggests. If it has done anything of the kind it has done so against the law. Would the minister read the two sections to which I have referred him.

Mr. COPP: My deputy informs me that we are doing it in accordance with the law passed by my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. BOYS: Does the minister contend that he can issue a certificate without first having a report from the judge? Does he say that he can issue it on his own initiative?

Mr. COPP: No, not without the report. But after the report does come in we can act as we see fit; and that is why I say that the report is of no value.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Even if the report is a negative one?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But how can a negative report comply with section 23? Really, it does not require a lawyer to see the significance of these sections. "If the court decides that the alien is a fit and proper person"—not if the court decides that he is not fit. If the court decides that he is a fit and proper person to be naturalized, and possesses the required qualifications, a certified copy of that decision is transmitted to the Secretary of State, and that being done, the Secretary of State can act. I impress upon the minister again that it is only by compliance with the judge's decision, that the applicant is a fit and proper person, that "thereupon" the Secretary of State may grant the certificate.

Mr. JACOBS: My information is that this practice has been followed ever since the law came into effect under the regime of my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. gentleman would likely have some information about that, but it would only date back a limited number of months.

Mr. JACOBS: A year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If any such practice has been followed it has been in direct violation of the law, and what we ought to do is to comply with the law we have instead of seeking to get rid of the safeguards it provides.

Mr. COPP: I am administering the act as it has all along been administered and my deputy informs me that it is the law that has been followed by the department ever since the act was passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like the minister to produce a case in support of that assertion.

Mr. COPP: Here is a case before me. Here is a judge of the county court who refused to decide an application as to the qualification of applicants for land patents, challenging the legality of the amendments to the Lands Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who did?

Mr. COPP: A judge of the county court. He has refused to receive applications from fully qualified applicants because of their racial origin. These are the reports we have in our office. One judge refused to recognize section 10. My Under Secretary of State informs me now, in spite of what my right hon. friend says, that the law is and has been administered by the department, that, irrespective of what report the judges may make after their inquiries, we have the sole discretion to say whether or not a certificate shall issue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not wish to reflect at all on the legal judgment of those under my hon. friend. I do not know what the legal department of the Secretary of State's office is. I know the deputy is a lawyer himself. But I should like the Secretary of State to produce an opinion from the Minister of Justice or from the Deputy Minister of Justice to this House to the effect that under sections 23 and 24 the Secretary of State has any power to issue a certificate unless there is first a favourable report from the judge, or a report complying with section 22.

Mr. COPP: The Under Secretary of State informs me that the section I read is part of our act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of the Imperial act?

Mr. COPP: No, of our act—the act under which we are working to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How is that part of our act? It is contained in the Imperial act.

Mr. COPP: It is part of our act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is it made a part of our act?

Mr. BOYS: What is the number of the section in our act?

Mr. COPP: Subsection 3 of section 2 of our act of 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What section of the act of 1914 embodies the Imperial act?

Mr. EULER: I have here a copy of the act respecting British naturalization of aliens, assented to on 12th June, 1914. This is chapter 44. On page 2, subsection 3 of section 2 is in this form:

> The grant of a certificate of naturalization to any such allien shall be in the absolute discretion of the Secretary of State of Canada, and he may, with or without assigning any reason give or withhold the certificate as he thinks most conducive to the public good, and no appeal shall lie from his decision.

Mr. COPP: That is the same section as I read.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well, but I have not got the exact connection yet. Certainly it is clear under sections 23 and 24, which the minister seeks to repeal, that he cannot exercise such discretion; but as the act now stands I would say that the general provision of section 2, subsection 3, would have to be complied with and be subordinated to the particular provisions of sections 23 and 24.

Mr. COPP: They must be read together; one does not override the other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know; but the particular provision prevails over the general when they are read together. I cannot understand section 2 being passed along with sections 23 and 24, because the latter clearly specifies the condition under which the Secretary of State may act.

Mr. COPP: It was passed in 1914 as I read to the committee. My right hon. friend attempted to lead the committee to believe that I was quoting from an act that was not part of our legislation. It is part of our legislation and was passed by the government of which my right hon. friend was a prominent member.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. minister should not say that. I asked him what he was reading from, he said the Imperial act, and I took him at his word.

Mr. COPP: It is taken from the Imperial act. My right hon. friend attempted to tell the committee that I was asking to be given a power that I did not have under the present legislation,

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is right.

Mr. COPP: I answered him by saying that I had this same power under an act passed by his own government some years ago. I am not finding fault with that act, it may be all right, but to-day when we are asking for the repeal of the section that I mentioned, we are asking for no greater power for the State department than is conferred upon it by the act passed by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not agree with the minister at all. He read from what he said first was the Imperial act. It turns out now that that is embodied in part 2 of our act of 1914. This seems to be the case, but I have not had time to review the relationship between that section 2 and sections 23 and 24. Under the latter sections the Secretary of State could not naturalize anyone unless he had first the judge's recommendation.

Mr. COPP: I did not say I could.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without the inquiry which I have not yet had an opportunity to make I would be of opinion that sections 23 and 24, being specific, would be the dominating sections over section 2; and that if the minister has been acting under section 2 alone without relation to sections 23 and 24 he has been acting illegally. Now he says he is not asking for any power which he has not had all along. I say he is; he is asking for power to issue naturalization without the necessary preliminary—a judicial investigation. If for the sake of argument we assume his view of the law is right—I do not think it is—and that after the judicial investigation he could do what he liked even though the judge reported against the applicant, he is asking now for power he never had before. Though he might do as he pleased before, according to his arguments he had at least to precede his action with a judicial investigation and report. That judicial investigation and report was a public document capable of production at any time at the call of this House, a public document by which the public and this House could judge of the rightness or wrongness of his action, a public document of record prepared by a judge of our courts. Now the minister wants to do away with that precaution which parliament imposed, he wants to do away with the necessity of any preliminary investigation and report by a judicial body. Certainly that is asking for a power that he did not have before; it is asking for power to enable him to exercise his duties without the restraints the act imposed before. Even on his own argument that he had an absolute right to give such final decision as he might deem advisable, those restraints were there before. Pass this legislation and those restraints are gone

I repeat that I shall be surprised if I have to come to the conclusion that this is the law. Though it may be the opinion of Mr. Newcombe, that section 2 would prevail even over the conditions stipulated in sections 23 and 24, I submit this is bad legislation. The minister says, "The judges' investigations have been no good and I am going to conduct them after this bill is passed through the Mounted Police." Investigations into the legal qualifications of a resident of Canada to be naturalized as a British subject! Was there ever a matter more fitting for judicial inquiry than this? And he says the reason the judges have been careless is because they have not been paid. I do not think his words will be accepted as a compliment by the bench of Canada. They have been paid for this work just as they have been paid for conducting the courts in Canada, and they are paid to-day for their work as inquirers, investigators, under the Naturalization Act in exactly the same way as they are paid for deciding whether a culprit goes to jail or not. All is embraced within their duties, and to suggest that because there is not some special pay applicable to this is to do no credit to the bench, and, I am afraid, to do none to the minister. I have

had something to do with the work of the judges under this act, in the way of watching it at least, and I have observed that the judges exercise just as much care in connection with their duties in this respect as they do in any other—indeed, a lot more care than could possibly be exercised by the minister or by his deputy on questions such as this. The act calls for giving notice to the public in the immediate territory where the applicant resides. It is notice that the public are almost bound to see, because there must be posting, not behind the door of the court house, but conspicuously in the court house. That is the provision of section 20.

Mr. COPP: Will my right hon. friend read that section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. It says:

> The application shall be delivered at the office of the clerk or other proper officer of the court during office hours, and such application shall be posted by such clerk or other proper officer in a conspicuous place in his office.

Mr. COPP: In his office, not in the court house.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In a conspicuous place, not behind the door. That would not be conspicuous.

Mr. JACOBS: When the door is closed it is conspicuous.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The section continues:

> The applicant shall also post up a copy of such application in a conspicuous place in the post office nearest to his place of residence.

Mr. COPP: That is repealed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Repealed in 1920? Then I would recommend that it be put in again, if it is thoroughness of investigation that the minister wants. At all events, there must be posting in a conspicuous place. In that way everyone gets to know who wants to know, and undoubtedly a great many get to know of these applications for naturalization. Time is allowed within which inquiry may be made and objection may be taken. All this procedure serves as a deterrent against fraudulent naturalization by residents. A man is not going to put in his application knowing that he will have to go before a judge, take his oath and submit to cross-examination—he is not going to do it if it is a fraudulent application. The chance is very slight that anyone will fraudulently set to work to get naturalization for the purposes of the franchise. But remove all this, and simply have a sort of subterranean investigation as to which there will be no report that the public can ever get, some sort of investigation like a detective department would get under way to find out the character of a supposed culprit—substitute such an investigation for this open, public inquiry before a judge, and it merely says to all and sundry: If you want naturalization, depend on the Secretary of State. It simply puts the whole country in the hands of the Secretary of State as to who shall have the franchise. The minister says he has the power anyway. I do not think he has. But if there is any fault with the present legislation it is that the restrictions are too few. Let us not wipe away the restraints that there are.

Mr. COPP: My right hon. friend has, as usual, resorted in his argument to a great deal of special pleading. He first thought that the sections I read were not a part of our act; we now find that they are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister thought they were not.

Mr. COPP: The provisions were properly passed and have been acted upon for the last eight years, whether rightly or wrongly is a question that is open to discussion. Personally I believe they are proper provisions. Sections 23 and 24 provide that a report must be made by the judges of our county court. But what I was chiefly pointing out was that this report filed by a judge of the county court was of no particular value. My right hon. friend rushes to the support of the county judges, who, it is intimated, I have villainously attacked. Well, I do not think I said anything in derogation of them, but I do say that those judges, realizing that their report has, in the final analysis, no effect on the question on whether or not a naturalization certificate shall be granted, pay no particular attention to the holding of an inquiry. The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) also rushes to the defence of the judges of New Brunswick whom I have, in his opinion, maligned in suggesting that they did not make the investigation as properly and as carefully as they would do if they were responsible for determining whether or not the certificate should be issued. If I understand the argument of the hon. member for York-Sunbury, it is that the law should be left as it is and that the applicant should have a lawyer to go to the court and plead his case for him. I contend it is the duty of this parliament and of the State department to give persons who come to this country every possible facility for acquiring the rights of citizenship.

Mr. FORKE: Does the minister believe that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police

would be more reliable than a county court judge in the matter of making a report?

Mr. COPP: The cases do not compare at all; it is not a question between the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the county court judges. The county court judge inquires into the situation in a casual way and makes a report. We may not refer to the Mounted Police; we may not refer to any particular body. But when the application comes to us, marked "approved" or "disapproved" by the judge of the county court before whom the applicant appeared, we make inquiry; we go to the immigration office. If we think it necessary we refer the matter to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in order to ascertain whether the applicant had been concerned in any criminal acts during his residence here, about which the county court judge might know nothing. Suppose a man from a town in Saskatchewan becomes implicated in bootlegging operations, the selling of narcotic drugs, or any other criminal act. He goes to Alberta; he has lived five years in Canada. How would a judge of the county court in Alberta know this man's record in Saskatchewan? So far as I have been able to follow the work of the Mounted Police, I am confident that they can judge pretty well whether a man who makes application for naturalization is a fit and proper person to become a British subject.

Mr. FORKE: I will not interfere again; but the suspicion in my mind would be that this change would place too much power in the hands of the Secretary of State. I do not mean that personally at all; it would be the same no matter what government was in power. But I think it is a dangerous thing to place power in the hands of the Secretary of State under which large sections of the foreign population could, on particular occasions, be practically enfranchised wholesale. That is my idea.

Mr. BOYS: I suggest that there is no conflict between section 2 and section 19. Section 2 says:

> The Secretary of State of Canada may grant a certificate of naturalization to an alien who makes an application for the purpose.

Then, section 19 states what the alien has to do in making his application. It says:

> An alien desiring to be naturalized shall apply—

Not to the Secretary of State.

> —for a decision establishing that he is qualified and fit to be naturalized under the provisions of this act.

Then follow the various paragraphs pointing out the procedure in the different provinces. That read with section 2 is quite consistent. Section 2 says he shall make application for the purpose, and section 19 says he shall make that application for a decision in Ontario to the Court of General Sessions, and in other provinces in other ways. Does the minister contend that there are two distinct powers, one whereby an application can be made to the Court of General Sessions in Ontario, and the other being made quite independently altogether to the Secretary of State?

Mr. COPP: The applications are not that way, but the powers.

Mr. BOYS: That is what I am trying to argue. I would ask the minister's serious consideration of what I am trying to suggest. If that was the intention of section 2,—that independent power should be given to the Secretary of State,—would it not say so? But it does not say any such thing. It says that the Secretary of State may grant the certificate to an alien who makes an application for that purpose. Surely the question that one must ask at once is, how is he going to make that inquiry? And I ask the minister if he can show me any other section of the act but 19 which outlines the manner in which that application is to be made. I do not think he can, and when you return to section 19 you find there that the application in Ontario is to be made to the Court of General Sessions, in Quebec to the Circuit Court, and so on—I need not read all the list. When the judge of the court in Ontario proceeds under that section he has to see that the applicant satisfies him of what is required by subsections (a) (b) and (c) of No. 2. If that is done the judge then certifies that he is a fit and proper person for naturalization; that report goes to the Secretary of State, and on the strength of that information got from the report of the judge the Secretary of State then has his jurisdiction. I do not contend for a moment that he cannot either grant or refuse the application. He can, but what I do contend is that he does not get any jurisdiction of any kind, sort or description to deal with the application of an alien to become naturalized unless there is in the first instance the report of a judge, and if the report of a judge is not made and sent to him he cannot deal with the naturalization of an alien at all. The minister nods his head in assent.

Mr. COPP: Absolutely.

Mr. BOYS: Then if he does, he at once admits—

Mr. COPP: No.

Mr. BOYS: Just hear what I am going to say first. He admits that he has no independent or separate jurisdiction to deal with applications made direct to him.

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: If we are together in that, I cannot see how there is any room for doubt, because section 19 provides the procedure and says how it is to be done. There is absolutely nowhere else in Ontario that you can make application except to the Court of General Sessions. Now I want to make one observation regarding the procedure there. I am not going to suggest that the minister was saying anything derogatory of our judges. He may not know how they proceed in Ontario. I know something of the procedure in Ontario and especially in my own county. I have sat many times in the Court of General Sessions when these applications are made, and I want to tell the committee how it is done. The applicants are there in person. They are sworn, examined by the county judge, the evidence is taken in shorthand, and the county judge requires one or two reputable citizens from the neighbourhood in which the applicant resides to be there and certify. If that procedure is taken I cannot see how the minister can find fault with the decision of a judge. Does he suggest that in the province of Ontario the county judges frequently make reports which upon investigation the department disregard and reach a totally different conclusion? I can understand that might be the case in respect to outlying districts perhaps in the Northwest but I very much doubt if it is so in Ontario, and so far as that province is concerned I want to say to the minister I am satisfied from the care that is exercised in working out the provisions of this act that it would be unwise to make a change so far as the older provinces of the Dominion are concerned. I certainly do not think the minister has power under section 2, which as a matter of fact so far as I have been able to see from a quick reading, is a verbatim copy of the provisions of the Imperial act and is of course our law, but it must be read in conjunction with the procedure provided for in section 19.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend has argued that we have no jurisdiction when the report comes from the judge. That is true; I have never hinted anything else; that is our jurisdiction. But what I say is that under our law when the report comes from the judge to whom the application was made we can use our own discretionary power whether to accept that report or not.

[M. Copp.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it must be a report from the judge in accordance with the act, and the only report he can make in accordance with the act is under section 23.

Mr. COPP: But under the other sections we can accept it or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: You can accept it or not, certainly.

Mr. COPP: And act as soon as the report is in from the judge irrespective of whether that report is for or against granting naturalization.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. COPP: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. As soon as the report is received by the department whether it is approved or not, that gives the department jurisdiction to act. We can act one way or the other whichever way we decide.

Mr. BOYS: Under what section is the county court judge required to report if he is not in favour of naturalization? If you read section 23—and there is no other section dealing with it—you will see that you only are apprised of the matter if the judge finds he is a fit and proper person to be naturalized. If he is not a fit and proper person a report does not reach your department.

Mr. COPP: Scores of them reach the department.

Mr. BOYS: I would be glad if the minister would show me under what section a judge is required to make any report if his report is unfavourable. Section 23 is as follows—I need not take the trouble to read the previous sections which provide how the application is to be posted, the opportunity for opposition, proof for qualification, and so on; when that is all done and the investigation has taken place, section 23 provides the next step, and what is it:

> If the court decides that the alien is a fit and proper person to be naturalized and possesses the required qualifications, a certified copy of such decision shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary of State of Canada together with the application—

That is where the application is received.

> —and such other papers, documents and reports as may be required by any regulation made hereunder.

The minister will see at once that the report only reaches his department when it is favourable. I do not say there is no other section, I do not profess to be an expert, but I ask the minister to show me any section which provides for transmitting a report when

it is not favourable. If there is no such section he would not hear of the matter unless the report is favourable.

Mr. JACOBS: Suppose the judge goes wrong in his law. That sometimes happens, not often, of course, but it has occurred, and he makes a report to the effect that this man has resided less than six years, when the law only calls for five, is the Secretary of State obliged to accept that report and refuse to issue a certificate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is under this act.

Mr. JACOBS: That would be absurd. That would be contrary to the law.

Mr. BOYS: What I said was that a report would only reach the department when it was a favourable report. The judge may go wrong; they are all mortal; I am not saying they are infallible, but the point is the Secretary of State never hears of the application unless it is reported on favourably.

Mr. JACOBS: As I understand it, the report is sent forward.

Mr. BOYS: I have asked the minister to show me the section. I am not saying it is not there; it may be; but let us see it. I have shown the section which provides for naturalization on a favourable report.

Mr. COPP: In the past fifteen months hundreds of applications have come forward from the judges marked "not approved".

Mr. MEIGHEN: But what difference does that make? These are beyond the purview of the act altogether.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend will wait just a moment. When that report is received it gives the Secretary of State authority to act under section 23.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is this section?

Mr. COPP: The Secretary of State acts upon the report. When that report from the judge is received it gives him authority to act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is where the minister is wrong, and I am sure that if he will consult his deputy he will find he is wholly wrong; there can be no question about it at all. The minister mentions that the practice is to get all sorts of reports as provided for by the act. Why, he may get letters from judges—all sorts of things. But only when he gets something which under the act empowers him to exercise his functions does he exercise them. Now the act says—in regard to the application coming through this channel—that the minister's duty arises under the condition, and that one condition only, that under section 23 the judge sends a report that the man is a fit and proper person to become naturalized. The minister has the full discretion to act but he only has the discretion when section 23, and the other sections, are complied with; until section 23 is complied with he has no discretion whatever. Now, once his discretion arises he can say yes or he can say no, but he gets no discretion whatever until the judge sends in his report that the applicant is a fit and proper person. There is no lawyer—not even my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs)—but would say the same thing; there is no other interpretation possible under this section.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Whatever may be the outcome of the legal discussion it would seem as if this amendment looks in the direction of more highly centralized authority, and very arbitrary authority at that. If I understood the Secretary of State aright the judge's report has no effect whatever in the final decision. If that is so the amendments placed before this House ought to look in the other direction altogether—that is towards very definitely giving the recommendation of the judges a place and weight in the final decision. I think it would be no less than an outrage if we allowed entrance to citizenship in Canada to be placed solely in the hands of one man. I am not reflecting in any way upon the present occupant of the office of Secretary of State—or on the occupant of that office any more than on the occupant of any other office—but it must surely be conceded that the question of whether or not a man should become a citizen of Canada ought not to be left to the absolute discretion of any one individual.

Further, the present legislation would seem not only to give this great power to one individual but it would also give to this same individual the right to disfranchise any citizen—a situation equally serious. According to the act of 1920:

> The Governor in Council shall by order revoke a certificate of naturalization granted by the Secretary of State of Canada under this act, or granted under any Naturalization Act heretofore in force in Canada in any case in which he is, upon the report of the Secretary of State of Canada, satisfied that the person to whom the certificate was granted either—
>
> (a) has, during any war in which His Majesty is engaged unlawfully traded or communicated with the enemy—

and so on. And

> (c) was not of good character at the date of the grant of the certificate.

Now it is obvious to anyone that it may be comparatively easy to say with regard to any particular citizen that he was not of good character five years previously. In that case, without any trial whatever, without any court coming to a decision on the matter in any form, the individual who has imagined himself to be a citizen of this country would thereby have withdrawn from him all the rights of citizenship. That, it seems to me, is an arbitrary power that is against all the ideas of British constitutional liberty that we have had in the past. To have made a change in that regard would seem to me to be something that might very well be brought before us at this time. But that provision still exists, and without any change in that particular clause we are being asked here to vote in favour of a further extension of this power to one individual.

But I would like particularly to call the attention of the House to the effect of this kind of provision and of this kind of procedure on the immigrant who comes to this country. We have tens of thousands of aliens scattered throughout the Canadian northwest. Many of them have come from other lands where they had exercised the rights of citizenship. They have been told that they could become free citizens of Canada. But for this they must wait five years—surely long enough. I should like, if I could, to get away from the official atmosphere of this House and ask you what effect it has upon these immigrants if, when they do make application for citizenship, they are treated more or less as though they were criminals, and mounted policemen sent around to investigate their character and their manner of life during the previous five years. There may be, it is quite true, an occasional criminal amongst them. I do not deny that; but I take it that we ought not in any sense whatever to regard prospective citizens as probably criminal. Surely the very essence of the British law is that a man ought to be regarded as innocent until he is proven guilty; he ought to be regarded as a good citizen until some definite charge is laid against him. Coming before the county court is a dignified proceeding. The people in the neighbourhood of the applicant's home have a chance of registering their opinion of his character. The judge is a man who is able, presumably, to give a disinterested opinion upon the evidence presented. There is no imputation whatever, there is no inference, that the applicant is anything but a desirable alien citizen honourably seeking to acquire citizenship in this new land. Any change in the procedure which would make it even possible for the Secretary of State to send in an outsider to make inquiries among the neighbours of the applicant as to whether, possibly, he had done something that was wrong is a distinct lowering of the standard of citizenship which we ought to encourage in this country. For the sake of these tens of thousands of immigrants—many of whom those of us from the West know personally—I would ask that the citizenship of Canada should be placed on a higher plane; if so, I think that coming Canadians would, if necessary, gladly travel a hundred miles rather than submit to the inquisitorial methods proposed by these amendments.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not propose to discuss at all the technical questions which have arisen under the existing act. I am inclined to think that my right hon. leader has correctly interpreted that act. I only want to take the hour and a half or more that has been spent in trying to find out what a single paragraph of this act means as a text upon which to try, if I may, to emphasize to the House what I think was the wisdom of my suggestion the other day when this bill was before us, and that is that the measure should be reprinted and we should have here in one pamphlet exactly what it is intended the naturalization law of Canada shall be after this legislation is put through. We have spent an hour and a half debating as to what the present law may or may not mean, and I think I am not exaggerating when I say that there is not one individual here who is absolutely sure.

Mr. GERMAN: Several are absolutely sure.

Mr. BAXTER: All right, but they do not agree. I think this House will concur in the view that British citizenship is not a thing to be handed out like some cheap decoration, and that we do not want people coming to the shores of this country, with bombs in their pockets or criminal records, and being advanced by every possible sort of misguided sympathy to the status of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. JACOBS: They will have to carry the bombs in their pockets for five years.

Mr. BAXTER: They might find places of concealment. I think my hon. friend might show them places where they could conceal them for a time and then take them, if necessary, if there was an outbreak, for instance, in the city of Winnipeg.

The second point I should like to make is that while citizenship should not be given lightly to any one, the law ought to be so

absolutely clear that there could be no room for misunderstanding either as to the conditions requisite for citizenship or the means to attain those conditions. I should like to see that in the bill. The other day I asked the minister if he would put in his bill the tribunal by which men are to be tried. Shall we have a branch of the Soviet, duly qualified to investigate people? Shall we go back to the days of the Terror and have a certain character of citizenship which will investigate the other citizens and demolish those who are unsatisfactory? Shall we have investigation by a secret police or by a judicial body? I look through this bill, and I do not find any clear-cut definition of what tribunal, by what means a man is to be adjusted to the citizenship which he proposes to assume. This is all left in the mind, in the discretion, in the magnanimity of the Secretary of State. That is precisely where I say it ought not to be. Judicial determination under the present system or the system of a few years ago, in my judgment—and I want to be frank and fair about this—was inadequate, because while I do not reflect upon the judges, while I think they did the best they could, there was not a dollar of the money of Canada spent, there was not the effort of a single official in Canada, as a sort of Crown proctor, to bring before them one solitary fact as regards the character of an applicant for citizenship. A man swore to formal affidavits; he presented himself before the court; he could be put through a certain cross-examination by the court, and the whole examination ended there. I think some of those who have gone on the roll of our citizenship might very well have tried to stand an inspection by members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police or some other body accustomed to dealing with criminals. Many undoubtedly got through who should not have had citizenship. I should like to see that feature of the act strengthened; but I will say on the other hand that it is not consistent with liberty, justice or fair play that the measure of a man's citizenship shall change from day to day and hour to hour according to, perhaps, the political exigencies of the gentleman who may occupy the position of Secretary of State. There is not in Canada a man who, when an election is not on, would do anything other than reprobate the idea of having a vast piece of political machinery that could be made use of at a critical moment. It is not the government that makes
5 p.m. citizens; it is ourselves who make them. We admit them to confraternity with the rest of us. Give the people, through some sort of judicial institution, an opportunity of saying who is to be admitted to the brotherhood and who is to be excluded. But if the principle of this bill, if there be a principle in it, be adopted, we shall have either the knowledge of the law possessed by the gentleman who may be Secretary of State for the time being or his principal adviser, whoever he may be, or we may have the ignorance of the law, if unfortunately either of them should be succeeded by people who do not know the law. But whether it be knowledge or ignorance, what that department pronounces will be law, even though this parliament never enacted it, if we are to depend on government by order in council, by regulations made by the Secretary of State, by any Secretary of State, no matter how good a man he may be. What I am asking is that there should be written plain and large in the statute every condition that is necessary to enable the man to enter upon British citizenship, both the qualifications and the procedure. To find out this to-day, you have to go through four Canadian statutes and three Imperial statutes; it is necessary to refer from one to another. I ask that they be brought into this chamber, written together as they are to be acted upon, so that if an election was coming on A.B. can get the information he wants if he goes to some person interested in elections and says: "Can I vote? I was born under certain conditions, in the United States or a foreign country. My father was a British subject," and so on. "Have I a right to go on the roll? Can I swear that I am a British subject?" Hon. members have heard the discussion that has taken place this afternoon as to the powers of the Secretary of State. I have looked into the statutes to some extent, and I can assure the committee that the rest is as big a jumble with regard to the qualifications of a British subject as the bill is with regard to the powers of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will say that his powers are clear; other hon. members will say that they are not clear. Is that the condition of affairs we want to have when a man seeks to know on the eve of an election, simply whether he is or is not a British subject? This can be cleared up if we can get a comprehensive bill embracing all phases of the subject. We could get through a bill of that kind in a few hours, in less time than it has taken us to discuss what may or may not be the law. I asked for that the other day. It has been refused by the government on the ground that some thousands of dollars have been spent for forms. I should like to know this, and perhaps the Secretary of State will tell me: Was the government so sure that

this bit of legislation would be adopted by this House; were the views that might be expressed by the rest of us with regard to this legislation so trivial and of so little concern that it was not worth while waiting for us to have a chance to express our opinions, but that a button was pushed, the Printing bureau began to operate and they got out tens of thousands of dollars worth of forms, saying that there would be a merely formal registration in this parliament because the minister was bringing down a bill? If so, do we count for very much here?

Mr. COPP: I think the hon. member has misconstrued the remarks I made.

Mr. BAXTER: Practically everybody seems to have done so.

Mr. COPP: I did not say that the printing was done because of the amendment I was introducing to-day. I said the printing was done because of the acts we have in force and if this was changed—it is not the amendment I referred to—

Mr. BAXTER: I will accept the reason which is the most compelling reason for letting this amendment stand until the forms are used up. Either we are at such an emergency that, in order to save our citizenship, we have to make a new law, and if we have to do that we must waste the forms; or if we have not the emergency, we can wait a while and use up the forms. This legislation would do quite as well next year. I have no personal motive against it; I am quite willing to help as far as I can in devising something that will be workable and fair and that will at the same time be a protection to our citizenship. But I ask that it all be made plain to the people who have to act under it and to the people who have to invoke its assistance. By to-day there could have been a print of all the acts, and put together; we could have had that on every desk, so that we could see what the law will be when the minister gets it through. You cannot tell by these references what it will be.

I am going to point out one simple thing. If hon. members will look at the bill, they will see on the right hand page of the bill what professes to be a summary of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1922. It is said that the sections we are asked to adopt are a reprint. Section 6 of the proposed bill is very nearly a reprint of section 3 of chapter 44 of the act of 1922 of the Imperial parliament. I do not like to have to deal with a technical matter of this sort because it is a little difficult to make it clear to the House. But if the House will have patience I will read one clause which, in copying the Imperial bill, my hon. friend has absolutely omitted. The clause is this:

> A copy of the principal act, with the amendments, whether by way of substitution, addition or omission required by this act, shall be prepared and certified by the clerk of parliament and deposited with the rolls of parliament; and his Majesty's printer shall print, in accordance with the copy so certified, all copies of the principal act which are printed after the commencement of this act.

There was the way they dealt with the matter in Great Britain, so that the people would have in one pamphlet the entire naturalization law. The Secretary of State told me the other day that his department would compile a pamphlet. I said I did not want a pamphlet made up by someone who was interpreting the law; I wanted a pamphlet that would reproduce, word for word, the law as this parliament makes it. Then if I have a view with regard to it and someone else has a different view we can go to a court and get the question straightened out. But if we have to act on the view of the Secretary of State or his deputy or anybody else we are simply bucking against bureaucracy and order in council government. I do not know whether it is one of those figments of the imagination in which we sometimes indulge, but I had thought that it was one of the claims of the Liberal party that they were opposed to order in council and bureaucratic legislation. I thought I had heard it repeated on many platforms that the business of parliament should be done here. I thought I heard my right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) not only criticized but condemned, damned I might say everlastingly, because he ruled the country by order in council. But I do not find any great abatement of order in council government since the accession to power of my hon. friends opposite, and I find in this bill an absolute determination to put at the will of one man all the rights of citizenship in Canada and to do that by order in council and order in council only, without giving any necessary notice to the people whose rights are to be affected. If the House and the country want that sort of thing all they have to do is to take it; but I urge the members of this House to impress upon the minister that he either allow this legislation to stand over until next session or let it remain in abeyance for forty-eight hours at least until we can make a compilation of the statutes ourselves so that we may know what the legislation will be when the minister gets it into the shape in which he wants it. It has been utterly impossible since the bill was in-

troduced, unless a man devoted his whole time to its consideration—and it would take half a day to go through the seven or eight or nine statutes that are all interlaced—to be able to form any kind of definite opinion as to what the law will be, unless we want to leave it in the pure, sheer ambiguity of order in council and the will of one individual who may be responsible at certain times only to party exigencies. The question for the country is this, I think: Shall naturalization be a matter of judicial determination upon a clear-cut, sane, well-known basis, open for every man to understand, or shall it be a matter of internal administration with the possibility of misuse for political purposes?

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend has made a number of suggestions and I was very sorry I could not see my way clear to accept the one he offered the other day in regard to the consolidation of the acts. He has made another suggestion to-day, asking for forty-eight hours in which to go over the various statutes himself and come to a conclusion as to what the law really is in regard to naturalization. I have a good idea of the law myself so far as I have been associated with its administration, but I would draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this parliament has for very many years, and with a great deal of reason and advantage, followed the acts of the Imperial parliament. And this is the exact form which the naturalization law takes in Great Britain; the application is made directly to the Home Secretary who makes an investigation and either grants or refuses the certificate. I am still convinced that the situation as I have outlined it is proper. I can quite understand a number of legal gentlemen at first blush being somewhat apprehensive of taking this matter from the purview of the judges; I was of the same frame of mind myself when the proposal was first made. But when I considered the matter thoroughly I came to see the very great advantage that must and would accrue if the system now proposed were adopted. However, this is not a matter of life and death, and there is no imperious necessity to dispose of it either to-day or to-morrow, or within forty-eight hours. I am quite willing to have hon. gentlemen thoroughly consider it. and indeed I should be glad to have them do so. I am prepared to let it stand over for forty-eight hours as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. BOYS: Make it six months.

Mr. COPP: Well, that is hardly possible. I will therefore move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. HANSON: Why not codify the law so that we could understand it?

Mr. BAXTER: My hon. friend is taking me literally in regard to my suggestion as to the length of time we might have to consider the matter; I hardly think that forty-eight hours would be adequate. Could we not have a reprint of the law as it will be in its final form so that we might have it all before us?

Mr. COPP: I will try to get that.

Mr. BAXTER: Thanks very much.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Will the minister be kind enough to see that a return is made to the questions I asked some time ago in regard to the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the county court judges of Vancouver on the question of naturalization? I should like to have that information before me before we resume consideration of this matter.

Mr. COPP: To what is my hon. friend referring?

Mr. McQUARRIE: A motion was passed some weeks ago for a return of correspondence between the Secretary of State and the county court judges of Vancouver with reference to the question of naturalization.

Mr. COPP: I shall be glad to see that the return is brought down.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I desire to have it before this matter is proceeded with.

Mr. McBRIDE: With reference to the question of naturalization certificates being issued on the authority of the judges, I would call the attention of the committee to a statement made by Judge Grant of Vancouver on the subject. He said that, "as long as I sit here as a judge I will always place the responsibility of granting naturalization on the Secretary of State and the government." When a member of the bench, who enjoys the respect that Judge Grant does, declares that he will always place the responsibility for granting naturalization on the government, I think that statement should go a long way to convince us that the Secretary of State is responsible for the citizenship of Canada; and if he is responsible I do not see why we should not leave the matter in his hands.

Progress reported.

COLD STORAGE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the third reading of Bill No. 9 to amend the Cold Storage Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

LIVE STOCK ACTS AMENDMENT

House in committee on Bill No. 10 to amend and consolidate the acts respecting live stock, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definitions, etc.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection (f) of section 2 has been amended by the agricultural committee by adding thereto the following:

—or any area of land used for the accommodation of live stock at ocean ports of export which may be declared as stockyards by the minister under the provisions of this act.

Subsection (h) has been amended by adding thereto the words:

either directly or indirectly through a commission merchant.

Is it the pleasure of the committee that clause 2 as amended be carried?

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—Live stock exchange at stockyards, etc.

The CHAIRMAN: This section has been amended by striking therefrom all of subsection 3.

The following amendment has been substituted:

Any such person doing business at a stockyard who neglects to comply with the provisions of section fifteen of this act, or who, for cause, is adjudged by the minister to be liable to removal and exclusion therefrom, shall upon the order of the minister, directed to an inspector or other officer of the department, be removed and excluded from the said stockyard and from doing business thereat and shall not be permitted to return thereto until he procure a special permit from the minister.

Subsection 4 has been added as follows:

Any person refusing to comply with the terms of an order issued by the minister under the next preceding subsection shall be deemed a person within the meaning of, and subject to the penalties provided by and under section thirteen of this act.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Bylaws of exchange to be approved:

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, as to section 4, since this bill came out of the agricultural committee the advisability of adding further provisions to safeguard owners of live stock from being defrauded by commission men in the event of the latter defaulting has been brought to my attention by the hon. member for Calgary and the hon. member for Macleod. It was our intention to frame regulations for this purpose, but a number of hon. members prefer to have suitable provisions inserted in the act itself. I have no particular choice in the matter. The advantage of effecting the purpose by way of regulations is that these can be changed from time to time if they are found not workable, whereas the act itself can be amended only while parliament is in session. This amendment is to be added at the end of subsection 2 of section 4 of the bill, and reads as follows:

All moneys received on account of sales for stock sold by a commission firm on behalf of the owner thereof shall be deposited in an account in a bank, separate from the firm's private or other commercial accounts, and disbursements of such moneys shall be made only in accordance with regulations prescribed by the exchange and approved by the minister.

The object of this amendment is to provide against the recurrence of a number of losses that have been sustained by stockmen as the result of a commission agent having animals consigned to him, selling them on the market, and then placing the money to the credit of his bank account, this money being used by the bank to adjust the commission man's personal account so that it cannot be made available for the owner of the cattle sold. We can either put this provision in the bill or issue it in our regulations according to the wisdom of the committee. In order to bring the matter to a head, Mr. Chairman, I would move that this amendment be inserted at the end of subsection 2 of section 4.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 4 is amended by adding to subsection 3 the words:

in such manner and to such extent as may be required.

An amendment has been proposed to subsection 2 of section 4 in the form moved by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SPENCE: Does the word "stock" mean live stock only? If it applies to anything else I would be opposed to the amendment. I do not see why it should be inserted anyhow, because a commission man who is labouring under financial difficulties would not get very many consignments of cattle to sell. It is ridiculous that a man should be expected to keep separate bank accounts, and I can see no necessity for such a requirement.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, it does not apply to anything but live stock.

Mr. SPENCE: That had better be made clear in the bill. The minister says the bank might take this portion of its customers' money and apply it to his indebtedness. It might do that with any account.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Possibly the word "live" should be inserted before "stock" in the first line.

Mr. FORKE: I have known of cases where people lost one carload or two or three carloads of stock in connection with a supposedly reliable firm; they did not know anything was wrong with the firm until the collapse occurred. My own brother lost over $1,000 as a drover, so that I think something should be done in the matter.

Mr. SPENCE: This will not save the situation, I am afraid.

Mr. FORKE: It may not; I do not know whether you can compel them to place that amount in the bank otherwise than to their own credit. But something should be done if possible.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is not a new difficulty; we have been discussing it at our conventions for years. This seems to be the best solution that has been suggested; if it does not work satisfactorily we can easily amend it. I am satisfied to try the provision in the act; it can do no harm and I think it can do a lot of good.

Mr. GOULD: In connection with section 13 as relating to subsection 2 of section 4, I should like to offer a word. Section 13 says:

> Any person violating any provision of this act or of any regulation thereunder, shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding four hundred dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or to both fine and imprisonment.

This is the provision for penalty. It is often the case that individuals in the West will send four, five or six carloads of stock from one farm or co-operative shipments may be sent forward and are handled by a commission firm, the sum involved in each case being some $5,000 or $6,000. It seems to me that if an individual wished to transgress the law he could appropriate thousands of dollars and $400 would be a very small penalty indeed. If a man wished to be crooked or deal unfairly, and took five or six or ten thousand dollars, he would willingly pay his $400. I think that penalty might be increased.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This precaution is in addition to the bond that he already has to give.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 12—Regulations:

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When the bill was in committee paragraph (d) was discussed from many angles and the article of wool was in one day and out the next. It is in now and since the bill came from the committee representations have been made to the department by members of this House indicating that in so far as imported wool is concerned it is physically impossible to grade it, and therefore what is the use of including it here? It was pointed out that it was brought in in large bales rendering it impossible to be inspected or graded, and as it was bought by the one intending to use it, it was consequently a matter between him and the shipper. I think, therefore, that the word "wool" should be deleted wherever it occurs in paragraph (d) as being an embarrassment to the importer and of no good to anyone else.

Mr. EULER: I would move, Mr. Chairman, that paragraph (d) be amended by striking out the word "wool" in lines 31 and 35.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move to amend paragraph (f) to read as follows:

> The manner in which calves are to be subjected to ante-mortem inspection, and the manner in which calves condemned by inspectors shall be disposed of.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LADNER: Before this section carries, I believe the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) had something to say in connection with it. He is not here just at the moment. Has the minister considered the conflicting sections between this act and the Animal Contagious Diseases Act with respect to meats and some other things.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh yes, we have had that under consideration.

Mr. LADNER: Are the provisions of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act or the operations under that act, wherever they conflict with this act, to prevail?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have taken precautions to see that they do not conflict.

Mr. LADNER: What precautions?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the drafting.

Mr. LADNER: How do you distinguish between meat under the Animals Contagious Diseases Act and meat under this act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Which subsection does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. LADNER: I refer to the paragraph in the interpretation clause:

> "Live Stock" means meat cattle, sheep and swine and poultry.

The CHAIRMAN: I might point out we are on section 13 now. Section 2 was passed a very considerable time ago.

Mr. LADNER: We have not passed section 12 yet, and section 12 purports to give power to the Governor in Council to regulate these things by order in council. It deals with the procedure, which is the vital thing. It may be that an inspector under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act would be carrying on his duties and another inspector under this act would authorize and pass out of the stockyard certain stock, and that when that stock gets one hundred and fifty miles out the inspector under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act suspects it of some disease. Whose authority would prevail in that case?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: These two inspections have an entirely different purpose in view. With regard to the Canned Meats Act the inspection is primarily from a sanitary standpoint The inspection under this act is for the purpose of determining the quality of the meat; not its sanitary character. The two do not conflict in the least degree. I think the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) was quite satisfied with this when it was in committee.

Mr. LADNER: He was not satisfied last evening when I was discussing the matter with him. I do not think the minister has really answered the question. The point is this. He says that under this act it is a question of quality that the inspector passes on. Now under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act it is a question of disease. In what way are the duties of these inspection departments to be co-ordinated so that they will not both be working on an animal at a certain time, and in order that both can carry on their duties conveniently?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think their duties will conflict. Even under the Canned Meats Act, if I remember rightly, the inspection of the carcase is sufficient. When it has been inspected and approved by the officers of the department after the animal is slaughtered, it is recognized as being all right for canning purposes. It is entirely a question of quality of grade, if you like to call it that as to whether the meat is fit for caning purposes.

Mr. LADNER: Is it not possible to have some system of inspection under which there will not be any confusion between two separate departments?

[Mr. Ladner.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does my hon. friend mean separate branches of the same department?

Mr. LADNER: Yes, certainly.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There has been some conflict but owing to friendly co-operation there has not been any friction in the past. Sometimes there has been overlapping, to some extent but we generally overcome that by working in as amicable a manner as possible and there has been no particular friction.

Mr. LADNER: I believe there is sometimes lack of co-operation, and there comes a time when the authority of the inspector who has to deal with diseases might conflict with the authority of the inspector under this act. Under those circumstances I submit that the authority of the former should prevail.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the hon. gentleman is quite right. If there is any conflict of authority the question of sanitation should receive the first consideration. If my hon. friend has any suggestions to make I would be very glad to receive them and see whether they can be incorporated in the act.

Mr. LADNER: I think the minister and myself agree on that point. Now, is there any provision in the act—if not one will be suggested—whereby there can be no difference in interpretation as to who has the authority? If so what is the provision in question?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Do you mean that there should be a provision of that nature in the act?

Mr. LADNER: Certainly.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will consider the proposition and see whether anything of that nature is required. In the meantime we can leave the bill in committee.

Mr. TOLMIE: In this connection I think that every possible effort should be made to guard against any clashing of authority. The authority as between the two branches—the Live Stock branch and the Health of Animals branch—should be quite clear and well defined. Let me point out the importance of that. In the event of an outbreak, or even a suspected outbreak, of disease in any of the live stock yards throughout the country any clashing of authority might result in very serious loss to Canada. Take for instance the outbreak of foot and mouth disease which occurred in the United States in 1914. Here there was a slowness in

diagnosis, a clashing of state and federal authorities with the result that before they got through the disease had extended to some twenty-two states, with a loss of $20,000,000 to the country. It was with a view to avoiding anything of that kind that I think the authority as between the Health of Animals branch and the Live Stock branch should be clearly defined. In the case of disease, or suspected disease, the Health of Animals branch should be able to step in at once and take control and in that way prevent, perhaps, very serious loss to the live stock industry of the country. This is particularly important because we have an understanding with the United States under which we have worked very amicably for a number of years. An outbreak of foot and mouth disease in this country would mean the quarantining of the American ports against our live stock, and, possibly, would also tie up our export overseas. The committee will readily realize how important this work is. I was upstairs preparing an amendment to this bill and had I got down in time should have moved it. I had no idea the bill was coming up quite so soon. However, I will be glad to let the minister have a copy. I will read this amendment which I desire to have added at the end of the bill. It is as follows:

18A. Notwithstanding the provisions in this act or any other act or law pertaining to or relating to live stock or in connection with live stock yards, it is hereby enacted that in every case where in the opinion of a veterinary inspector duly appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Animals' Contagious Diseases Act, a contagious disease or contagious diseases of animals exist, or are suspected to exist, the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and amendments thereto and the provisions therein shall prevail as against this act or all or any other act or acts relating to or pertaining to live stock or live stock yards as defined herein.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That will come in at the end of the bill—is that the idea?

Mr. TOLMIE: That is the idea.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 12 is carried.

On section 20—Repeal:

Mr. GOULD: I wish to make some further reference to the matter of penalties. The minister, in reply to the illustration which I gave, said that commission men were always bonded. That is true but the fact of their being bonded has not prevented them from infringing the act in the past. If a commission man has acted improperly in a case where money has been entrusted to him in the past the imposition of a paltry fine of four or five hundred dollars is not likely to act as a serious deterrent in the future.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What the hon. gentleman says is quite correct but in our commercial relations with each other we have always to take a business risk. Now, this risk has been been reduced to a minimum—first by requiring a bond and second by the precaution of opening a special account. There is also the penalty which has been referred to. If my hon. friend has any suggestions to make looking to further precautions I will be glad to discuss the matter with him. What can we do beyond enacting the provisions set forth here? The man is bonded; he is restricted as to the disposition he will make of the money entrusted to him; if he violates the law he is fined. We might provide a further punishment, we might hang him, but that would not help the man who lost the money any more than would the imposition of a fine. I will talk the matter over with the hon. member for Assiniboia and see if any further provision can be made to secure the owner of the cattle against further losses. There have been losses in the past. There is no question but that very considerable loss has taken place, and we want now to adopt safeguards as adequate as human ingenuity can suggest.

Mr. GOULD: It is not my intention to ask the minister to hold the bill in committee; I think he understands the circumstances of the case thoroughly well. As I have stated, there have been these occurrences in the past; there is a possibility of their being repeated. The tendency of producers in the West is to go more and more into co-operation in the shipment of cattle. Instead of the carloads that formerly were shipped, there will be whole train loads going forward. It is not a question of a shipment valued merely at $1,000; the amount now involved runs into $10,000 or $20,000. I think the penalties in this case should be increased. The fine might remain at $400 but there should be a maximum, say, of $1,000; and the security should be on a graduated scale proportionate to the liability which rests on the commission man.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As I have already intimated we will leave the bill in committee for the present. My attention has been drawn to the further fact that in addition to the precautions contained in the bill, and the fact that an offender can be fined, there is this further fact that he can be expelled from the exchange, so that the offence cannot be repeated. But that does not meet my hon. friend's representation, nor do I think it can be met if we undertake to increase the bond from $10,000, because this would

simply increase the cost to the commission men that much more. I will, however, look into the matter to see whether the bond can be raised to advantage without embarrassing the trade generally.

Progress reported.

ADMIRALTY ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 117, to amend the Admiralty Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The resolution which is the basis of this bill was adopted a few days ago. Clauses 1 and 2 are a reproduction of the resolution.

On section 4—Deputy registrar:

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This provides for the appointment of a deputy registrar. There is no such provision in the existing statute.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved the third reading of Bill No. 112, to amend the Irrigation Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, April 26, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS

Fifth report of the select standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization—Mr. Kay.

Fourth report of the select standing committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills—Mr. McGiverin.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 136, to amend the Immigration Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the few amendments we are proposing to the act are merely to make it conform to changed conditions. Some sections with respect to alien enemies are being amended, and in the case of section 41 we are reverting to the old section in substitution of the amended section of two years ago. We are also increasing the fines from $10 to $20 where shipmasters are negligent in reporting desertion.

Mr. JACOBS: What is the change in section 41?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We revert to old section 4 of two years ago.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MONTREAL COLD STORAGE

Mr. THOMPSON:

1. Is the Montreal Cold Storage a national institution?
2. To what extent is it financed by the government and at what rate of interest?
3. What are the net results (profit or loss) on the operating expenses of this storage for its first year's operations?
4. How will deficits be met, and in event of loss will harbour dues be increased to meet same?
5. Are the rates charged by the Montreal commission lower than other public cold storages charged previous to opening the Montreal commission's plant?
6. Is it the intention of the government to subsidize cold storages to be operated by co-operative associations in various parts of the country with the idea of having a chain of storages in the country to supply the Montreal Cold Storage and thus have all under government control?
7. Would there be any discrimination against private individuals or corporations who might desire a subsidy for a cold storage plant, or is it intended to assist only rural communities that are organized?
8. Has any provision been made for the continuance of a subsidized cold storage in case of disorganization of the co-operative societies?
9. In the event of public cold storages being closed as a result of competition is there likely to be any increase in the rates charged by the Montreal commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have at that port a cold storage plant in addition to other cold storage plants at Montreal.

2. The building of this plant was financed to the extent of $2,765,000 out of money loaned by the government under statutory authority and secured by debentures bearing interest at 5 per cent.

3. Operation and maintenance, 7 months, $113,789.62; interest on cost of construction, 7 months, $80,665.60; total receipts for 7 months, $55,416.45.

4. It is confidently expected that the plant will in future be self-sustaining, but any deficit that may occur will be met from general harbour revenues without increasing harbour dues.

5. The rates charged by the harbour commissioners' cold storage plant are the same as those charged by the other cold storage plants in Montreal, with the exception that in the case of the former no charge is made for insurance.

6. No.

7. The Cold Storage Act, as approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, provides that subsidies be paid only on account of municipal and co-operative cold storages.

8. No provision has been made for the continuance of a subsidized cold storage in case of disorganization of the co-operative societies, but the act will provide that the government shall hold a lien on the cold storage for the full amount of the subsidy.

9. There is no likelihood whatever of the rates in the harbour commissioners cold storage plant being increased if the other cold storages become closed as a result of competition, the intention of the harbour commission being to make the charges for this service as low as they possibly can, having regard to revenue requirements.

CANADIAN VICKERS

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. What investment, if any, has the government in the plant of Canadian Vickers?
2. What moneys, if any, are being paid Canadian Vickers, and for what services?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Not any.

2. An annual subsidy of $105,000 is paid by agreement under authority of the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 9-10 Edward VII, chapter 17 (1910), amended by 2 George V., chapter 20 (1912).

FEDERAL OFFICES, HAWKESBURY

Mr. BINETTE:

1. What is the revenue of the Custom House, at Hawkesbury, Ontario?
2. What amount is paid in salaries to the Dominion government employees, at Hawkesbury?
3. What are the names, salaries and date of appointment of each government employee at Hawkesbury?
4. Why was Dr. R. P. Pattee superannuated?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Department of Customs and Excise—

1. Revenue for the fiscal year 1922-23, $54,380.10.

2. Salaries as of 1st April, 1923, $3,180.00 per year.

3. Alex. Aiken, salary $1,080; employed January 22, 1917; permanently appointed October 1, 1917. W. T. Emonds, salary $1,140; employed February 18, 1913; permanently appointed July 10, 1914. H. M. Mooney, salary $960; employed January 17, 1921.

4. Retired order in council of May 18, 1921, under the provisions of the Public Service Retirement Act on the recommendation of the chairman of the sub-committee of council on reorganization and efficiency approving of a report and recommendation of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Post Office Department—

1. No information.

2. No information.

3. James G. Higginson, postmaster, salary $2,836.66, out of which the postmaster pays his assistants; appointed 1st June, 1869.

4. No information.

PROTECTION OF TIMBER

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Referring to part K Auditor General's report for the year ending March 31st, 1921, at page 102, the item Interior-Protection of timber, $2,623.08:

1. How was this sum expended?
2. To whom was it paid?
3. What service or material was received for same?
4. Was same paid through any Yukon official?
5. If so, through whom?
6. If not, through what official of the government was same paid?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. This money was paid from Protection of Timber Appropriation and sent to F. G. Berton, Mining Recorder, Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, as follows, in payment of accounts rendered for fire-fighting:

1920					
August	17,	Cheque	No. 203	for	$ 210 45
November	12,	"	" 1027	"	2,344 03
December	17,	"	" 1604	"	3 60
1921					
January	31,	"	" 1895	"	5 00
March	9,	"	" 2136	"	60 00
					$2,623 08

2. F. G. Berton, Mining Recorder, Whitehorse.

3. —

Travel—

Sept. 12, 1920, F. G. Berton, one-half expenses, Fire Inspection trip		$ 11 50
Fire fighters, etc.—		
June pay list	$ 210 45	
July pay list	198 65	
August pay list	1,339 35	
Services, 1 man, 1 day	5 00	
W.P. & Y.R. Transport	16 45	
		$1,769 90

Auto Hire—		
July 30, 1920, F. E. Harbottle	30 00	
July 29, 1920, R. H. Palmer	74 00	
		$ 104 00
Hardware—		
July 30, 1920, John Sewell	55 05	
July 30, 1920, W. A. Puckett	100 95	
		$ 156 00
Provisions, etc.—		
From July 30 to August 20, 1920, Arctic Trading Co	514 53	
From July 30 to August 20, 1920, White Pass & Yukon Rte. Freight	7 15	
Services, 75 hours, August 1920, James Miller Services	60 00	
		$ 581 68
		$2,623 08

4. Yes.

5. F. G. Berton, Mining Recorder, Whitehorse.

6. Answered by No. 5.

YUKON TELEGRAPH SYSTEM

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. What was the revenue during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, from the Yukon Telegraph System?

2. What was the revenue during the same period on the said system from messages sent and delivered within British Columbia?

3. What was the revenue during the same period on said system from messages: (a) Sent and delivered within Yukon Territory; (b) Sent within Yukon Territory and delivered elsewhere; (c) Sent from points outside Yukon Territory and delivered within Yukon Territory?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay): With respect to this question, we are waiting for information, which will be ready in a few days.

BOARD OF GRAIN COMMISSIONERS

Mr. COOTE:

1. What are the names and addresses of the members of the Board of Grain Commissioners?

2. What was the address and occupation of each member of the commission previous to his appointment?

3. When were they appointed, and for how long?

4. What is the salary of each commissioner?

5. Are these salaries fixed by statute or are they voted annually?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Leslie H. Boyd, Fort William, Ont.; Matthew Snow, Fort William, Ont. and Winnipeg, Man.; James Robertson, Fort William, Ont.

2. Leslie H. Boyd, K.C., Montreal, Que.; Matthew Snow, Secretary Northwest Grain Dealers' Association, Winnipeg; James Robinson, Vice-President Saskatchewan Co-operative Association, Regina, Sask.

3. Leslie H. Boyd, March 27, 1917, period of ten years; Matthew Snow, April 19, 1922, period of ten years; James Robinson, September 1, 1922, period of ten years.

Leslie H. Boyd, Chief Commissioner, $6,500 per annum; Matthew Snow, Commissioner, $6,000 per annum; James Robinson, Commissioner, $6,000 per annum.

5. Fixed by statute—Canada Grain Act.

INCOME TAX—PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What has been the gross amount of revenue per year, collected by the Dominion government, from income taxes in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba (separately), each year since the coming into effect of the said income tax?

2. What has been the total cost of collecting this tax each year?

3. What has been the net revenue obtained from same?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

In accordance with section 4 of the Income War Tax Act payments made under the Business Profits War Tax Act are deducted from the amount of taxes that would otherwise be payable under the Income War Tax Act; also as the administration of both acts is conducted by the same staff the answers hereinafter given relate to the collections and expenses in these provinces under the two acts combined.

1.	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
Manitoba	$3,552,115 21	$4,627,585 75	$6,079,860 12	$7,439,409 42	$5,164,930 23
Saskatchewan	457,433 88	1,261,685 48	1,519,890 82	2,665,235 37	1,738,248 78
Alberta	699,874 98	2,213,708 03	2,232,193 75	2,707,262 26	2,120,915 97
2.					
Manitoba	$ 25,166 82	$ 117,270 60	$ 93,484 45	$ 118,317 46	$ 112,313 36
Saskatchewan	25,583 45	194,311 86	161,073 09	181,955 62	166,669 87
Alberta	25,209 37	101,425 87	79,093 65	95,163 87	100,025 72
3.					
Manitoba	$3,526,948 39	$4,510,315 15	$5,986,375 67	$7,321,091 96	$5,052,616 87
Saskatchewan	431,850 43	1,067,373 62	1,358,817 73	2,483,279 75	1,571,578 91
Alberta	674,665 61	2,112,282 16	2,153,100 10	2,612,098 39	2,020,890 25

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT LOANS

Mr. ARTHURS:

Referring to Hansard, page 2029, the Minister of Immigration stated, first column, that the total amount loaned under the Soldier Settlement Act was $94,993,421.38. At the foot of the second column he made the statement that the amount of money expended on loans was:—

Year	Loans
1918-1919	$ 1,383,391 82
1919-1920	42,715,374 34
1920-1921	22,833,186 29
1921-1922	11,501,160 09
	$78,433,112 54

What is the explanation for the difference in the amounts?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The loan disbursements for Fiscal Year 1920-1921 should read $32,833,186.29 and not $22,833,-186.29; also the total loan disbursements quoted in the previous column ($94,933,421.-38) are up to January 31, 1923. Therefore, if the amount disbursed from April 1, 1922, to January 31, 1923, ($6,560,308.84) is added, the statement printed in column 1, Page 2,106 will be found to be correct, viz:

Year	Loans
1918-1919	$ 1,383,391 82
1919-1920	42,715,374 34
1920-1921	32,833,186 29
1921-1922	11,501,160 09
1922 to January 31, 1923	6,560,308 84
	$94,993,421 38

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

GRAIN COMMISSIONERS—EMPLOYEES, ETC.

Mr. COOTE:

1. What was the total number of employees of the Board of Grain Commissioners at Fort William in the year 1922, and what was the total of the salaries paid during the year?
2. What number of persons were employed in the Weighing department in each month, and what was the amount of wages paid to them in each month?
3. What was the amount of grain weighed by this department in each month?
4. What number of persons were employed in the Inspection department in each month, and what was the amount of wages paid to them in each month?
5. What was the amount of grain inspected by this department in each month?

THETFORD MINES STRIKE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACOBS: Is the government able to give us any information in regard to the strike at Thetford Mines?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the first information received by the government in regard to this strike was this morning in a letter from the correspondent of the department at Thetford Mines. The strike appears to have started on Monday morning, some four hundred men being concerned. The company has closed the mines, and the employees so far have refused to consider returning to work unless and until the manager is removed. The provincial government is looking into the situation. That is all the information we have at the present time. My department has an officer on the spot making further inquiries to see if we can assist in settling the trouble.

SHIRE HORSES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ELLIOTT (South Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I notice in to-day's Citizen a news item to the effect that the horses donated to Canada by the Shire Breeders of Great Britain have arrived at the Experimental Farm and will be kept there for a few days, their ultimate destination being Lacombe, Alberta. I should like to ask the minister (Mr. Motherwell)—unfortunately he is not in his seat at the moment—if it is the intention of his department to send all of these horses out to the West, or will any of them be retained in Ontario for the improvement of the breed in this province?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat at the moment, but I shall have pleasure in directing his attention to the question which my hon. friend has asked.

VANCOUVER FISHERY PATROL

UNITED STATES SCHOONER SILOAM FIRED ON BY PROTECTION STEAMER MALASPINA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACOBS: Can the government give us any information with respect to the killing of two American citizens by the crew of a Canadian patrol boat off Vancouver Island yesterday?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): A preliminary report has been prepared in connection with this incident. Here is what has been supplied to me:

The fishery protection steamer Malaspina, Captain Newcombe in command, sighted the United States schooner Siloam, of Seattle, engaged in fishing within one mile of Solander island. Upon sighting the schooner, the captain blew three whistles, the usual signal for the schooner to stop. No attention having been paid this signal, the Malaspina fired three blank shots across the bow of the schooner. The latter continuing, two solid shots were fired across the

bow, but still no attention from the schooner. The captain of the Malaspina at this point hailed the captain of the schooner again, requesting him to stop, but he declined to do so. Two solid shots were then fired but missed, after which the Malaspina demanded that the schooner stop, warning the captain that if these instructions were not obeyed the vessel would be sunk. The schooner persisted in paying no attention to this warning, consequently no alternative was left to the captain of the Malaspina but to fire a rifle volley at the pilot house.

Unfortunately a man was wounded, but the schooner stopped and the schooner's boat brought the wounded man to the Malaspina and then headed for the shore. The report continues.

The Malaspina lowered a boat at once and a line was put on board the schooner, when it was discovered that the crew had scuttled her before leaving. The Malaspina then endeavoured to tow her, although full of water, and obtain medical aid for the wounded man. The Mounted Police and other authorities were notified and tried to arrest the four other men of the schooner's crew who had escaped.

It is the opinion of the officers of the department that these men are not American citizens, though they were on an American schooner; they are probably foreigners. We will have a final and more complete report in a short time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

Mr. ANDERSON: I placed two questions on the order paper on 5th March. These questions were passed as orders for returns and appear in the votes and proceedings of 7th March. I should like to know when I may expect to receive an answer to these questions?

Mr. FIELDING: The questions were in a form which seemed to us to be incomplete. If the hon. member had in proper course moved his motion I would have asked an amendment which would have covered all the ground he wished to cover, and something more. The matter, of course, can only be brought up in its proper order. If the hon. member attaches importance to it, I would arrange with him as to what the amendment should be and we can bring down the return even yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I caught the minister's remarks, he does not propose, without an amendment, to bring down a return which has been ordered by the House?

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) is wrong; the return has not been ordered by the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was the statement of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson).

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. FIELDING: No, I do not think he meant that. The motion was put on the order paper and the hon. member was not here when it was called; at all events it was not moved in its proper order. My recollection is that it is still on the order paper as a notice of motion.

Mr. ANDERSON: They are in the Votes and Proceedings, and one has been passed as an order for return. The statement in the Votes and Proceedings of March 7th is that an order of the House had been issued to the proper officers to prepare the information asked for in the notice of motion.

Mr. FIELDING: Possibly I have the wrong impression in mind; I will look into the matter. Certainly, the order I had in mind stood as a notice of motion. In view of the hon member's statement, however, I will make inquiries.

Mr. ANDERSON: There was also a question in my name which stood as notice of motion for an order for return. Then there was also an order of the House which was the result of a notice of motion.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps I have been referring to the wrong one. If so, my remarks have been out of place.

ILLICIT LIQUOR TRAFFIC

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: A number of papers in the United States and Canada are calling attention to the conditions which exist with regard to the rum running traffic. It is claimed that Canada is being used as a base for this illicit traffic from this country to the United States, and further that the new regulations are not at all effective in preventing this evil. I should like to ask whether the government is bringing in any measures with a view to dealing effectively with this matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government is exercising every care to see that the existing regulations are carried out. Thus far it has not been possible to devise more effective means than those we already have. It is probable that some of these reports are not well founded. However, I shall have pleasure in directing the attention of the minister to the matter and having it looked into further.

FRENCH TREATY

BILL TO RATIFY—DEBATE ON SECOND READING CONCLUDED

The House resumed from Thursday, April 19, the debate on the motion of Hon. Mr.

Fielding for the second reading of Bill No. 23, respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the French Republic.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I desire to continue, though I fear my remarks will have to be brief, the discussion of the second reading of the French Treaty Bill. At the last sitting I called attention to the valuable concessions this country had given, concessions that aggregated a loss in revenue unquestionably amounting to between half a million and a million dollars—revenue that was derived from the users of undoubted luxuries and now must be made up by taking more or declining to take less from the pockets of the users of undoubted necessities. The price we pay does not end there. The price we pay involves as well disabilities upon primary producers of this country, producers of wines, producers, or contemplated and quite practical producers, of silks and many commodities in respect of which we now have remaining little more than a nominal duty against the importation. Every single item that appears in the schedules of the treaty affecting goods coming to Canada is a real item; every one is an item of some importance; many of them are items of major importance. The French negotiators did not consider that printer's ink was of particular value in a treaty; they wanted concessions that were concessions, and they got them. They did not think of the wisdom of going back to their parliament with a long list of articles which even their parliament would know nothing about, such as was the course pursued by our representatives.

I want now to dwell on what we obtain which is alleged to be of value in the treaty; and I will not need to be detailed at all. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) has placed upon Hansard figures taken from our export and import returns that bear directly on the value of this treaty on both sides, on the value of every concession or of everything that is supposed to be a concession to us. All that has been said about the treaty, assuming everything the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has uttered to be correct, does not shatter in the least degree the case made by the hon. member for Lincoln. The Minister of Finance says, "Oh, we get concessions here in respect of certain goods asked to be reduced by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association," and he read a list of those goods, undoubtedly articles in respect of which he has already had the duty reduced down to the American level, in some cases down to the minimum tariff, but in all cases to the American level, and he says: Look at that for a triumph! Is not that something worth while? Those articles, he says, are not to be treated with scorn as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) treated them. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lincoln treated no article that the minister mentioned with scorn, not at all. He admitted they were concessions. But are they of much value? Surely ministers do not come here and say they sat for three, four or five months in Paris trying to get a few spare parts of implements down to the American level of duty.

Take the minister's speech and read the articles to which he attributes so much importance—certain portions of agricultural implements, canvass for binders, magnetos for another implement that we sell to France, that is for automobiles, and other articles of similar kind. Read the list from beginning to end and I venture to say that there is not one article that the French people would not readily have reduced to the American level in their own interests for reasons that are so obvious that we would not need to send anybody to France. These articles are binder canvasses, canvass straps, magnetos, ordinary cast iron spares, straight solid steel shafts, tubular bored straight shafts, spark plugs and certain articles of a similar character in iron and steel. The French people are using the completed products of these goods. They have our binders, our mowers, our automobiles, and they found they could not get these spare parts except over a prohibitive duty. Why, the French people, one would think, would be at the door of their government to have these articles reduced. But it is worth something to Canada. No one disputes that it is of some value to the manufacturers of these goods, and they would ask for it, but it is no triumph for the Canadian negotiators and no real concession on the part of France. Grant the reduced duties on these articles, and everything the Minister of Finance has mentioned, and in sight of that meagre array just let us bring to our minds what the Minister of Finance has given.

I will refer in a moment to the contention of the minister that he could not do any better, that he did the best he could. But it is surely worth while for us to compare the conditions under this treaty with the conditions that existed before. If it is not, then the Minister of Finance simply raises the white flag and he says: We have got to do what every high tariff country in this world tells us; we have to do it; we have to bow down and submit to the exactions which any

country wishes to impose. If the treaty we have with them is not good enough for them and they want something more to their advantage, all they have to do is to say so. That on the plea that he could do no better is the position of the Minister of Finance.

No, Mr. Speaker, we must compare the conditions under this treaty with the conditions that existed before, and I say that we would be infinitely better off without this treaty and have the conditions that existed before; and if France wants to get rid of the conditions that existed before, surely we are not going to proclaim that we are absolutely without weapons while France has all the weapons in her hands.

The minister has his schedule A in respect of which he has the French minimum tariff. Well, the French minimum tariff may be of value on certain goods, and may be of no value at all on other goods, and I venture to say that the Minister of Finance has not secured one single reduction in respect of schedule A, his best schedule, that is of any substantial value to the Dominion of Canada. But it is his best schedule. Most of our exports are under that schedule, the body of our exports that go to France to-day are under the general tariff, the general tariff being as regards them the same as the minimum tariff. Surely the minister was not afraid that there would be a penalty duty imposed against Canada. Our wheat, our grain and all these things that we export in tremendous quantities do not go very much into France, it is true, because the duty is so high, but they are our chief exports. The French general tariff is the same on them as their minimum tariff, and on the first page of Schedule A which embraces 65 per cent of the exports of Canada, the minister has secured reductions on five articles not one dollar of which we ever send to France, and the exports of Canada in relation to all of them and the possibilities of exports, well, they are almost negligible. They amount to nothing at all. Relative to the trade of the nation they are merely chicken feed, and the same applies to page 2 and page 3 of schedule A. The minister has nothing for this country on these pages. Go over them one after the other. I think the total number of articles that come after page 1 of schedule A on which the minister has secured reductions is 19, and you can go over them one after another and you will find in nearly all cases, and in all cases of consequence, that we are buyers of the same goods from France or from the world, and in many cases from France herself, buyers in large amounts, and not exporters at all. Where we are exporters it is in trifling sums, and very little or nothing to France. Now what value is such a schedule to this country? Is it worth while paying an annual sum of from five hundred thousand to a million dollars for? Is it so worth while when we must throw down our bars on luxuries to Japan, to Italy, to Switzerland and all of some eleven favoured nations?

Mr. McMASTER: Does the right hon. leader of the Opposition mean to infer that it is an expense to the Canadian people to get goods at a lower cost?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes I do, when we have to pay extra on goods that we need far more. I wonder if the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was in the Liberal convention in which they solemnly resolved to tax luxuries? He was there. Now he is going to support a bill which reduces the tax on luxuries and consequently imposes a heavier tax on necessaries. That is what I am against.

Now leaving schedule A, which is the best schedule, we have nothing at all that compares with the concessions granted—nothing at all. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that in respect to schedule B there are at least twenty-five penalties imposed on us the injury to Canada as regards any one of which is greater than all that we get in the whole of schedule A. In schedule B there are thirty articles, our large exports many of them, exports of which we send a substantial quantity to France, in respect of which the minister has gone over and yielded to the demand of France for a far higher duty than existed before. I say again, you can take not all of them upon which the tariff against us is raised by this treaty—there are about three not of very great consequence, but not more than three—there are twenty-five at any rate that are of outstanding consequence, and all of them or nearly all are of consequence to the agricultural producers of Canada. Is this the way to get wider markets? How are hon. gentlemen who are down here on a crusade for wider markets going to go home to their constituencies and say: The first vote I had on any treaty for wider markets I cast to curtail and contract the markets for the agricultural products of our country, but I did it because the Minister of Finance told me that when another country had a higher tariff than we had, we simply had to do it and that if we pursued a low tariff doctrine, the same thing is what we would have to do every time. Such is the answer they will have to make to their constituents as to why they voted for this contraction of the agricultural products markets of this country. The hon.

member for Brome shakes his head. Does he not see in this treaty agricultural products and manufactures of agricultural products one by one to at least twenty with the French duty raised against them, and he cannot point to one agricultural product with the duty lowered? Now he shakes his head; let him speak.

Mr. McMASTER: I point out a well-known economic fact—that if you allow goods to come into your country at a low rate of duty you help the exports from your country to the country from which the exports come.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see. So by reducing our duty on brandy we help our exports of meat.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see.

Mr. McMASTER: That is a well-known economic law. Of course, I would not say that brandy was a wise example.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not think so —nor is silk, nor anything else that we reduce.

Mr. McMASTER: But it is correct economics.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. member also explain how, by lowering the duties on embroideries and silks, of which we import millions of dollars worth, we are going to help the farmer to sell his cattle?

Mr. McMASTER: Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will? With the tariff raised against us on cattle?

Mr. McMASTER: Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We cannot help but bow in admiration before the optimism of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Yes, in every respect the farmers, through this treaty, have barriers put up against them. They have had to submit to the erection of higher barriers against the sale of the agricultural products of this country; against poultry, against meats, against potatoes, against vegetables, against condensed milk, against stock, against the main agricultural exports of Canada save grain alone. In respect of grain they have the general tariff of France and nothing more. In respect of live animals we have not yet succeeded in selling any to France.

Mr. McMASTER: Any what?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any live animals. As regards those we have a higher tariff even than we had before. The possibility of widening our markets for stock in France is stopped. If we could not sell any in the face of a tariff of 20 francs, we are not likely to sell any in the face of a tariff of 21½ francs. In other cases we have to face a duty of 100 per cent more than we previously had; and a duty of 50 per cent more is frequently found in this new French tariff. And this is what we are asked to submit to. We are asked to take this because—in the words of the Finance Minister—after five months' work he could not for the life of him get anything better. Now, I want hon. gentlemen to reflect upon our position in that regard. The Canadian ministers had, in order to maintain that this is a low tariff country, in order to save the face of the Minister of Finance—who has been preaching low tariff in opposition and binding himself to general reductions every time he got on his feet—they had to curtail and contract the export market for the agricultural products of Canada. What a fine confession to make to the agricultural producers of this country. I can imagine the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sitting beside the statesmen of France negotiating this treaty as one by one these articles were produced. Condensed milk was laid before the Minister of Finance and he was told, "You will have to submit to 50 per cent more duty, half as much again, on this; you will have to submit to a higher duty on live stock; you will have to submit to a duty of half as much again, or more, on meats and vegetables of which we export large amounts representing a value of millions". The minister, I fancy, protested, and kept on protesting for five months, but the French negotiators sat there with the Liberal platform in their pockets. They had the Liberal convention report, they had the resolution moved by the minister himself in this House, and they said to him, "What do you propose to do if we increase these duties?"; —and the minister could not say that he would raise the tariff against French luxuries imported into this country. If he did they would laugh at him. He could not even protest against higher duties on articles going into France. The French negotiators would say to him, "You have been arguing in your parliament for years that the putting up of duties by us only hurts ourselves" and so he could not complain; he did not have a word to say for himself. All the French negotiators needed to have was simply the record of the speeches of the Minister of Finance in this parliament, the record of his resolutions, and they would be still better armed with a copy of that precious document the report of the Liberal convention of 1919. Faced with these things the minister was helpless, and that is

why he is back to this House with this treaty. But is his quandary any reason why we should accept the treaty? Is it any reason why this House should accept this humiliating surrender which the Minister of Finance proposes to us? This is a capitulation—in every line of the treaty it is a capitulation to France. In many respects it is a bigger capitulation to Japan from whom we get nothing at all than it is to France; a bigger capitulation to Switzerland, in many respects, than it is to France. All this we are asked to take from the Minister of Finance on the mere plea that he could not do any better, when we know the reason he could not do any better was his own insincere conduct in opposition. For his conduct this country is now paying the penalty in the form of this treaty.

Will the minister suggest to me anything, save those things that he gets under Schedule A, that is of value to this country? I do not know of anything that he gets that is of value anyway to the agriculturists of Canada. He does get something that is better in respect to certain manufactured products which I have named; but even in getting them he does not secure any concession from France which could not have been secured with far less trouble and infinitely less sacrifice on the part of the government of Canada.

I want again to inquire why the Minister of Finance comes to this parliament with an illusion, a grotesque pact—a poor, helpless treaty, surrounded and buried in pure padding? "Oh," he says, "We may make some of these things some day." Is that a real excuse for having these articles in the treaty? I turn the minister's attention to a page and a half containing over one hundred articles, page 21 and half of 22, and I take the chance of saying to the minister now that he cannot tell me what one of those articles is. I will go further. I venture to suggest that there is not a member of the government that has the faintest idea what one out of those one hundred articles is at all. I admit that I do not, and I do not know where to find out.

Mr. McMASTER: How could anybody else expect to know if the minister does not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Maybe the member for Brome would and for the purpose of this inquiry, although not for any other purpose, I will include him as a member of the government—will he give the information to this House? All this was done simply to cover the surrender of our interests that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made in their negotiations; it was done simply to cover up the surrender of our real interests under this copious pact of page after page of articles the nature of which none of us know and the names of which we cannot even pronounce. I invite any member of this House to take some of these products with names of thirty or forty letters and practise for half a day the pronouncing of them. I conjecture the result would be that nobody could tell what he was saying. This is a feature of the treaty we have entered into.

Mr. McMASTER: The value of a pharmacopœia does not depend upon its pronunciability.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member tell me the value of even one of these one hundred articles. On the authority of the best chemist we can find—

Mr. McMASTER: Dr. Sheard?

Mr. MEIGHEN: —we are assured that none of them was ever made in this country. In a letter that was read to the House at the last session the best chemist in the country stated that although these products are made in some other land none of them was ever produced in Canada save one and that the ingredients for this one exception all had to be imported. Yet this is supposed to be a treaty. But the matter is serious. In respect of real exports from Canada it is very serious. We are going to suffer a handicap from the day this treaty goes into effect onward because of the surrender of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and all we have to weigh is, whether the reasons for the surrender were such that we should now accept this treaty as part of the inevitable. That is all we have to weigh. Nobody disputes that we are injured by this treaty. The Minister of Finance himself in his speech says that the French people were not willing to compete with us as favourably as they were back in 1907 when he made his previous treaty.

There was a temporary extension of the 1907 treaty with some alterations in 1921—a very good extension under all the circumstances. This was in effect when the Minister of Finance went over, and he said France was not ready to treat on so favourable a basis as in that, which is another way of admitting that he has brought back worse conditions than he took over. There is no use labouring the matter further, but I venture to say any hon. member of this House who will examine the schedules and our exports will place a far greater value upon what this country loses by the treaty than did the Minister of Finance.

But he says we have secured on some articles the schedules already accorded the United States. Now I do not dispute—and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) did not dispute—that this was worth something, but is it something for which we should make large—very large—concessions to France? Why, let me ask, should we be penalized by France as between ourselves and the United States of America? I should like hon. members to reflect on that and try to answer. Does any hon. member know why the United States should enjoy, for no concession whatever, for no pretence of a concession, in the face of a policy that definitely denies a concession, something that Canada can only secure by granting heavy concessions? Would it be much of a triumph if the Minister of Finance had come back with equal conditions as between this country and the United States in the tariff of France? I do not think it would. But that he has not obtained—not by a very long way. The United States are not letting silks, embroideries, satins, brandies and champagnes, and all these other products into their country, the way we are doing in Canada. They are not imposing taxes on necessaries in order that they may relieve the consumers of luxuries. They are not doing such things in order to get, as they do get, everything we are getting by this treaty.

I wish to refer to another phase. When we grant to France the right to send her silks to Canada at a certain rate of duty, we grant the same thing to eleven favoured nations, with the result that in case after case we are making far more concessions to the other countries than we are making to France herself.

Mr. McMASTER: Does that hurt France?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly it does—and it hurts us. It merely puts more taxes on the users of necessaries in our country. If it does not hurt Canada, if it helps Canada, why leave any tariff on? That is where the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is, but not where the Minister of Finance stands. Who is going to argue that it is a benefit to us to maintain our taxes on necessaries and reduce our taxes on luxuries? The supporter of this treaty is bound so to maintain, or to admit, that we make very serious concessions for worse than nothing.

Mr. GOOD: Why could we not collect some of our taxes in some other way than by transferring the duties from luxuries to necessaries?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the Minister of Finance will have to do just that. But the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) must remember that last year the way he increased taxes was chiefly by a 50 per cent increase in the sales tax, which came on everybody. Does the member for Brant hope to reduce the sales tax by relieving the users of luxuries of their taxes? Indeed he does not. He shakes his head honestly in the negative. If we do not get an increased sales tax this year, to make up what we are losing under this, or if we do not get a reduction when we should otherwise get it, it is because of the blunders of the concessions of this treaty, and he who votes for the treaty votes to shut the door on the reduction of our sales tax, and he votes to shut the door against relief on the necessaries of life. Of course the Minister of Finance knows that just to the extent this treaty operates that is what he is doing.

Mr. McMASTER: Not necessarily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the plan proposed by the hon. member for Brome?

Mr. McMASTER: I think, perhaps, the leader of the Opposition might realize that even in silks the reduction of duty might mean increased imports, and might mean greater revenue raised.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might, but the Minister of Finance himself estimates that it will be $850,000 less. In any event I am not quite able to understand just how this country is going to get richer or pay debts faster by buying more silks and champagnes or buying more of anything that is embraced in the schedules of the treaty where we make concessions to France.

I want to impress upon the House instances that go to show what we are actually doing when we sign this treaty. I call attention to the main exports of our country to France. Take them one by one from the largest until you get through, fifteen to twenty, and on each one you will find higher duties put up against us by France. Then take the imports of this country which compete with our own productions in some instances, and which in almost every instance are luxuries. Where we take the tariff off for the sake of France on goods she sells us of $100 value we sometimes take the tariff off Switzerland on goods she sells us of $300, $400, and even $1,000. That is a splendid way to make a concession to France, is it not? I have before me a list of the goods so affected, and I would like the House to bear with me while I call attention to some of them. I commence with braids and cords. We are lowering the duty to France, though she only sends us $46,000 worth odd, but we

are taking it off similarly to Switzerland, which country sends us $112,407, and Switzerland gives us nothing. It is true she does not pay us by raising the duty against us. I suppose from that point of view really Switzerland is better entitled to it than France. In respect of France, for doing this, we have the duty raised against us on our main imports to that country. In respect to Switzerland we do it for nothing at all. But let us pass on. In the matter of brushes, where France sells us $42,000 worth, Switzerland sells us $114,000 worth or about two and a half or three times as much, and we are making concessions on that article to Switzerland for nothing whatsoever. Going from that to buttons, where we buy $11,000 worth from France we buy from Japan $107,000 worth, or nearly ten times as much, so that where we are making a concession of $1 to the French exporter to Canada, we are making a concession of $10 to the Japanese exporter to Canada. Will any hon. member tell me why we should do that? If we are bound to be making concessions on these lines of goods, we should have done two things first. We should have had a comparable tariff on them or, at least, a tariff from which we could have come down, and secondly we should have got rid of the necessity of making concessions to countries which give us nothing at all.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member's premises are wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How?

Mr. FORKE: What about the barrier we put up against the Mother Country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What has that to do with the case?

Mr. FORKE: It has a good deal to do with it. The hon. member is talking about barriers being put up against us. We are putting up barriers and there is no complaint.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know we do, and I do not see any of them reduced here. I would like the hon. member to compare the reductions elsewhere.

Mr. FORKE: We are not lamenting the reductions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want to treat the hon. member discourteously but I do not see his point. By making these concessions on luxuries and making ten times the concessions to Japan—

Mr. FORKE: Buttons are not luxuries, they are necessities.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN:—but I venture to say the necessities in the way of buttons are manufactured here. I do not think we are getting many from Japan. I think my hon. friend will find that he has not worn very often, nor have I, the kind of buttons we import from those countries.

Mr. EULER: I should like to correct the right hon. gentleman as regards that. The situation is exactly the reverse. The kind of buttons imported from Japan are the kind we wear on our vests.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be a great deal better for us if we made them in Kitchener—

Mr. EULER: I would grant you that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —or some other town. If this does not hit one way, it hits the other. It injures us every time. Buttons are about the only things that are not luxuries under the schedules.

Mr. McMASTER: Brushes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We make brushes in this country. I venture to say we do not get anything but fancy brushes from so far away as that. Does my hon. friend know about that?

Mr. McMASTER: My interest in brushes is not as great as that of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will pass on, for I do not want to dwell too long on the infirmities of the hon. member. The next article is clocks and watches. Of these we import $3,829 worth from France, but from Switzerland we import $75,586 worth. For the sake of making a concession to France at our expense, we make virtually twenty-five times that concession to Switzerland.

Mr. McMASTER: Think of the saving of time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did not save much time in making this treaty. We lost about five months, and we also lost a great deal to this country. The next item is electrical apparatus, telephones and the like. Of these, whereas we bought from France $1,231 worth, we bought from Japan $18,000 odd worth, making about sixteen times the concession to Japan that we make to France, and all at the expense of this country.

The next item is embroideries. We buy $17,700 worth from France, and from Switzerland $100,598 worth. Of handkerchiefs we bought from France $5,000 odd worth, from Japan $77,000 odd worth, and from Switzerland

$225,000 odd worth; or hon. members will see that we bought some forty times as much from Switzerland as from France. We open our doors to all these countries with no concessions from them at all, and we also open them to France for the privilege of having the duties on our staple exports raised against us. I could pass from one article to another, silk ribbons, toys, silk fabrics, various other things, some of them somewhat hard to pronounce, and in respect of every one of them we make many times the concession to favoured-nation countries that we have made to France.

Besides all this, we fix specific duties on our goods, duties that we cannot vary. This applies to quite a part of the treaty in relation to the duties of Canada. France does not do so. We bind ourselves besides to maintain the same parity between our minimum tariff, and our general tariff as we have to-day. France makes no such covenant with us at all. Moreover, France has reserved the right—and there is no corresponding reservation for this country—to give to all neighbouring, as well as former enemy countries, all concessions that she gives to us. If she exercises that right, do hon. members know of anything that we can get in there under this treaty that will be of any value at all to Canadian exporters? Let her exercise that right in favour of all those neighbouring states, and she has cancelled or all but cancelled the meagre concessions that we already have. The ministers came back and they did not know the effect of that concession. When the matter was put to them in this House on the reading of the resolution, I think it was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who stated that this clause applied, as in previous treaties, just to a certain border zone, bordering on France. It is true that in previous treaties it applied only to such narrow border zone; but in this treaty there is no restriction at all. It applies to all the territory of all nations adjacent to France.

The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) has argued—and I admire the ingenuity of the argument; I think he was driven to it—that he does not consider this treaty solely on an economic basis, and as a matter of dollars and cents. He says: "France suffered terriffic losses in the late war; she lost her million or two million men; she lost another two or three or more millions in disabilities. She lost as well tremendous amounts in property destruction. She sacrificed, of the very manhood and wealth of her nation, relatively more than any other nation that went through the war." In all that I concur; but I do not think the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères will say that I have at any time in my life shown anything but sympathy for and a real desire to help France in her struggle. I think I anticipate the character of campaign it is proposed to wage against those who question the desirability of this treaty. It seems to be disclosed in the speech of the hon. member; but they will have to direct it at all events against some hon. members who have in the crucial past done everything in their power and at considerable risk to render practical and needed assistance to France. I do not, however, believe in mixing up trade treaties with international obligations. It will be argued that we are under obligations to France greater than are the obligations of France to us. I do not admit that. This country sacrificed a great deal, and though we made the sacrifice for ourselves, we must remember that the direct peril to France was far greater than the direct peril to us. I do not admit there is a balance in favour of the other nation. I think we did our duty. We did not do any more; we would and should have done more if we could. That is quite true; but if there is an obligation, then I say: Let us in all honesty discharge it; but do not let us, in discharging it, pay a far greater sum to other countries to whom we are under no obligation whatever. If we seek that method of discharging a debt of honour, a debt of devotion to France, we are taking the most uneconomical, the most disastrous method to the interests of Canada and the least beneficial to the interests of France. Far better, if there is an obligation, to discharge it in a direct way, in a way that we shall know just what we are doing, and not in a way that piles on the back of this country burdens far greater than the amount of the concession passing to France. France benefits by this treaty far more than we benefit; but other nations, benefit too, and while we are helping France we are helping other nations, nations to whom no one would argue that this country is under any obligation whatever. I do not yield even to the hon, member for Chambly and Verchères in my admiration of the French character and the French nation, nor in my desire to assist in the rehabilitation of that country, stricken as it is, in the anguish of after-war collapse. But I do not believe that trade treaties are the right method, and I do not believe, if trade treaties are, that this is the character of treaty that we should make. I do not want to have included among our beneficiaries a number of countries to whom

4 p.m.

we are under no obligation at all, Consequently I think we would be better to reject this treaty.

We are not without resources in this country. Surely hon. members will not argue that we have to sit down and take just what we get from countries that have a higher tariff level from our own. Surely hon. members will not argue that we must continue to do this ad infinitum and that we are utterly without resources to protect ourselves? But they must so argue if they ask us to support this treaty.

There are other courses we can take. France has something to lose by the rejection of this treaty; she stands to lose on exports that for the last fiscal year, of 1922, were far greater than her imports from us. Reject the treaty, adopt the resources that any self-respecting country would adopt and stand up in this battle with other nations. If we do not, we are only going to add to the distresses of our own. Every morning even now our newspapers are full of calamitous tales of our working men emigrating to the United States. As I came in I picked up the Liberal organ of the city of Montreal owned, or at least presided over, by a Liberal member of the Upper House, and I read the heading:

Montreal workmen going in thousands to United States—Present situation threatens serious labour shortage here—

Of course, solving the problem of unemployment triumphantly for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock).

Hundreds every day now storm offices of United States Immigration eager to cross the border—Recent immigrants join in.

And then proceeds the heartrending tale of what is going on. Is there anything in this treaty that is likely to deter one man from emigrating to the United States? Does not this treaty contain the germs that ultimately will result in more men going to the United States? I make this appeal particularly to the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). Many phases of the concession mean that result, and that result alone.

Therefore I say this is not the course to pursue. Let us stand up and behave as a nation in our commercial as we would in all other negotiations, and not proclaim to the world that we must submit meekly and helplessly to the tariff exactions of any country.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished British statesman once said that to oppose is the business of an official opposition. No doubt this is so, but I cannot see why this treaty should have been singled out for such a violent onslaught on the part of my hon. friends opposite. As to the desirability of having friendly relations with France, commercially and otherwise, I hope everybody is in agreement, and consequently it is a matter of regret that an instrument which has been made to meet the wishes of both nations for friendlier relations should have met such a hostile reception from my hon. friends opposite. There are between France and Canada bonds created by tradition, by history, even by heredity, which makes that friendship desirable and permanent, and I repeat that I am sorry this instrument should be met with what I think I am justified in describing as unfair criticism on the part of those hon. gentlemen. Perhaps it will have a good effect somewhere. In France this criticism will produce a mixed effect and many there will regret that suggestions of unfairness on her part should have been made; on the other hand, it will help the French government to secure the ratification of the treaty by the Chamber of Deputies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They will ratify it all right.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because there, I can assure my hon. friends opposite, the concessions given to Canada by France are far from being considered as trivial and useless. I am confident that in this country the treaty will be accepted by the people as a fair one.

My hon. friends opposite have scrutinized schedules A and B, and my hon. friend for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) was selected to launch an attack against those unfortunate schedules. In reading over the debate of 1908, when the treaty that had then been negotiated was under discussion in this House, I see that a similar line of attack was chosen; someone read a list of articles of little importance to this country and made merry of them. Well, the same course is being pursued to-day. My hon. friends are like the Bourbons—they have not learned anything and they have not forgotten anything.

There is this paramount fact to be borne in mind, that every article in which Canada is interested as far as her export trade is concerned is included in this treaty. Now, to use the words of my hon. friend for Lincoln, does it hurt him or anyone else that there are added to the treaty articles in which we have little or no trade at the present time? Twenty-five years ago commodities which to-day are very important to our exporters were not manufactured in this country. Have we reached the limit of our industrial ability? The industries of Canada have progressed by leaps and bounds in the last twenty-five years

I ask again, have we reached the limit of our industrial ability? Is that the confidence of my hon. friends opposite in the ability of our manufacturers? Is that the Conservative confidence in the future of this country?

Take chemical products, for instance; these have been specially selected for gibes and jokes in the course of this debate. Why I am told by men who know that there is a tremendous field for expansion in the manufacture of chemical products. We have the natural resources, the raw material, we have the scientific ability, and in this particular field Canada is bound to accomplish success in the future. This treaty is not made for the past, it is made for the future. It is made for the trade of coming years, not for the industrial development of twenty-five years ago. We are not asking this House to legislate for our ancestors, but for our children and for ourselves.

Now, is it quite certain that we are not exporting the very articles which my hon. friends have criticised us for including in this treaty? Well, I see my hon. friend for Lincoln is still feeling the effects of that bronze powder in which he became involved the other day and from which his leader unsuccessfully tried to extricate him. He said that he had used that article for fourteen years and did not know it was manufactured in this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. minister at the bronze powder again?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. and my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) said: Well, it is excusable because the reports of the Trade and Commerce department did not include bronze powder.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As an export.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is that an excuse?

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is an excuse for my not knowing it was exported.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Probably that is the reason the French government reduced the duty; they looked at our trade reports and found that we did not export bronze powder.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend says it is still an excuse. Well, if it is an excuse for my hon. friend not to have bought bronze powder because it was not listed in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, I may tell him that in the Canadian Trade Index issue of 1920-21, compiled and published by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Toronto, Canada, there is an alphabetical list of articles manufactured in Canada with the names of all firms manufacturing them. This is prepared for the use of Canadian manufacturers, and my hon. friend has certainly received a copy of it. Page 274, article No. 896, bronze powder—and here are the names of the firms manufacturing it: Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Limited, Montréal, Quebec; and there is an advertisement of that company on page 84. But more than that, there is a firm in the very province of my hon. friend which is making bronze powder. Its name is Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, Ontario. I hope my hon. friend will purchase his powder there next time, otherwise the "Made in Canada" campaign could hardly apply in the case of those who purchased the articles of the hon. gentleman.

My hon. friend referred to fresh butter. He said that the duty on fresh butter had been reduced from 30 to 22½ per cent, and he asked what was the necessity for that, in view of the fact that Canada was not exporting fresh butter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He said we were not exporting it to France, but that we were exporting salt butter, on which the duty had been raised.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I beg my right hon. friend's pardon. He said Canada does not export fresh butter, but Canada exports salt butter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To France.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think he qualified it. But even if he did, there is no reason why we should not try to export to France if we export to other countries. At present the demand in the European markets is for fresh butter, not for salt butter. The representative of the province of Quebec in Belgium, Mr. Langlois, told my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that a representative of the Department of Agriculture of Quebec had entered into a contract in Beigium for the export of large quantities of fresh butter. After my hon. friend's reference to it in his speech I communicated with the Minister of Agriculture of Quebec and he tells me that the province of Quebec is at present exporting fresh butter to Belgium; that they have contracted for 20,000 boxes of 60 pounds each. My friend himself can figure out how many hundreds of thousands of dollars the export of fresh butter means to this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But is not the Belgian duty only a fraction of what the duty to France still is under this treaty?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Exactly; that is the very reason why we brought about a reduction of the French duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is many times the Belgian duty still. Is there any substantial chance of sending any fresh butter to France, even over the reduced duty? And the chance of sending salted butter is nil.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We hope there is a chance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is merely fancy.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But is the objection of my hon. friend a good one? If with a duty of 30 per cent it was impossible to trade with France in fresh butter, is there not a better chance to do so when the duty is reduced to 22½ per cent? Again I say that my hon. friend was speaking of the past when he referred to the export of butter. We have not negotiated a treaty for the Pilgrim Fathers or for the farmers who came with Jacques Cartier and Champlain; we have negotiated it for our farmers of the present.

My hon. friend referred also to item 404, tissues of pure cotton. Well, I wish my hon. friend would consult with his friends the manufacturers of agricultural implements. They will tell him that reapers and binders are exported to France and that the cotton that is used for the wings goes there in a knocked-down state and is adjusted in France. That cotton has had to pay a heavy duty, 1,240 francs per 100 kilograms; under the present arrangement that cotton will pay the same duty as cotton from the United States, 400 francs per 100 kilograms. The manufacturers themselves have asked for that reduction.

My hon. friend referred to bottles. He said we had reduced the duty on bottles but that we were not sending any to France. Let me tell him that we are sending to France articles contained in bottles, and without the reduction these bottles or containers are subject to a duty which is almost prohibitive. But there is this fundamental fact, Mr. Speaker: the manufacturers and producers in this country have frequently complained that they were at a disadvantage compared with their United States competitors on account of the discrimination in the treaty as it was. As the Minister of Finance said the other day, when they came here last year in a strong delegation the gentlemen who presented the case for the necessity of a treaty with France was a gentleman from my own constituency, Mr. Picard, general manager of the Rock City Tobacco Company, a very distinguished citizen of Quebec. The manufacturers there asked the government to have that discrimination removed. They pointed out especially that in respect of the fourteen articles which under the modus vivendi of 1921 were excluded from the operations of the minimum tariff granted by the treaty of 1907, they were at a disadvantage as compared with the United States manufacturers, and they urged that it was the duty of the government to see that that discrimination was done away with. Well, to-day we have no such discrimination. That was the objective of Canada in negotiating the treaty, and we have the guarantee that we shall always have the benefit of at least the same conditions that are granted by France to the United States. I will say more than that: on many articles we have the advantage of our American competitors.

When my hon. friend says that we would be better without a treaty, surely he does not speak for the manufacturers, who have been so pressing in their demands for a new treaty, a new agreement, a new convention. My hon. friend, the former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), when he spoke in the House a couple of days after the hon. member for Lincoln delivered his speech, admitted that a treaty would be beneficial to the manufacturers. He even eulogized the hon. member for Lincoln as a martyr to unselfishness and devotion, because, notwithstanding the many disadvantages that this treaty was giving to the manufacturers, he was protesting against it on the ground that it was not to the advantage of the farmers. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am almost sure that the farmers of Canada will not trust their interests either to the former Minister of Finance or to the hon. member for Lincoln. I will say this also: that on agricultural articles of production as well as manufactured articles our farmers have the same advantages as, in some instances more advantages than, the United States farmers—and they are their competitors in the markets of the world.

My hon. friends are building upon wrong premises when they compare the duties which will be imposed under this treaty with the conditions that existed under the former treaty and say that we have not the same advantages, and that we would be better off without the treaty. As a matter of fact the treaty of 1908 no longer exists. It has been denounced. France, since the war, has denounced all her commercial agreements on account of the conditions resulting from the war. In our case, it has been replaced by a modus vivendi, the first article of which states:

Pending the conclusion of a new commercial convention with a view to which negotiations will begin

immediately, the French and Canadian governments have agreed to the following provisions.

Everybody knew and everybody knows that we could not expect to go on much further, or any further indeed with that modus vivendi of 1921. France would not have agreed to grant to Canada what is the modus vivendi of 1921 any longer because we were obligated to begin negotiations at once after the signing of that agreement of 1921. So, when my hon. friends are making comparisons with the stipulations of that agreement, they are comparing this treaty with something that did not exist or was on the point of disappearance, and they well know that we would have been placed under the general tariff of France, and it is with the general tariff of France that comparison should be made.

Mr. BELAND: That is the point.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The policy of France at the present time is not to grant the minimum tariff to any nation. As I said a few moments ago, she denounced all her treaties after the war. I will say one thing, and I think I can challenge contradiction in this regard. Of all the treaties which have been made and entered into by France since the denunciation of her agreements with all nations, no other nation ever was granted as good conditions as Canada has been under this treaty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: For information I should like to find out, if possible, what other nations France has entered into agreements with.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will mention two, and there are four or five. I mention Spain and Czecho-Slovakia.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought you were going to mention the United States perhaps. What about the United States?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a fine joke, but it has no bearing on the point. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has criticized in his speech to-day and in his first speech when the resolution was before the House the exception contained in Article II of the treaty:

1. The grant of the Minimum tariff for the products enumerated in schedule A means the treatment of the Most Favoured Nation as respects such products, but does not entitle Canada to claim the benefit of any preferential advantage which France may grant to her Protectorates or the benefit of any tariff resulting from economic agreements which France may enter into with border states, or the benefits of any tariff which France may grant for products the importation of which is designed to facilitate financial settlements with those countries that were at war with France during the years 1914-1918.

Now, Mr. Speaker, France has placed the same exception in all her treaties since the war, and they do not intend, as they say, to take advantage of it, but they do not want to be deprived of the right to make special economic agreements with regard to certain industries. The reason is, first, because they would not impose any duties, for instance, on goods which would be given to France in payment of the reparations resulting from the war, and secondly, there are in France and Belgium certain industries of the same character which have suffered from the same causes, both during and since the war, and especially for the purpose of rebuilding the devastated areas it may be necessary for France and Belgium to have special agreements concerning those industries. As I said before, this exception is included in all the treaties that France has signed since the war. Spain herself, which would be a good deal more interested than we are, for she is a border state, has agreed to that stipulation, and every other country has agreed to it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Spain gets the benefit of it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: She does not get the benefit of any special economic agreements France may enter into with Belgium.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This treaty reserves the right for France to give a preference to Spain. It is a border country.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but for the reason which I have just given. France may enter into a special agreement with Belgium resulting from the war and its consequences, and Spain would not get the benefit of it, and Spain is more likely to be interested in it than than we are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If those were the reasons that actuated the minister in allowing this concession to France, why were we told on the introduction of the resolution that it only applied to a strip of country along the border, and not to the whole country?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why should my hon. friend ask that question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to know.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am giving the reasons as I know them to be, and my hon. friend is answering by asking why should another reason have been given. I am sure the Minister of Finance will be able to answer my hon. friend when he speaks again on this question.

Let me say, moreover, that our competitors will be placed in the same position as we are

in. We cannot suffer because those with whom we are competing in the French market cannot get the benefit of that stipulation in any way whatever.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend say that Belgium is not a competitor of Canada in manufactured articles?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps in some articles, but not in most articles which Canada exports.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: She can get better treatment under this.

Mr. LAPOINTE: France really does not deserve the suggestion of unfairness which is being made against her in this House. What have we given, to use my hon. friend's own words?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think any one has accused France of unfairness. I think we are charging our ministers with lack of acumen, not France with unfairness.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Thank you very much. We are in fine company because my hon. friend having said what he has just repeated, a very few moments after said that France will not get any benefit out of this treaty; Japan will benefit, Switzerland will benefit, but not France. So, the French negotiators were no good, according to my hon. friend. I will try to show in a few moments that my hon. friend need not be so proud, and contemptuous. He is liable to make some slight mistakes himself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very often.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not very often but more often than my hon. friend thinks and supposes. Now, what have we given in return? To use the words of the opposition we have asked France to lower her barriers, and France has asked Canada to lower her barriers against the importation of the articles she makes and exports. Of course the barriers, in the case of Canada, are to be lowered with respect to articles which France makes, not with respect to articles she does not make. My hon. friend said—and he said it with a smile which I admire occasionally—that we should have first raised our tariff. The leader of the Opposition also said that the other day and he repeated it to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On luxuries.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know whether we would have accomplished much by raising our tariff but I will admit that we have yet to start in the business of raising tariffs—

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: They knew that over in France.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Last year we did reduce the tariff in many instances and we were met by a motion on the part of my right hon. friend in which he declared that the House should not have any confidence in the government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not because we raised the tariff but because we did not sufficiently reduce it we were told that we were not true to our pledges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The resolution did not say that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know the purpose of the resolution very well; it is a sample of my right hon. friend's statesmanship.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend would only adhere to the facts I would not interrupt him. The resolution condemned the government for abandoning specific pledges on which they had been returned to power.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What would have been the nature of the motion if we had raised the tariff?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would depend on the nature of the increase on the specific article, but in any event—

Mr. FIELDING: There would have been condemnation in either case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would have condemned the government's breach of faith just the same.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would condemn the breach of faith notwithstanding the fact that the actual tariff brought down might be in accord with our principles. Does the hon. member not see any difference between acting in accord—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —between acting in accord with covenants and acting in violation of them even although going in the right direction?

Mr. LAPOINTE: So we are in this awful dilemma; if we raise the tariff we would be met by a motion on the part of my right hon. friend—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —that we are ruining the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not say that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend not agree to that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member is simply playing with words, and, what is more serious for him playing with the truth. If he raised the tariff he would be met with the motion that he and his colleagues were violating their pledges just as there was a motion of that kind before.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And if we had reduced the tariff?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If hon. gentlemen opposite reduced the tariff it would depend upon the merits of the reduction. I think that is consistent but my hon. friend does not seem to understand.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand the purpose of my right hon. friend quite well. He is trying to extricate himself from the position in which he placed himself last year with that famous motion of his. In that motion my right hon. friend was not loyal to his principles; he was loyal to his bitterness and partisanship.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, oh.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am glad that the ex-Minister of Finance does not take matters so seriously as the leader of the Opposition.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I could not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I see that we still have a friend in the front ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have lowered the tariff on many articles and this is in line with the traditional Liberal policy. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) says that the operation of this treaty involves a loss to Canada of $500,000. Loss to whom and by whom? Every cent of this $500,000 would be taken from the pockets of the consumers of Canada and they are the people who gain under this treaty. And if the result of the treaty is to enlarge the facilities for trading with France, if our producers send more goods to France, surely that revenue will come back to the treasury of Canada in some other way. It is not true either that only the duties on luxuries have been reduced as my hon. friends opposite seem to argue. They know full well that they have to select a few articles in order to attempt to show that the duties on luxuries have been reduced. I will not weary the House by reading the famous list we have heard so much about. The ex-Minister of Finance said the other day in reference to item 581 concerning silks, that we had reduced the duty to 20 per cent and that it is a fixed duty. Well, the variety of silk which comes under that reduction to 20 per cent constitutes only 10 per cent of our entire importations of silk; the other 90 per cent enters under the intermediate tariff of 27½ per cent less the discount of 10 per cent under schedule B. My hon. friend was 10 per cent right and 90 per cent wrong, and he maintained that proportion fairly well throughout the whole course of his speech.

My hon. friend also alluded to what he termed our blunder in not taking into account the unfavourable balance of trade between Canada and France when this treaty was negotiated. He said that France had an advantage over Canada last year of $5,000,000 and added I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not know that when he went over to France,—and he looked at me with a smiling look of self-satisfied superiority. Well, I will surprise my hon. friend by saying that I knew that. Perhaps I will remove a little of his superiority when I add that I also knew, although apparently he did not seem to know, that in former years we had the balance of trade in our favour.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In 1922, that was last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That was during the war and post-war period. Everybody knows it except my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let us see. I admit that in 1918 we were still in a part of the war period. During that year we exported $201,053,676 worth of products to France and we imported from that country products to the amount of only $5,274,064. In 1919, we exported $96,103,142 worth to France, and we imported only $3,632,900 worth. In 1920, when we were receding a little from the war, we exported $61,108,693 worth to France, and imported $10,630,865 worth. In 1921, a few years after the war, we exported $27,428,308 worth to France and imported $19,138,062 worth leaving a balance in our favour of $8,290,246.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was not my hon. friend aware that France had been decimated and had run dry of material, and that she had to get a great many articles from outside after the war? Does he not know she had to get credits outside for that purpose? Does he not know that was an abnormal balance?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know all that, and I will give my hon. friend something more to satisfy him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister give the relative exports and imports prior to the war, say, for the five years, and subsequent to the old French treaty? It would be very interesting.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have already stated that I am not living in the past.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These later years are during abnormal conditions.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The war was not proceeding in 1921; we are not at war now. Surely my hon. friend will agree with me on that point. I have here the report of trade of Canada for the eleven months of the year ending the last of February of this year. We have exported to France during those eleven months $12,663,158, and we have imported from France during those eleven months, ending February last $11,143,948. That is, for the eleven months of this fiscal year just ended, and the reports for the month of March are not yet published, but we have a balance of trade in our favour during that period, with France of over $1,000,000. And we are no longer at war.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister not see how very much better we are getting on without that treaty?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We are getting on better since my hon. friends went out of power. I would not like to say that my hon. friends opposite were responsible for the condition, but it is a strange coincidence that during that very year, the only year during the last six years where there was a very large balance of trade against us, my right hon. friend was Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does my hon. friend not know that our increased exports this year are practically wholly wheat, which goes in under the general tariff and which is not in the least affected, whether we make a treaty or not?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sure my right hon. friend will at least agree that the making of this treaty, which will lower the barrier against our trade, will still increase the volume of trade instead of decreasing it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It increases the barrier.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), said that we must have a treaty with France. He agreed that it was most desirable that there should be a commercial treaty with France. Afterwards he said that the treaty of 1908 was no good and that we lost money under that treaty and that we would have been better without the treaty of 1908. He said that the present treaty was no good either.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And that we would have been very much better without this treaty. Then, in the name of goodness, if a treaty with France is necessary, if the treaty of 1908 was no good, and if this treaty is no good, why did he not do something when he had the power to do it, and make a treaty himself? If the treaty of 1907 was no good why did my hon. friend vote in this House, as Minister of Finance, for a modus vivendi which had the effect of excluding from the treaty of 1908 many articles, and everybody knows that the agreement of 1921 was not so good as the treaty of 1908, and my hon. friend voted for it, though the treaty of 1907 was no good, and this treaty is no good either.

What was the object of the government of Canada in making this treaty? Its objective was to get on the markets of France the same treatment as the United States had. We never concealed that goal or that aim. Everybody knew that was what we had in view, and we got it. What was the objective of France? I do not want to disclose any secrets, but I have in my hand an article signed by Edouard Néron, the member for Haute-Loire, who is a general reporter of the customs board of the chamber of deputies and of commercial agreements. In this article Mr. Néron says that the objective of Canada was to get the same treatment as the United States got. And what was the objective of France, according to him? It was to get on the Canadian market as good treatment as Great Britain got, whom France considered their competitors on the market of Canada. And they did not get that treatment, because the British preference is a Canadian policy of our own. It is a policy of which we are proud which has been created in Canada by the Liberal party. By that policy we stand and by that policy we intend to stand. It has been stated that as to certain articles of the treaty the British preference is lower.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is gone.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If hon. members are afraid of the fate of the British preference, let them not worry, the British preference is safer in the hands of its creator than it would

be in the hands of my right hon. friend. I am proud to have been associated with the Minister of Finance in his negotiation of this treaty. Let me tell the House and the country and let me tell my hon. friends opposite and particularly the ex-Minister of Finance who has been admiring France for her business ability, and so on, that I am sure, in spite of the criticism of my hon. friends opposite, the work of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will commend itself to the House and will receive the support of the people of Canada.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, in beginning the discussion of this question this afternoon I propose to read a few words from an editorial in the Montreal Witness which came into my hand to-day as illustrating how hopelessly the people of Canada, as well as the members of this House, are divided on questions of trade in the way in which we look at treaties and tariffs. The editorial reads:

> What is the use of discussion in parliament between men living in different worlds, who cannot even see each other's point of view, and perhaps don't want to. The French Treaty, the protectionists argue, is all give and no take. On a lot of articles, such as tools, etc., they say Canada is to pay 50 per cent duty when she sends them into France, but it is only to collect 20 to 25 per cent on importing them from France. How would this read if we should put it this way? The French people have to pay 50 per cent duty on what they import as well as on ten times more that they do not import, while Canadians have to pay only 20 to 25 per cent. The trouble is that those on one side of the controversy can only see the protected interests, while those on the other keep the interests of the people who need tools somewhat in view.

It seems to me unfortunate that these treaties between nations are generally made an occasion for a very acrimonious controversy and the position is very frequently taken by the opponents of the government in power, whatever government it may be—and it seems to be the same in every country—that a treaty secured was not as good as it ought to be, and there has been a disposition to object to the treaty for that reason.

I was in the United States three years ago when the controversy was going on there as regards its attitude towards the League of Nations. I was at a meeting in the town of Waterbury, which by the way is a very strong Republican centre, and one man actually made the statement: "Now, that we have shown President Wilson where he gets off at, we want the treaty." They wanted the treaty, but they wanted and took the opportunity that was offered to them to get a slam at President Wilson. I do not think that principle has been entirely wanting in this country when we look over the past few years and consider the situation in relation to the attempt to get trading arrangements with various nations. I would not like to say that it is absent on the present occasion. It seems to me that the most important question to-day is not: Did we get the best treaty possible? We do not know. Possibly those who negotiated the treaty, might, in their inmost souls, think that if they had been a little more firm on certain points they could have secured better terms. You can never tell when you are negotiating with a party just how far you can press him until negotiations come right to the breaking point. The most important question, at least for this parliament, to decide seems to be to-day whether, under this treaty, we are going to be placed in a better position than we would be in without the treaty. Notwithstanding the fact that hon. gentlemen to our right have declared positively that we would be better off without the treaty than we would be under circumstances that would prevail if we had the treaty, they have not made it clear to me that such is the case. When this treaty was first brought before the House, I was disposed to attach to it much the same valuation as I thought the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) attached to it in his speech in introducing it to us. Perhaps I drew inferences that were not altogether warranted on that occasion; but still in looking over the treaty and in giving a cursory glance at the schedules, I fail to find anything that would cause us to wax very enthusiastic. Speaking from the standpoint of those who are engaged in agriculture, I feel that as regards our major products, there does not seem to be in the treaty a great deal over which we could become enthusiastic. If there is in it the poison that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) would seem to say there is, I would not want it; but on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread, I for my part would be prepared to accept the treaty for what it is worth.

I will not deal very largely with the schedules in particular, but I should like to make a few comments as regards certain arguments that have been advanced why this treaty should not be accepted. Speaking generally, I think I can say, speaking, not only for myself, but for those with whom I am associated, that we are in favour of any attempt that can be made to break down the barriers which nations have erected amongst themselves in matters of trade. I would hope, therefore, that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), who is not in his place, was not correctly re-

5 p.m

ported, or that he was misrepresented when he was reported to have said during the Moose Jaw campaign, that there was no evidence that the Progressives were not still opposed to reciprocity. If there is one thing that we have made abundantly clear in this House since we have been here, it is that we were strongly in favour of that reciprocity agreement. Perhaps the prominence given to that question in the Moose Jaw campaign ought to convince the country that the question of better trade relations with the United States is not dead; that it is alive, and that it is going to be very much alive. It might be well for those who were responsible for the rejection of that treaty, and those who are the political successors of those who rejected that treaty, to take cognizance of that fact. I know some explanations are given as to why they are in the position in which they are to-day. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) made a speech a short time ago in Winnipeg—and I suppose he repeated the same speech in Ottawa, because I know he said some of the same things here—stating that their party had sacrificed themselves because of the war. He seems to think that that was the reason of their present humiliation. When I read that statement, I wondered whether the sacrifice which they made was in being compelled to sit along with the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). But seriously, speaking for the West and the prairie provinces only, I wish to say that it was not the war record or the post-war record of the hon. gentlemen that caused them to pass through the valley of humiliation. The people of the western prairies remembered 1911 and the kind of arguments that were foisted upon them at that time. When we remember the arguments that were put forward at that time, we are not disposed to attach too much value to the arguments that are advanced against this treaty to-day.

I said that I was not going to discuss in any great detail the schedules, but rather that I would make some comments upon arguments that have been advanced why we should reject the treaty. No doubt the arguments of hon. gentlemen are sound from their point of view, from the protectionist point of view, and if I belonged to that school, undoubtedly I would accept them as sound and consider it my duty to act in accordance with the sentiments they expressed. But since we have never accepted their point of view, and speak from an entirely different one, I cannot for one see how it is possible to respond to the appeal that they have made. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) advanced some arguments, and I have been somewhat amused at the way in which the shuttlecock has been batted backwards and forwards. I was disposed to think the weight of the argument lay with one side and then with the other; but I think at the present time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) has the advantage on his side.

The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) laid a great deal of emphasis upon the question of the balance of trade. There seems to be some conflict in the figures that have been presented to us by the ex-Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and just at present I am not able to reconcile the two statements, although that may possibly be done. It seems to me, however, that many false conclusions have been based upon this question of an adverse balance of trade. It is by no means conclusive, by no means sure, as applied to trade as a whole, that an injury is necessarily done to a country because for the time being the balance would seem to be against it. But still less is it safe, when we come to consider relations between any two nations, to conclude that trade is necessarily detrimental to the one against which the balance would seem to be for the time being. International trade is not simply a two-sided question; it is not simply a case of A trading with B; it is a case of A trading with B, C, D and E, and B trading with all the rest of them. It is, therefore, absolutely impossible to establish conclusions as sound by considering simply the relations which for the time being exist between any two of those nations.

It has been urged that it would have been better if the government had raised the tariff before proceeding to enter into negotiations. That again is a principle of questionable soundness, even if we consider it in regard to our tariff as a whole, and still more questionable when we consider it in relation to this particular question. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has urged that the minister should have definitely increased the tariff against France on luxuries before entering into negotiations. I wonder how it would have been possible in that case for the ministers to have entered into negotiations at all. If it had been definitely stated in this House that in order to negotiate a trade bargain with France we would increase the tax upon luxuries, I can well imagine what response we would have had from the French people. The probability is our ministers would have come back without any treaty at

all. On the other hand, had it been definitely stated that luxuries would have to pay a higher tariff, I cannot see how it would have been possible to conclude such a treaty as this.

A great deal has been said about the most favoured nation clause. I again say that it cannot for a moment be contended that our ministers could have taken any other position in the negotiations. I maintain in regard to this treaty that negotiations should be entered upon in a spirit of good will and fairness towards other nations. It would seem to me impossible at this time to contend that we should continue to regard trade treaties in any other light than as arrangements of mutual advantage to the countries concerned. I cannot conceive, Mr. Speaker, that we should approach this question in any other spirit than that of a desire to make fair and equitable arrangements with those nations which are willing to trade with us.

A great deal of emphasis has been laid upon what is called the adverse balance of trade. It would seem to me to be absolutely unsound as between two nations that we should take a position based on this adverse balance of trade; at least it does not prove anything to my mind in this respect. Speaking generally, I would take the position that in all trade arrangements with other nations we must be willing to negotiate in a spirit of give and take; there must be no thought that we can retain all the advantage upon our own side. This treaty has been entered into with a nation that was our ally during the war, and it would ill become us to attempt to impose upon France obligations which, torn as she was by war, she might find it difficult to accept. Matters of trade should not, as in the past, be treated as, potentially, occasions of war, but rather as arrangements of mutual advantage to all concerned. We should always remember that trade is of paramount interest to all concerned, and that peace can only come in this world as we are willing to approach all nations in a spirit of good will.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend and neighbour for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) presented to this House such a voluminous criticism of this treaty, and as it appears that several of the items affect, to some extent at least, the financial interests of persons residing in the county that I have the honour to represent, I feel it a duty, however much I may dislike its performance, to occupy the attention of the House for a short time while I give the reasons why I intend to vote for the second reading of this bill.

When this matter first came before the House by way of resolution both my hon. friend for Lincoln and myself apparently fell into the same error. He stated that the bringing into force of this convention would very seriously interfere with the grape industry in the Niagara district, and he added that at a convention of grape growers in the county of Lincoln a suggestion was made that the grape vines should be ploughed up and the wine industry abandoned. I am free to say that when the resolution was introduced I fell into the same error and had unnecessary fears that the passing of this bill, in so far as it affected the importation of wines from France, would seriously injure our grape growers and our wine manufacturers in the Niagara district. But, Sir, on looking into the matter further I find that there is absolutely no change made in the duty on French wines from what it has been for the last fifteen years. In 1908 the French Convention of Commerce, which was agreed to in 1907, came into force. This is the item of that agreement so far as wine is concerned:

Wines of fresh grape of all kinds, not sparkling, imported	
(a) containing 20 p.c. or less proof spirit, per gallon	15 cents
(b)containing more than 20 p.c. and not more than 23 p.c. proof spirit, per gallon	20 cents
(c) containing more than 23 p.c. and not more than 26 p.c. of proof spirit, per gallon	25 cents
For each degree in excess of 26 p.c. of proof spirit until the strength reaches 40 p.c. of proof spirit	3 cents

The only difference that has been made so far as these items are concerned is that in the present treaty 55 cents per gallon has been added in the case of wines containing more than 26 per cent of proof spirit, and up to 40 per cent. So to that extent at any rate the protection against French wines is much greater now than it was under the convention of 1907. If no injury has resulted to the wine producers and grape growers of the Niagara district under conditions similar to those that will exist under this new treaty, conditions which have prevailed during the last fifteen years, surely we can expect no very serious injury in the future. In that period the price of grapes in the Niagara district has increased from $70 to $80 a ton. Indeed, it went as high as $100 a ton; but last year, under exactly the same tariff, the price fell to $60 or $65 a ton. In view of these facts, therefore it would seem that both the hon. member for Lincoln and myself were unduly alarmed when this matter first came before the House. I am free to say, though, that if it is found that this new treaty does work a disadvantage to the grape growers and the wine producers

in that part of the country, I will readily join the hon. member for Lincoln in a conference with the Minister of Finance with a view to securing such modifications of the conditions as will effect a remedy. But in any case I feel that I should support this bill and leave it to the intelligence and fair-mindedness of the Minister of Finance to right any wrong that might be occasioned, rather than vote against a measure which in other respects is, to my mind, of great advantage to the people of Canada.

The hon. member for Lincoln further stated that the treaty worked a great injustice to nursery men. He said:

> I now wish to refer for a moment, but only in a general way, to some of the articles that France is allowed to sell Canada under this treaty. I would ask the Minister of Finance why shrubs, grape vines, gooseberry bushes, and trees of all kinds of which we have good growers in this country and of which we export considerable quantities are allowed to enter Canada at two cents apiece whereas similar provision has not been made for Canadian trees and shrubs on the part of France.

If my hon. friend will look at item 170 of the French tariff he will find that these articles go into France free of duty, so that the duty on nursery stock coming into Canada is to our advantage and not to the advantage of France.

The hon. member referred to a very large number of items, in connection with which he strove to show that the treaty was working a disadvantage. The right hon. leader of the Opposition also says that the existing treaty, which this convention does away with, is far better than the one we are now considering. He said also that the treaty of 1908 was still in force at the time this new convention was entered into and that it could have continued in force, and he read article 6 of the statute, as follows:

> The present arrangement shall remain in force until the conclusion of a new commercial convention, but either of the high contracting parties may denounce it after four months' notice.

I think my right hon. friend was hardly fair in his criticism in regard to that matter, because he endeavoured to leave the impression on the members of this House and on the people throughout the country that the treaty of 1908 could have continued in force practically indefinitely. But the preamble, not of the act of 1920, but of the schedule to the act says:

> Pending the conclusion of a new commercial convention, with a view to which negotiations will begin immediately, the French and Canadian governments have agreed to the following provisions.

So that whether intentionally or not, the right hon. gentleman was rather misleading

[Mr. German.]

the House and the people when he suggested that the treaty could have remained in force for any considerable length of time.

Now, Sir, what do we find in regard to this present convention? In looking at schedule A, which has been the subject of considerable discussion, we find that there are 110 articles on which the duty is considerably less than the duty on similar articles going from the United States. First, on horses, from Canada, the duty is 150 francs; from the United States, 225 francs. On meats of certain kinds, from Canada, 40 francs; from the United States, 60 francs—the same difference on various grades of meat. On fish there is a difference in favour of Canada. On linen yarns, from Canada, 80 francs; from the United States, 120 francs. On tools, articles mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln—spades, scythes, sickles, files, vices, etc., the duty is 140 francs from Canada and 212 from the United States. In another case, 100 francs from Canada; 152 from the United States. And so on through the whole list there are very substantial reductions on behalf of Canada as against similar articles going from the United States—and these are articles made by the hon. member for Lincoln.

The hon. member spoke of buckles; there is a large percentage, as respects the duty, in favour of goods from Canada as against similar goods from the United States. Doors of hardwood or softwood, painted or carved—these are articles made in Canada in large quantities, and the French duty is considerably less on goods coming from Canada than it is on goods from the United States. Asbestos is an article which is bought, particularly in the province of Quebec, in very large quantities. On sheets the duty is 67 francs from Canada and 102 francs from the United States; shaped asbestos, 135 francs from Canada and 202 francs from the United States; asbestos threads, 198 francs from Canada and 297 francs from the United States; asbestos plates, 247 francs from Canada and 346 francs from the United States, and so on through the whole list. I find there are at least 110 articles where the duty in favour of Canada is a very large percentage indeed.

Then take schedule B, which hon. gentlemen say is of no use. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) alleged that the treaty of 1908 was far and away preferable to the present treaty, but what do we find in looking at the same articles in the treaty of 1908 and the treaty before us at the present time? We find that there are some 800 articles of commerce mentioned in

this treaty affected by the duty on Canadian goods, and on 450 of these the duty is far and away less on Canadian goods going into France by from ten to fifty per cent than it was under the old treaty and on 110 articles from Canada the duty is much lower than on the same articles going from the United States. So that it does appear to me that the argument is all in favour of this treaty as against the treaty which was in force for the last fifteen years.

Now it has been alleged and strongly urged by my hon. friend for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), also by the right hon. leader of the Opposition as well as the hon. member for West York, that not many of these articles were being exported from Canada to France. I want to tell hon. members of this House that there have been millions of dollars of United States money invested in Canada in manufacturing industries for the sole and only reason that they get the benefit of the Canadian tariff for their export business. I know that because it is happening in the county of Welland, and my hon. friend from Lincoln must know it because the same thing exists in his county. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested in these two counties by United States manufacturing industries for the alleged reason, according to them, that they were getting the benefit of the Canadian tariff for their export business. What do we find under this treaty which this House is not asked to confirm? We find that on 110 articles, practically the necessaries of life, the duty is far and away lower on goods going from Canada than on goods going from the United States. Surely, therefore, we shall have a greater influx of United States money into Canada for the purpose of developing our manufacturing industries. That is what we desire in that section of Canada; that is what we desire in the whole of Canada.

The first great commercial industry, to call it that, is the farming industry. That is the industry which should be protected, preserved and encouraged more than any other. Our natural resources should be developed and encouraged; our manufacturing industries should be developed and encouraged, and that can only be done by a sane, sensible tariff policy which exists in my opinion, to the extent to which it goes, in this very treaty that is now before the House. It is the desire of us all to see Canada prosper, to see our natural resources developed and our manufacturing industries progress, and that can only be done by applying to the industries of Canada the intelligent, courageous and progressive principles of Liberalism.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If there is no objection perhaps we might call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FIELDING: Very well.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am going to move an amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, then you ought to give us time to consider it.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my hon. friend for Welland (Mr. German), who concluded his address just before the House took recess, and I think I may go so far as to say that the calm, clear, well-reasoned argument which he presented, upon what is really a practical question of trade was in style and tenor very suitable indeed to the occasion and to the question which he sought to argue. While I cannot agree with the conclusion reached by my hon. friend I must say that from his point of view he stated his case with great fairness and with great calmness. He objected, in one instance, to a statement made by my hon. friend for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) in regard to the question of the duties upon imported wines, and he seems to take issue upon that question with the attitude adopted by the hon. member for Lincoln some days ago. As both of these hon. members come from what we know as the grape-growing district in the province of Ontario, I think they will have to settle that question pretty much between themselves; at all events I can offer them no light upon the subject. I did gather from the remarks of the Finance Minister, when he originally introduced this matter to the House, that perhaps there was something in the contention of my hon. friend for Lincoln, but that the proper time to correct the error, if there was one, would be upon the presentation of the budget rather than in connection with the present measure.

Apart from that question, my hon. friend for Welland dwelt in his argument almost exclusively upon the fact that in schedule A of the present treaty, likewise in schedule B, certain goods which on export from Canada to

France were formerly at a disanvantage as compared with those of the United States, had now been put upon the same plane as exports from the last-named country; also that in regard to schedule B there will be a large number of reductions from former duties on exports of Canadian goods to France I may tell my hon. friend for Welland that his argument in that respect is not convincing. If the duties to be maintained by France in the future on exports from Canada are yet so high that those goods cannot be profitably exported from this country, the reduction is purely a matter of form and not a matter of substance; it is not a reduction of which we can take any advantage. I tell him also that if he will read over the various items of schedule B to which he referred, he will find instance after instance where the duties which prevail to-day under the treaty of 1908, have been actually increased by the present proposal. I am not persuaded that my hon. friend is right in his conclusion, I take issue with him upon that point; but I must say that he argued the matter very fairly from his point of view.

I think we all realize that the question now before the House is purely a matter of trade and commerce, is purely a business arrangement Whether it be good or whether it be bad for the people of Canada is a question upon which this House will have to pass; but in my view of the matter nothing is gained by seeking to make it a political question, or treating it from the standpoint of party politics.

I think it is to be regretted that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) this afternoon became so warm, became as he evidently did so excited, became so over-emphatic, if I may be allowed to use the term, in many of his statements. I think if he had contented himself with a defence of this proposal upon business and economic grounds, and not sought to arouse a storm of partisan enthusiasm from his own side of the House, he would have displayed greater dignity himself and treated the question with more respect. I think his whole statement this afternoon lacked everything in the nature of sound business argument. I think he absolutely failed to advance sound reasons why this House should adopt this treaty. He referred, of course, to two or three of the minor items which are involved in the present trade proposal. He waxed eloquent upon the question of bronze powders. He waxed eloquent upon the question of fresh or unsalted butter, and had something to say about the statement of my hon. friend for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) in regard to tissues of cotton. I am satisfied, from a re-reading of the speech of my hon. friend for Lincoln upon these three points, that the hon. member was quite correct in the statement which he made to the House. I have Hansard before me. I am not going to refer to it, but any hon. member who desires to verify this statement can find it in the speech of the hon. member for Lincoln a few days ago. But even suppose that on these three points, butter, web cotton and bronze powder, all that the hon. member for Lincoln said was wrong, and all that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) said was right, I think that should weigh very very little with this House or any member of it in coming to a conclusion upon the broad question of this treaty. These are matters of but trifling importance. If we are going to arrive at a correct conclusion in regard to this treaty proposal I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not altogether out of place to refer very briefly to what one might call the history of the matter. I go back to the year 1894, which is the year during which the first commercial treaty with France was negotiated. Between 1894 and 1908 the trade of this country under the treaty of 1894 did not show any very material gain, either in exports from Canada or in imports into Canada, and I agree with the Finance Minister to-day, who was Finance Minister in 1908, that in the year 1908 the time had arrived for some new arrangement between France and Canada. I was in the House at that time, I supported the treaty, and I am going to give the House a little bit of information on that subject. My right hon. friend and leader (Mr. Meighen) was not in the House in 1908, but in the session of 1909 after he had been elected a member of this House, and when the Finance Minister came before parliament with supplementary legislation to bring into effect the French treaty of 1908, I find in the records of the House, at page 160 of the Votes and Proceedings for the session of 1909-10, the following:

> The House then resumed the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding "That the Bill No. 12 an Act respecting a certain supplementary convention between His Majesty and the President of the French republic be now read a second time."

The question being put on the motion, the House divided, the names were called, they were recorded by the clerk and among those who supported the present Minister of Finance in his motion on that occasion was the right hon. leader of the Opposition. So far as I can remember, the names on the division list, he was the only member of the Opposition at that time who did support the Finance

Minister in regard to the French treaty. It is idle at this distance of time for any one to say that my right hon. friend and leader is opposed on principle to a trade arrangement with France. He proved his faith in the matter during the first session he sat in this House, and it is just as idle to say that any member sitting in the official opposition in this House to-day is opposed to any fair and reasonable trade arrangement between Canada and France. We, one and all of us, are in favour of an equitable arrangement for increased trade. What we condemn about the present proposal is that it is too one-sided, that it is not reciprocal, and that there is no mutuality about it, either in advantage or obligation. These are the criticisms we offer against the present proposal, but we are in favour of any reasonable reciprocal trade arrangement that can be made with France.

The treaty of 1908 negotiated by the present Minister of Finance has not finally expired. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance just a few days ago said that that treaty was as dead as Julius Caesar, but I think he rather overstated the fact on that occasion. The treaty is still in existence, as varied by the act of this parliament in 1921, and to-day, on the importation of goods from France into this country, you are bound by the terms of the treaty of 1908, and on the export of goods from this country to France, you are still bound by the terms of that treaty, varied as it was in 1921 by legislation of this parliament. So that it is an existing tariff arrangement to-day.

There is no doubt that in the month of September 1918, shortly before the end of the war, the government of France adopted a policy of giving notice and denouncing various commercial treaties which France enjoyed throughout the world. France had evidently come to the conclusion that she would make new financial arrangements with the various countries of the world. Notice was given to Canada along with other countries that our treaty would expire within 12 months, which was the time limit required by the treaty. France subsequently gave an intimation, I think by way of withdrawal of the first notice, because for a certain period of time the treaty was carried forward under no very definite arrangement; but in the year 1920, when we in Canada realized that France was reaping no benefit whatever under the treaty of 1908 and that other nations of the world were reaping very substantial benefit under the same treaty, on account of the most favoured nation clause Canada gave notice to France of the termination of the treaty. Then it was that matters were brought to a head, and negotiations took place which resulted in the agreement known as the modus vivendi agreement, which was ratified in this House on the 15th May, 1921. It is well, though, to remember that in the meantime new arrangements had been consummated by France with the United States. Early in the year 1921 the United States made application to France for more favourable treatment in regard to tariff matters. What the arguments used by the United States' authorities were we cannot tell. We know what the result was. The result of the representations of the negotiators on behalf of the United States was this: that a much lower tariff was granted by France for a much larger number of articles than the United States had ever enjoyed before, and in many instances these rates were considerably lower than the rates which Canada enjoyed under the French treaty of 1908. That was the situation, which, to say the least of it, was awkward, and I quite realize that as soon as the new government came into power negotiations were commenced, the Finance Minister says, by a visit from the French Consul General of Montreal. Negotiations were, at all events, opened shortly after the new government came into power, with a view of making a new trade arrangement to bind both Canada and France for a term of years to come. The new government had not been in power more than a few months when emissaries of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association likewise came to Ottawa and presented a memorial to the Finance Minister showing that, in respect of certain articles, the United States did then enjoy advantages over Canada, so far as Canadian trade with France was concerned. There were, therefore, two reasons to fix these matters in the mind of the Finance Minister. There was the visit from the French Consul General and there was the memorial from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Now, an hon. member of this House with the experience in national financing of the present Minister of Finance had distinct notice that, in the very near future treaty negotiations would again be taken up with France with a view to coming to a new trade arrangement. He knew well what the French treaty of 1908 was. He knew what the French present tariff was. He knew the difficulties which would inevitably face him when he went to France to negotiate for a new treaty. He was warned by the Consul General in Montreal and by the Manufacturers' Association, yet he brought down his budget in 1922 and made no preparation whatever in that budget to enable him to conduct successful negotiations with

the government of France. My hon. friend the Finance Minister has informed us that France has a different tariff system from that which we enjoy in Canada. Under the French system he has informed this House that France has adopted a general tariff usually very high, and also a minimum tariff which likewise is pretty high. But there is a large difference between the two tariffs. In many instances one is as much as four times as great as the other, and in some instances five or six times as great. The Finance Minister assured the House that France maintains that particular kind of tariff "as an instrument for commercial negotiation." I think these are his actual words. He was fully aware of this last spring before his budget; he knew it when he was called upon by the French Consul General, and it has been well said that to be fore-warned is to be fore-armed. He should have armed himself in the 1922 budget, yet, so far as we can judge from the budget which he brought down, he did nothing whatever by way of preparation to meet the situation which he knew must face him in the ensuing months when in consultation with the government of France which possessed under its tariff system this peculiar "instrument for the negotiation of commercial treaties," while he had none. What under such circumstances one might expect to happen did actually happen and the result is the one-sided proposal now before the House.

Before I turn to that point, let me just refer to this other one. I think I am not going beyond the fact in saying that, in the opinion of most people in this country, the results obtained under the international trade treaty between France and Canada of 1908 have fallen far below our expectations. I think in 1908, we all expected that there would be a very substantial increase in the trade between France and Canada as a result of the treaty; but year after year the figures were disappointing. The trade was not being done, and even at the expense of repeating some of the figures that have been given to the House in the course of this debate, I wish to include in my remarks the actual trade results that were obtained prior to the war under the treaty of 1908. The figures are as follows:

Fiscal year	Imports from France into Canada	Exports from Canada into France
1909..	$ 8,197,000	$2,341,000
1910..	10,109,000	2,601,000
1911..	11,583,000	2,535,000
1912..	11,744,000	2,048,000
1913..	15,375,000	2,357,000

In 1913, the volume of imports from France into Canada was the greatest.

	Imports from France	Exports from Canada
1914..	$14,276,000	$3,632,000

Whether or not I should include 1914, is a question. The war broke out in the beginning of August, 1914, after only four months of our financial year had elapsed, so that it may be said that eight months of that year were war months. But taking the whole six years from 1909 to 1914, both inclusive, we find that we bought from France under the treaty of 1908, $71,264,000 worth of goods, and France purchased from us only $14,514,000 worth. Therefore, in those six years there was an adverse balance of trade of $57,000,000 against Canada. I am going to omit the war years in the statement that I submit to the House. I come from 1914 down to the year 1922, which is the last year for which I have been able to get complete trade reports. For 1922, I find that we bought from France $13,500,000 worth of goods, and France bought from us $8,208,000 worth. But we had a statement made in the House to-day of the trade returns for the first eleven months of the last complete year, or up to the first March of the present year, and as I recollect the figures given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) this afternoon, our exports to France had reached a total of about $12,000,000, while our imports from France during the same eleven months had come down to $11,000,000. I think that I have learned the reason for this. We know that there are monthly as well as yearly reports from the Trade and Commerce department. It so happens that last year we had a very heavy crop of wheat in this country, and, I regret to say there was a very low price for wheat. France, on the other hand, was in the market to buy wheat, and I have been informed that wheat comprises three million dollars of the increase in our exports to France during the last eleven months. During the previous year our exports of wheat to France amounted to about $1,250,000, while for 11 months of this year they have increased to $4,000,000 worth or thereabouts. The other notable increase in the present year has been in sugar. During the last eleven months there is an increase of just about $1,000,000 worth of sugar.

I mention these two matters particularly because the treaty does not affect either of them one way or the other. They are both under the French maximum or general tariff, and I suppose you might say also that they are both under the French minimum tariff, because the rate upon them is precisely the

same under both the general and the minimum tariffs. Under the general tariff the rate on wheat, is 7 francs per 100 kilograms and under the minimum tariff the rate is precisely the same. Under the general tariff the rate on sugar is 90 francs per 100 kilograms, and under the minimum tariff the rate is precisely the same. Therefore, importations or exportations of both these commodities are unaffected by either the present proposal or by the treaty of 1908, because the rate under the general and the minimum tariff is the same. Whether you have a treaty or not does not matter as regards exports of wheat and sugar to France, because the rates are the same to us and all the rest of the world, no advantage being given to any nation.

There are however certain aspects of the present treaty which call, I think, for more than passing comment, particularly when one seeks to make a comparison between the arrangement contained in the proposal now before the House and the arrangement which the Minister of Finance made in 1908, and which this parliament ratified. I point out in the first instance, that whenever you find a variation between the trade arrangement of 1908 and the present proposal, you find it is in the interest of France and to the disadvantage of Canada. It is significant that every variation that occurs is in the same direction—an enlargement of the liberty of action of France, a contraction or restriction of the rights of Canada. I cannot find a single variation in the terms of the two treaties which is not favourable to France and at the same time a limitation upon Canada. I take for example the goods referred to in schedule A of the present proposal. These are goods which under the proposal are entitled to entry into France at the minimum French tariff. I compare article 1 and article 2 of the present proposal with the same articles in the treaty of 1908, and I find this marked distinction. Under the treaty of 1908 we not only had the right to ship our products into France at minimum tariff rates but also into all the French colonies, protectorates and possessions. That has been altered. The present arrangement permits us to ship goods under schedule A to French colonies, possessions and protectorates "having the same customs tariff as France." These words were not in the former treaty. Consequently if a possession of France has a different tariff—and I assume for reasons that I will state in a moment that many of them have—we have no right to export to that possession or colony upon the same basis as we are entitled to deal with France herself.

In the next place, by article 2 of the present tariff France grants her minimum tariff to Canada as one of the most favoured nations. We are guaranteed most favoured nation treatment, according to article 2. That is not the way the former treaty was settled; the treaty of 1908 expressly provided that if France made a better arrangement with any "foreign country"—not the most favoured nation—Canada should have the benefit of such arrangement. I am fully aware that there are eleven nations in the world at this time who, as respects Canada and France, are entitled to what is called most favoured nation treatment; but there are a good many more than eleven important trading nations in the world. Under the treaty of 1908 we were entitled to the benefit of any tariff that France granted "to any foreign country"; under this proposal we come in only for the treatment accorded to the eleven most favoured nations.

Under the treaty of 1908 France likewise reserved a small zone for tariff administration purposes as between herself and border states. Article II of the old treaty reads:

> The privileges which have been or may be granted to border states for facilitating frontier traffic within a limit not exceeding 15 kilometres on each side of the boundary.

That provision has been very much enlarged under the present proposal, which provides that France may make any tariff arrangement she sees fit with "border states," which means with Spain, with Italy, with Switzerland, with Belgium or with Germany, and Canada cannot claim the benefit of any such arrangement This is an express reservation by France in so many words, so plain that he who runs may read. And likewise France has insisted on another condition for her own benefit over and above anything she asked of Canada in 1908; that is, her right to make special trade treaties with states or countries with which she has been at war, which would of course include Germany, Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria.

Now, I think France has pretty well provided in this treaty that she is to be at liberty to make practically any trade arrangements she likes with pretty much any country in Europe without our being able to take advantage of it. This applies to schedule A.

Well, what is the proposal in regard to schedule B? This schedule represents those goods which, if this treaty be ratified, will be entitled to go into France from Canada at a percentage of reduction as between the general tariff and the minimum tariff of France. Perhaps an example is the best way of illustrating the operation of this provision. Supposing the general tariff in France is 200 francs

on an article and the minimum tariff is 100 francs, and the percentage of reduction in favour of Canada is 50 per cent; the difference between the general and the minimum tariff being 100 francs, 50 per cent of that would be 50 francs. Take 50 from the 200 francs, the general tariff, and the net tariff on Canadian goods would be 150 francs.

With such terms in a treaty is it not of vital importance to Canada that the proportion as between the general and the minimum tariff should always remain unchanged? But France has taken special pains to express clearly in this treaty that she is not to be bound by such a provision; on the contrary France has reserved expressly to herself the right to raise her maximum or her minimum tariff, or both, just as she may deem proper, but all Canada will get is the benefit of a percentage of reduction as between the general and minimum tariffs. Suppose in the case I have just put that the day after this treaty is ratified by this parliament France for her own purposes increases her general tariff to 400 francs, what is the result? The difference between this tariff and the minimum would then be 300 francs, and our percentage of reduction would be 50 per cent of the difference, or 150 francs. Deduct this from the 400 francs, which is the general tariff, and the rate on the goods of this country entering France would be 250 francs instead of the rate of 150 francs which I quoted a few minutes ago. And France reserves the right to make such increases as and when she may so desire.

France was quite justified in making the best bargain she could. Nobody can complain of that. In fact this afternoon I was rather surprised when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) hinted that somebody in this quarter of the House had suggested that the negotiators for France had acted in some respects unfairly in the negotiations. No such suggestion was made from this quarter. We are prepared to pay the negotiators for France in this matter every compliment. They are entitled to it. They certainly were wide-awake when they negotiated this treaty. I do not think they have missed much—indeed, I do not think they have missed anything. The treaty appears to be all in favour of France; every fresh limitation, every new condition has given an additional advantage to France and imposed a corresponding disadvantage upon Canada. The French diplomats have certainly made a splendid bargain for France.

In regard to goods in schedule B the position is simply this: France may alter the rates of duty upon these goods to-morrow and most effectually exclude us from her markets. Does anyone think we are entitled to the most favoured nation treatment with respect to goods mentioned in schedule B? Indeed we are not; France has reserved that point too. In the treaty of 1908 it is provided that we shall have the benefit of the lowest French tariff with any foreign nation; but when we come to schedule B of the present treaty it merely says that we shall get the benefit of the lowest rate accorded to the United States. Other nations may enjoy much lower rates; all we get in regard to goods on schedule B is the lowest rate which is given to the United States.

Then there is another provision just as favourable to France as schedules A and B. In respect of goods that are not in either schedule A or schedule B we simply get the United States rate, and if the agreement between France and the United States shall at any time be terminated, then we get a 25 per cent reduction and the difference between the general and the minimum French rates. But there is a curious provision in repect to the goods not included in schedules A or B, and that provision is contained in article V. It says:

> If at any time France grants to the United States of America for any products other than those enumerated in schedules A and B to this convention more favourable treatment than is granted to Canada, Canada shall be entitled to claim the benefit of the same treatment for any identical or similar products originating in and coming from Canada, on condition that France shall be entitled to ask from Canada a reasonable and equivalent concession.

When France deals with our diplomats; when France deals with the two ministers of this government who went to Paris to negotiate this treaty, France expressly provides that if any concession is granted to Canada, Canada shall grant an identical concession to France. But when the negotiators for the United States went over in 1921 to arrange their trade convention, for aught we know or are able to learn about the matter they gave no concession whatever to France and France gave them freely what they asked. But under the present treaty, even if in the future the United States gets a further concession of which we claim the benefit, we are bound under the treaty to give a similar concession to France.

Now, my summary of the agreement as it is presented to parliament is that it is by no means as satisfactory a treaty as that which is still in force. Every change has been a disadvantage to this country. France has succeeded in securing for herself absolute freedom

of action for the future; Canada, on the other hand, is bound under the hard and fast terms of express stipulations. Let me turn for a moment to the provisions in regard to Canada. Canada in respect to schedule D grants to France a fixed rate of duty; if the bill is passed bringing this treaty into force we absolutely fix the rates of duty on all the goods mentioned in schedule D coming from France to Canada and we cannot alter these rates unless we denounce the treaty. We have agreed to it; we have allowed ourselves no liberty of action; we cannot change a single rate under schedule D—that is the express language of the treaty. Then, in regard to schedule E which is a list of goods in respect of which Canada says to France, "We will give you the intermediate tariff of Canada and in addition we will give you a discount of 10 per cent." One would think that was a pretty reasonable offer to France and that as France herself had retained liberty of action in almost every respect she would have granted Canada some liberty of action; that some reciprocal arrangement would have been effected. But no, the negotiators for France say, "You must bind yourselves that you will always maintain the same proportion between the intermediate and the general tariff of Canada." We cannot alter this proportion. We can raise the general tariff, it is true, but if we do we must keep up the same proportion between our general and our intermediate tariffs so that a 10 per cent advantage to France will be sure to result. If there were anything like mutuality in this bargain, anything like reciprocal treatment, surely France would not have insisted on her right to raise her minimum or general tariff, one or the other or both, as she saw fit, and would not have so far bound the hands of the Canadian representatives as to schedule D to say, "These are the figures and you cannot alter them; you shall go no higher or no lower," and as to schedule E to say, "We will have your intermediate tariff with 10 per cent off, but you must bind yourselves to keep up the same proportion between your intermediate and your general tariff as at the present time." So again with schedule F, which deals with goods which France will be entitled to send into Canada at a discount of 15 per cent from the intermediate tariff. The same language is employed in schedule F as in schedule E; we cannot change the proportion of our general and our intermediate tariff in any way.

I have tried to state these things as clearly and as fairly as I can. I have tried to point out to the House the tremendous difference which exists between these two treaties, that of 1908 and the one now offered by the Finance Minister for the ratification of this parliament. If our trade did not succeed very well under the treaty of 1908; if we were disappointed in the trade results under that treaty—and I think we all were—what will happen to us under a treaty so overbalanced in favour of France as the present proposal? Every restriction in favour of France, every variation, every liberty, we are bound to by the treaty, and France is perfectly free to alter it or to nullify it as she sees fit. That is one aspect of the matter which appeals to me. But there is another important phase of the matter and even at the risk of some repetition I am going to refer to it.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance very candidly states that in his opinion this trade arrangement is of far more consequence to Canada than it is to France. I entirely differ from him in that opinion. He has pointed out the enormous difference between the French general and minimum tariffs and the comparatively small difference between our intermediate and general tariffs. He says that in one case the general tariff of France may be four or five times the minimum tariff while in Canada the difference is not more than perhaps five or seven and a half per cent between our general and intermediate rates and that is true. But I judge of the matter from the actual trade returns. If France sold to Canada last year $13,500,000 worth of goods and Canada sold to France a little over $8,000,000 worth of goods might one not assume that the trade as between the two countries is substantially more valuable and important to France than it is to Canada? What do the trade figures disclose? I will take the figures submitted to-day by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the eleven months of the present year—$12,000,000 of exports from Canada to France. I received to-day from the Department of Trade and Commerce a statement of the total exports of Canada for the last year and I find that the domestic merchandise exported ran to the enormous sum of $932,000,000 odd. Of that, $12,000,000 went to France, about one and one-quarter per cent of our exports. Is the export to France, then, such a vital matter to Canada as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance seems to think? I do not regard it as such a vital matter at all; if we had no trade treaty between France and Canada to-day I do not believe it would prove such a calamity that we need fear. It would not even seriously injure us. I do believe it would be a commercial misfortune. I think what we

require is a fair treaty. What we require is something in the nature of a reciprocal arrangement where the obligations and burdens on one country are to some extent similar to the obligations and burdens on the other country, and so also with the benefits and advantages. But I do not think the proposal we have before us constitutes such a treaty, and for that reason I do not approve it.

Even at the risk of repeating some of the things that may have been better said by others in the course of this debate I desire to look at this matter from another viewpoint for a few moments, and that is in regard to the question of the preferred nations or the most favoured nation treatment. I saw in a statement issued by the Customs department a list of the most favoured nations as they exist at the present time, they are as follows: the Argentine republic, Colombia, Denmark, France, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela. It is to be noted that Belgium is not one of them; it is to be noted also that Holland is not one of them; but there are eleven of them and under this arrangement every one of these nations, without giving us the slightest concession or the slightest advantage in its market is entitled to take the benefit of this proposed treaty as between France and Canada. I have made up a brief statement showing how our international trade operated last year, and if this treaty should come into force I think the figures in this statement will probably be greatly magnified next year. In my view of the matter the proposed treaty is going to prove, not in form, but in reality a treaty for increased trade with Switzerland rather than a treaty for increased trade as between Canada and France. Switzerland will obtain all the advantages which France will obtain in Canada without giving Canada any corresponding advantage in markets of Switzerland. I have only taken two tariff items which represent some of the larger exports as between Canada, France and Switzerland. I take tariff item 575 and tariff item 526 as examples. Tariff item 575 comprises a large number of goods. The item was referred to this afternoon. It comprises braids, cords, fringes and tassels. From France we bought last year $48,847 worth, and from Switzerland $112,207. Under the same item 575 come embroidered handkerchiefs. From France we bought last year $6,039, and from Switzerland $423,000. Under the same item come other handkerchiefs. From France we bought last year $5,629, and from Switzerland $225,823.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Under item 526 comes lace, white and cream colour. From France we bought last year $68,474, and from Switzerland $241,915. For these two items the totals are as follows: From France we purchased a total of $128,989, and from Switzerland $1,002,945. Or we purchased from Switzerland about eight times as much as we did from France. Now we propose to give France a preference in our market on the condition that France does something for us, but are we not in reality giving that preference to Switzerland rather than to France? And Switzerland gives absolutely no concession to us.

It is the same or worse in the case of Japan. Let me give one or two items in respect of Japan because in my view this is perhaps the most important aspect of the whole treaty. We are not, except on the surface, dealing with France. We are in reality dealing with the most favoured nations. Japan is a strong competitor of this country in many lines of manufacture. Let us examine the figures in regard to three or four tariff items? Take item 581, silk fabrics. We brought from France last year $1,006,000 and from Japan $4,093,000 worth. Item 582, silk ribbons. Of these we bought from France last year $248,656, and from Japan $692,408. Item 624, toys and dolls. Of these we bought from France last year $23,173, and from Japan $187,000. Item 653, brushes. Of these we bought from France last year $42,941, and from Japan $114,415. Buttons, in which my hon. friend for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) will be interested, we bought last year from France to the amount of $11,332, and from Japan $107,761 worth. Just in regard to the last item, while there is no button industry in the riding which I have the honour to represent, there is one and a large one in the adjoining riding of North Waterloo at the town of Kitchener. Now what will be the operation of this treaty in regard to buttons? Last year we bought from France $11,332 worth, a negligible quantity, and in the same year we bought from Japan $107,000 worth. The customs tariff on butons at the present moment is 30 per cent. Take 10 per cent off that rate, that is 3 per cent, and the result is a net duty under the proposed treaty of 27 per cent. There will be a reduction from 30 to 27 per cent in regard to the button industry at the city of Kitchener, and the competition in this line of goods is not from France at all but from Japan. The totals of the figures I have just given under these five tariff items show that we bought goods from France last year to the amount of $1,332,000, and from

9 p.m.

Japan to the amount of $5,194,000. This again I submit on the surface is a trade agreement between Canada and France, but in reality it will prove to be a trade agreement between Canada and Japan for the benefit of Japan and for which Japan grants Canada no concession whatever.

Passing from this phase of the question I ask myself, living as I do in the central portion of the province of Ontario, how this proposal will be viewed in the riding which I have the honour to represent. How will it affect the people of that particular locality? It may be said that is a narrow view to take of the question. It may be narrow, but it is very natural, and as I have the honour to represent a riding that is made up of all classes of people pretty well distributed, perhaps the views of the people in that riding would in general be a fair guide in other portions of the Dominion of Canada I look over the whole proposal. I take schedule A and I take schedule B and I ask myself, what effect will this proposed arrangement have in South Wellington? Who is going to benefit if this proposal goes into force? The largest single class of people in my riding, of course, is the agricultural class representing, I think, probably forty or forty-five per cent of the total population of that riding. I look over the schedules, examine schedule A carefully, examine schedule B just as carefully, and I do not find a single article in either schedule concerning which I can appeal to the agricultural classes in my community and say, this will be an advantage to agriculturists in the Dominion of Canada. It cannot be truly said; it is not within the terms of the treaty. There is not a scintilla of advantage to Canadian agriculturists from one end of the treaty to the other. Take the case of horses, ham, lard, eggs, cheese, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, apples, peaches and the like; there is no change in the French tariff on these items. We are not in a worse position I grant, nor are we in any better position, under the present proposal than you were under the old treaty—the rates are precisely the same. I will grant this also: There are some items as to which Canada, under the new proposal in regard to the agricultural schedules, is in a little better position than the United States. I do not say for a moment that the whole treaty is bad. I would not argue for a moment that there were not some items in respect of which we may have secured some advantage, because I find in the agricultural schedules that we do have some advantage over the United States. In such items as cheese, eggs, horses, fish (fresh and salted) lobsters. In all these items we have a benefit which the United States has not by reason of a slightly reduced tariff; but the French tariff remains still too high for any business. The tariff has not been sufficiently reduced to enable us to do a profitable trade in respect of these very articles—it is still too high. We are still shut out of France. We have not, in the past, been able to get into the French market, with our cheese, eggs, horses, etc., because of the French tariff, and we will not in the future because the high tariff rates will still prevail.

I notice, however, that all those classes of fish which the Maritime provinces may hope to export to France have been fairly well looked after by the Minister of Finance in the present proposal; but in respect to shipments of fish from the far province of British Columbia, I find, that the rate on canned salmon has been raised from 25 to 35 per cent. So far as the eastern fishing industry is concerned the terms are just as favourable now as they were before, but not so for the fishing industry of British Columbia.

What are the agricultural classes in my riding or in Canada going to gain by this arrangement? One result will be that we will have to raise more revenue in Canada next year than we are doing at present. The Finance Minister when he introduced this treaty into the House said that he estimated that as a result of the operation of the treaty there would be a loss to the revenue of $850,000. I do not think for a moment that he exaggerated the amount, I would not be surprised if the amount was far in excess of that figure, but that money will have to be made up to the treasury from some other source. Surely that fact is too plain for argument. We know the situation in regard to national finance in the Dominion at this moment. We know that we must have revenue from every possible source, we know that there is a very heavy debt upon the people; the interest burden runs into a tremendous amount each year. We cannot carelessly sacrifice a dollar of our revenue. The Minister of Finance estimates that we will lose $850,000 of revenue if this treaty goes into force. How are we going to make it up? That is a fair question. It will be lost through the reduction of duty on the importation into Canada of luxuries. It has been stated by both the ministers who negotiated this treaty that if you are going to negotiate a trade arrangement with France you must arrange to take from that country the goods which France manufactures and desires to export; largely these goods are luxuries. I do not desire to

enlarge upon this phase of the matter, but the fact remains that the goods which will come to Canada under the preferential arrangement which we propose to enter into with France will be brandy, champagne and wines, laces (white or cream), embroideries satins, silks, velvets, works of art—classes of goods which no one in this country would hesitate for a moment to class as luxuries. They are luxuries according to our style of living. The people who use these goods in Canada represent but a very small proportion of the population of the Dominion; they are the favoured few. There is probably but 5 or at the most 10 per cent of our people who can buy those articles upon which the rate of taxation is to be lowered under this proposal, and the treasury of Canada is to be deprived of $850,000 of revenue per annum according to the estimate of the Finance Minister. The question is, how shall we make up that amount? Will it be done by further customs taxation? If so you cannot further tax luxuries; the treaty will prevent it. I think it is a well-known principle of taxation, it is a principle of taxation accepted at least in this country, that luxuries should be the most highly taxed and necessaries the most lightly taxed. The adoption of this treaty would be a practical subversion of that principle; this treaty involves a reduction of the present taxes upon luxuries. Then how are you going to make up the loss unless you increase the tax on necessaries? You may do it by means of your customs tariff, or you may do it by means of direct taxation. In one way or the other it must be raised upon necessaries—you will have to do it in order to make up $850,000 lost through reducing the tax upon luxuries. The treasury must have this sum if we are going to meet our obligations and our liabilities.

So far as I can see, the only class in my riding who are going to receive any direct or positive benefit from this treaty if it be put into force is that small percentage of the people who are "clothed in purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously every day." But to the ordinary people of that constituency there will be a positive loss and the infliction of further taxation upon the necessaries of life. I pass from the agriculturist class to the ordinary class of people in the city, the artisans, mechanics and people generally. What advantage is there for them in this treaty? Is there a single suggestion of benefit or advantage of any kind; I ask anyone to point it out. I cannot find it and I have read and re-read the treaty; I have turned it over and examined it from every point of view. For the great midlde class, the ordinary people of this country, while there is no possible advantage there is positive disadvantage.

Then I turn to the manufacturing class and I come to a few cases where I believe there may be possible benefit. I do not find that great benefit can possibly result to the riding of South Wellington where I live; but I can well understand that when this treaty comes into force there may, perhaps, be an opportunity to export to France some farm machinery and parts of farm machinery which we are not able to export now. I grant that. I realize also that if this treaty comes into force the manufacturer of automobiles may secure some trade with France which is not now enjoyed. Last year we sold to France one automobile. With the new proposed rate of 45 per cent on automobiles I doubt if very much business will be done; but it is possible that some export business may be developed by our manufacturers in that line. I think also I can point to an industry in my own riding, as well as in the riding of the hon. member for Welland, which makes iron and steel tubes. The rate of duty on iron and steel tubes entering France is better under this arrangement than under the treaty of 1908. It is possible but I do not think it is probable—because the rates are still very high—it is possible that some additional business may be done in the export to France of iron and steel tubes. I am sure that my hon. friend for Lincoln will be able to do some additional business in France which he is not able to do at present. I think he is entitled to every credit for the position he has taken in regard to this matter. No man knows his own business better than does the member for Lincoln; but notwithstanding the possibility of advantage to himself under this agreement he recognizes the general disadvantage of this proposal to the whole of the Dominion.

Coming back again to my own riding I desire to ask the manufacturers of South Wellington, of the city of Guelph, what their views upon this question are. The Finance Minister has proclaimed more than once in this debate that his chief object in going to France was to secure for the manufacturers of Canada a readjustment of the French tariff which would put the manufacturers of Canada upon the same basis as the manufacturers of the United States in respect of trade with France, and he says that to a reasonable extent he has achieved his end.

Such an achievement might be all right if we did not have too pay too high a price for it. It might be a noble achievement if other conditions were equal or fair. I come to my

own riding again, and I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance what he thinks of this proposal in regard to sewing machines? In the city of Guelph we have a very large industry manufacturing sewing machines known as The White Sewing Machine Company. My hon. friend and his colleague have succeeded in putting sewing machines upon the same plane exactly as machines of American manufacture. But in reality what have they done? Under the treaty in force to-day stands for sewing machines are taxed 32.8 francs per 100 kilograms upon export to France. Now my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has succeeded in putting Canada on the same plane as the United States. In doing so he has raised the French duty from 32.8 to 41 francs per 100 kilograms. The machines proper to-day can be sent into France at a rate of 143½ francs. But now that we are placed on the same plane as the manufacturers in the United States, the duty on machines is raised to 205 francs. We were not able to do much business with France under the present duty, but what can we possibly expect in the way of export trade if this treaty comes into force, which has raised the French tariff on stands from 32.8 to 41 francs, and on machines proper from 143½ to 205 francs? What am I going to say to the manufacturers of sewing machines in my city if I admit that I voted for this new proposal made by the Minister of Finance and his colleague last summer?

Then I take another big industry in the city in which I live, that of pianos and organs. We have the Bell Organ and Piano Company, one of the oldest established concerns in this country, well known from one end of the country to the other. They have been large exporters of their manufactures. The Minister of Finance has succeeded in putting them on the same plane as the American manufacturer. What am I going to say to them when they look over the schedules of the treaty. But before I go into this, I wish to say I believe there is a mistake in the particulars relating to customs tariff rates in France which the government has laid on the table. I want it particularly noted that I think this item in the particulars is wrong, but I am going to use these figures as they are the only ones available and have been supplied by the government. What do I find? Under item, marked x 604 I find "pianos, grand." The rate to-day is 52.5 francs, but again the Finance Minister has put us on the American plane. We are on a level with American piano manufacturers and the French tariff has been raised from 52.5 to 85 francs. The rate on upright pianos is unchanged. Then we come to the humbler instrument, the organ—the cottage organ and not the church organ. Organs under the same item, of 200 kilograms, but less than 300, to-day are exported into France at the rate of 52½ francs, but the minister again has put us on the American level which has raised the tariff to 260 francs. What am I going to say to the manufacturers in my district about pianos and organs? To-day under the old arrangement, you could export pianos to France at 52.5 francs, but if the new treaty comes into effect we will have to pay 85 francs. To-day you can export organs at 52½ francs, but when the new treaty comes into effect you will have to pay 260 francs.

I will take another item. These matters of course all pertain particularly to my own riding, and it may be said that I am taking rather a narrow view of the question, but the same thing applies all over Canada We are also favoured in the constituency which I have the honour to represent with some important rubber manufacturing institutions. We have rubber factories in Guelph where they produce a large assortment of rubber goods. There is the Northern Rubber Company, producing rubber boots and shoes. What am I going to say when I explain this treaty to the Northern Rubber Company? I can say "Well you are on exactly the same plane as the American manufacturer, the finance minister has arranged this for you," but what consolation will that be to the proprietors of the concern when they come to read the present tariff? On rubber boots and shoes with felt the present rate is 260 francs per 100 kilograms, but these have been put on the American rate by the new treaty and raised to 390 francs per 100 kilograms, a raise of 130 francs, which is very substantial. The next item I mention is rubber boots lined with cotton. The present rate is 208 francs. The new rate, which is the American rate, is 312 francs. That is the result of the treaty on another of the largest industries we have in South Wellington. I desire to refer to one more item. We have a tire factory engaged in a large way of business in the manufacture of rubber tires and tubes. I can say to them "Now you ought to be happy, you are put on the same plane as the American manufacturer." But when they come to look up the tariff what will they find? They will find to-day that the rate on inner tubes and pneumatic tires per 100 kilograms is 150 francs, but under the new treaty they have been put on a parity with their American competitors and the tariff has been put up to 225 francs, which they will have

to pay when shipping their goods to France. These are the items which especially appeal to me in the matter, and which especially affect the riding which I have the honour to represent in this House. I have tried as well as I can to balance in my own mind and according to my own judgment the advantages —because there are some—and the disadvantages, which in my judgment—

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is asking again and again what answer he can make to his constituents when they find these advances. Now, in every case he is making a comparison with a dead arrangement, with an instrument which is dead or dying, and any comparison made between the present rates and the new tariff is absolutely unfair. The comparison should be between the rates of the treaty and the general tariff of France.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That may be a very fair remark, but I want to point out to my hon. friend that he has stated in a most emphatic way—and emphasized his statement on two occasions—"My object in going to France was to get the American rates for Canadian goods." Now he has them, and I have given him the results in my riding, and if the manufacturers of my riding are satisfied with the result, I will certainly be very much surprised.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member is not doing me justice in this matter. It is true that I stated the object was to get on even terms with the United States, because they will be our chief competitors in the European market, but beyond that the great point is to get something better than we would get by coming under the general tariff of France.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My criticism of the hon. minister's position is this: that what he has got is not such an arrangement as we in Canada are warranted in accepting.

Mr. FIELDING: That is another question.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is what I am trying to argue and that is the point upon which I am submitting these various comparisons. I do not for a moment admit that the treaty which he has brought back is one which this parliament should accept. My argument is entirely the other way. I do want a fair and reasonable commercial arrangement between Canada and France and every one on this side of the House wants it also. We desire any kind of a reciprocal arrangement with France which will confer something like equal benefits upon both countries, but the arrangement which is proposed by the government is so one-sided, so overbalanced, and so unequal in every respect, so far as I have been able to examine it, that in my opinion this House would not be warranted in accepting it as a satisfactory trade agreement between the two countries.

It would be far better for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to drop this proposal. It would be far better for him and his colleague to go back and try again. They know something of the game of treaty-making now. Let them take a little longer time, if necessary, and let them say to the negotiators of France: "In the bright light of an April day this proposal does not suit the parliament of Canada. It insists upon a better bargain". To whose interest is it most to make a treaty? As I said before, it is certainly to the interest of France, and I have no doubt, if this government should persist, it can procure a less objectionable treaty. The United States certainly secured a better one, and if our negotiators were as persistent, patient and diplomatic as those able statesmen whom France designated to conduct its side of the negotiations, I think we might have secured a much more satisfactory treaty than the one now before us.

I have tried to balance the advantages and disadvantages under this arrangement. I have tried to make some kind of an estimate of what we may reasonably expect in the way of increased trade, although that is very hard to estimate. I have mentioned several lines in which I think it may be possible to increase our exports to France; but after all, what will this amount to? Perhaps a million, two million, think you, three million a year in increased exports? Less than half of that, I feel sure. Suppose our exports should increase by two or three million dollars; last year the total amount was only eight million dollars odd all told, of agricultural products, manufactured products and everything else. Suppose the increase in exports is say three million dollars per annum, are we not paying too much for such an increase in export trade? Are we not tying our hands so completely under this agreement that we will not be able in the future to take advantage of more favourable arrangements which may be offered other countries of the world? Are we not going to pay too highly by loss to our treasury of $850,000 a year for the little bit of benefit which may possibly result? But apart from that altogether, are we not by this very treaty, granting favours, by reduction of taxation, to the people who least require such reductions? What satisfaction is it to the general public of Canada to know that a few of the people in the cities of this country are going to get their luxuries, their silks, their laces and their

wines under a duty of $27 a hundred instead of $30 as formerly? We may find it very hard to explain this aspect to the people if this treaty should go through. It will be of no benefit to the people in my constituency. It may be of some little benefit to the rich people of Montreal, Toronto or other large centres of population who purchase luxuries. But perhaps the worst feature of the question is that the loss of revenue must be made up, and as you cannot make up this loss by increased taxation on luxuries, because your treaty forbids it—consequently it must be made up by further taxation of the necessaries of life. These are the reasons why this treaty does not commend itself to me. It is for those reasons that I was prepared to move an amendment upon the second reading of this bill; but during the dinner recess, I may tell the House that I was in consultation with my leader, and he thinks it better that the bill should go into committee and be fully discussed there. I certainly intend, however, to reserve my right on the third reading of the bill to move the amendment which I had proposed to move to-night, but which I am dissuaded from doing by the request of my leader. Perhaps, on the whole, when the bill is discussed in committee, we may be able to demonstrate more clearly than we are able to do now, that the proposal is not to the advantage or benefit of the great mass of the people of this country.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, hon. members of this House who, in 1911, were members of the Canadian parliament, and who then listened to the eloquent and convincing speech of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in defending the proposals for reciprocity with the United States, must have admired his ability to turn corners quickly as they listened to his speech this evening condemning the present proposed arrangement with the republic of France.

Mr. DUFF: We are used to him now.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is it the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) my hon. friend is referring to?

Mr. ROBB: Wellington.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I thought my hon. friend said the hon. member for Welland.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for Wellington and the hon. member for Welland were in this House on the same side defending the party against the attacks of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) who now leads the opposition. Most of the argument presented in 1911 against the reciprocity pact with the United States was along the same lines as that of my hon. friend to-night; that is, that automatically the proposed arrangement of 1911 affected some twelve to fifteen states, and no one was more eloquent in advancing that idea than the then hon. member for St. Antoine, Sir Herbert Ames, and the present leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member mean in the House?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is drawing on his imagination. If he looks up Hansard, he will find that I never spoke at all.

Mr. ROBB: My right hon. friend had then in mind his resolution for lowering the duties on agricultural implements. Perhaps I have in mind his speech on the hustings. The hon. member for South Wellington, however, has to-night tried to narrow down this proposition to butter and bronze powder, forgetting that in the schedule for the minimum tariff there are some 413 items. True, my hon. friend argues that some of these items are the same in the minimum tariff as in the general tariff; but there may be a day when the republic of France will change that tariff, and Canada will be in that list and will be entitled to all the benefits of whatever reduction may be made.

I recall that soon after this government acquired power last winter, we were approached by the representative of France, who intimated that the treaty that had been extended by the government that preceded us was narrowed down to France alone, and that Canada did not share in the trade between the colonies, protectorates, and possessions of France. When we looked up the records, we discovered that the balance of trade with the colonies, protectorates and possessions of France were very much in favour of Canada. Therefore, at once this government enlarged the scope of the treaty so that it covered those colonies and protectorates. Then I have in mind that a very large manufacturer of agricultural implements came to us and pointed out that under the arrangement with the United States of March, 1921, their well-established business in France was very much in danger, particularly as they were under a disadvantage as regards parts of agricultural implements. I have in mind too a very large industry in Hamilton which approached us through its representatives, and I have under

my hand their letter pointing out that the republic of France proposed a considerable electrical development where large quantities of porcelain were required, and stating that if they were placed upon the same basis as the United States, they could secure that business. Therefore, I may remind my hon. friend that having succeeded in placing Canada upon the same basis as the United States, we have succeeded in securing a considerable advantage for the people of Canada, for producers of both agricultural and manufactured products?

I wish just for a moment to draw the attention of my hon. friend to one item in the tariff, and I am not going to pursue this tariff question long or go into details or figures. I think it has been fairly well presented to the House; but may I remind my hon. friend again what was pointed out to him just a minute ago by the Minister of Finance, that had we not secured this arrangement, we would have come under the general tariff of France? What would that mean? I will give my hon. friend just one example. Under the arrangement which is now before us the duty on boots and shoes is 390 francs; under the general tariff, which would be operative had we not been placed upon the same basis as the United States, the duty would be 4,040 francs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the difference whether it is the one or the other? Does the hon. gentleman think we can put shoes into France against the present tariff?

Mr. ROBB: I would remind my hon. friend that the war has taught Canadians to have a little more confidence in themselves and that to-day we are going into the markets of the world with our products. Canadian manufacturers realize that, given equal terms, they can compete in the markets of the world. I am reminded that boots and shoes from the United States are sold in the French stores.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and the manufacturers of the United States make enough boots and shoes in one day to supply the whole of Canada for nearly a year.

Mr. ROBB: Canada is commencing to export.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not boots and shoes to France.

Mr. ROBB: Canada will export boots and shoes to France. My hon. friend, for whom I have great admiration, came into this House the same year I did, in 1908, and by his industry and ability rose to a leading place in parliament. He eventually became Prime Minister and in the campaign of 1921 he was the only real, true "defender of the faith" of high tariff and trading only with ourselves.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should not say that, for his own Finance Minister has confessed to the House that all I was defending was a low tariff.

Mr. LAPOINTE: National-Liberal-Conservative.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend was trying to re-unite a great party along the lines that we can get rich by trading among ourselves —swapping jack-knives. Although the last speaker (Mr. Guthrie) has just admitted his party did not have the courage to move the amendment which was suggested prior to six o'clock, my hon. friend is advocating a policy of trading only with ourselves. I ask him if we can ever grow as a nation in that way?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does he base that statement on?

Mr. ROBB: On the whole argument of my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Pshaw, not at all.

Mr. ROBB: I think I can convince my hon. friend that it does not make any difference what treaty is presented to parliament or to the country, if it makes for enlarged trade it i sure to meet with opposition from him. I will prove this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I am complaining of in this treaty is that it contracts our market in the things we really sell.

Mr. ROBB: In 1911 the Liberal party presented to the country a treaty with the United States, and my hon. friend and his party complained that it gave all to the farmers and paid no regard to the manufacturers. That was the assertion then made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not mine.

Mr. ROBB: Well, my hon. friend supported that policy. To-day he argues that this treaty gives everything to the manufacturers and provides nothing for the farmers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It gives everything to France.

Mr. ROBB: In 1911 the policy of my hon. friend was: No truck or trade with the Yankees.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not at all.

Mr. ROBB: To-day his policy is: No truck or trade with the French. That is the natural conclusion to be drawn from the argument we have had presented against this treaty. Remembering the attitude of my hon. friend in 1911, I am not sure how the farmers of western Canada will regard his solicitude for them in respect of this treaty, but I rather suspect they will have very grave doubts as to the sincerity of his attitude.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What will they think of the hon. minister's?

Mr. ROBB: I believe that in this arrangement Canada has obtained many concessions that will be of value in the future. I have made a study of some of the foreign trade of France and I observe that she has purchased large quantities of goods from the United States and the Argentine. Under the proposed arrangement Canada will be at least upon the same basis as the United States, and as there is no possibility of those two countries coming under the objections advanced by my hon. friend this afternoon with respect to border states, in that regard we start out on an equal footing with our great neighbour to the south and with the Argentine—

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. ROBB: —who supply large quantities of goods to France.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What do those countries give France?

Mr. ROBB: I have the details, but I will not detain the House by reciting them. In addition, we provide for the future, for in article 3 it will be observed that whatever changes France makes as regards the tariffs of her colonies, possessions and protectorates, Canada will be entitled to similar percentages. To quote the article:

> These percentages shall remain the same whatever increase or decrease of tariff duties, surtaxes or coefficients France may establish in the future.

Then I observe that article 5 provides:

> If the United States of America should at any time cease to enjoy the benefit of the French decree of March 28th, 1921, products of Canada other than those enumerated in schedules A and B to this convention shall enjoy a reduction of twenty-five per cent on the difference between the French general tariff and minimum tariff, whatever the rates of these tariffs may be.
>
> If at any time France grants to the United States of America for any products other than those enumerated in schedule A and B to this Convention more favourable treatment than is granted to Canada, Canada shall be entitled to claim the benefit of the same treatment for any identical or similar products originating in and coming from Canada.

That is a concession which is worth something for the future.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Would the minister be kind enough to read the concluding words of the sentence?

Mr. ROBB: Do you mean:

> On condition that France shall be entitled to ask from Canada a reasonable and equivalent concession.

Is that it?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: Is there any objection to that? My hon. friend who has just preceded me—and I have it here in Hansard—laid down the policy in 1911 that any trade between countries must be on a fair basis, that you cannot obtain concessions without giving an equivalent in return. I submit that the hon. member for South Wellington was on sound ground then, but in the interval he has wandered far from good company. Now, article 7 is in these terms:

> If under the preceding articles the French minimum tariff does not apply to foodstuffs originating in and coming from Canada these products shall nevertheless enjoy the benefit of the said tariff upon their importation into the French West Indies and French Guiana.

Then there are other provisions that are worth something but that have not yet been pointed out. Customs tariff is not the only imposition that is placed upon the products of a country in these days when all the nations are searching about for methods of raising revenue. We ouselves raise certain revenues through the excise; France has provided for that. In this treaty ample care is taken that no matter whether it is a province, a town or a city that imposes excise, Canada shall be protected. I quote article XVIII.:

> Products of Canadian origin of any kind imported into France, the French colonies, possessions and protectorates shall not be subject to any other or higher duties of excise or town dues than those which are or may be charged upon like products of the most favoured nation. In like manner products of any kind originating in France, the French colonies, possessions or protectorates when imported into Canada shall not be subject to any other or higher duties of excise or town dues than those which are or may be charged upon like products of the most favoured nation.

So that upon that ground we are placed in exactly the same position as any favoured nation desiring to trade with France. I submit that while this arangement with France may not be all that we would desire to get —because any man who goes out to promote trade relations tries to get all he can for his country—France had something to say about the matter, and it is all that France has given to any other nation. What more can we ask from these 36,000,000 customers, industrious people who always pay for what they buy?

If my hon. friend believes that my advice is worth anything to him I suggest that he think it over again before coming to the conclusion that that amendment should be offered. I am satisfied that the people of Canada will not look kindly upon any attempt to stop the expansion of Canadian trade with any country that is able to buy Canadian products.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on this subject it is not my hope that I shall be able to add very much to what has already been said as respects the details of the treaty now under consideration. But I have been struck with some of the remarks made by some of my hon. friends to my right. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that under this treaty the farmers of Canada would be no worse or no better off. Well, I submit that if we in this part of the House opposed the treaty on the ground that it did not contain much for the farmers, the hon. member for South Wellington would be one of the first to charge us with selfishness. I believe the manufacturers will derive some benefit from the terms of this treaty. We in this part of the House are glad of that. We think it is a good thing for Canada as a whole that our manufacturers should be prosperous; we are glad to have trade arrangements made with other countries that will give them a market for their products.

This trade arrangement, Mr. Speaker, as all others, should be considered wholly on its merits. I am convinced, though, that the opposition in this House would be hard to satisfy in this respect; as a matter of fact I do not think this government could negotiate a treaty that would be acceptable to the official opposition. Under the bi-party system an opposition, it would appear, is expected to oppose, and I am sure the present opposition are fulfilling that duty to the letter. We in this part of the House stand for something different: we stand for wider markets and freer trade. While this treaty is not all that we could desire, while it is ours to accept or reject, I think it is only natural that Canada should endeavour to secure better trade relations with the republic of France. France was our ally in the late war. It can be fairly stated that trade rivalry very often leads to misunderstanding and war and that friendly intercourse in the matter of trade as between countries lessens the chances of strained relations. It is also a fact that thirty per cent of the people of this country speak the French tongue. I do not believe in mixing sentiment with business, but that is a fact that is worthy of consideration. Thousands of our people visit France annually. The Canadian people are to-day the titled owners of 250 acres of land in that great republic. So there are many things that bind Canada to France, and if we do not make some endeavour to continue our trade relations with that country under the best possible terms, I submit that instead of being drawn closer together we will drift further apart.

Both the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. member for South Wellington made much of the point that other nations would derive the same benefit from this treaty as would France. But would it be possible to negotiate a treaty with France and get away from that result? I do not see how it could be done. The right hon. leader of the Opposition stated in this connection some days ago that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) should have increased the duties on luxuries before going over to negotiate this treaty. Speaking to-day, he said the hands of the Minister of Finance were tied on account of his association with a party that stood for lower tariffs, and he also said that France had been well advised as to that position. Well, if the latter is the case, by what sort of reasoning does the right hon. gentleman think that France could have been led into a trade arrangement if the Minister of Finance had followed his advice and raised the duties on luxuries immediately preceding his visit to that country. The negotiators of France would certainly have been advised of that fact and the deal would have been off.

The right hon. gentleman also stated that Canada would lose some $500,000 in revenue from customs duties through the operation of this treaty if it goes into effect. I am forced to think that he based that statement on the old fallacy that high customs means greater revenue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On what does the hon. member think the Minister of Finance bases his estimate of $850,000?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Just at the moment I am dealing with what my right hon. friend said, and if he will let me pursue that I will probbably come to his question later. Now, he contends that we are going to lose $500,000 on this arrangement. I say I believe he is figuring on the old fallacy that the higher the customs duties the greater the revenue. If we look at the returns from customs duties for the last fiscal year we find that our revenue was increased by some thirteen

million dollars. It is a fact that last year the Minister of Finance gave some slight reductions in the customs tariff. I am not here to say that the full amount of this increase in our revenue from customs was due to those reductions: nevertheless, we have that result, our revenue did increase by some thirteen million dollars. Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a delusion that the tariff is the bulwark of our revenue producing machinery in this country. Not more than thirty per cent of our revenue was raised from this source last year, and the United States, the greatest protectionist country in the world, did not raise ten per cent of her revenue from customs duties last year.

I would like to say here if I might be permitted to digress to that extent that we in this part of the House are strong for an increase in the British preference. We are particularly strong for it at this time because our imports from the United States greatly exceed our exports to that country, while our imports from Great Britain are infinitesimal as compared with our exports to that country. So I hope the Minister of Finance is giving very serious consideration to this matter besides making trade arrangements with France and other countries. Further, Mr. Speaker, we in this part of the House, are and I hope always shall be strong for wider markets and lower tariffs. We are behind this treaty because we want better trade relations with France as with other countries. I believe at this particular time wider markets are essential to our growth and national well being, and I am sorry that the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition is not of that mind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say I was not. I would like the hon. member to show how we are going to get wider markets by having duties put up higher on our staple exports to other countries.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I coupled with that statement as you will have noticed, Mr. Speaker, higher tariffs and I had particular reference to that part of my statement. I hold in my hand a press despatch dated St. Catharines April 22nd, which states "Mr. Meighen preached strong protective tariff to improve conditions here." On exactly the same day according to a despatch from Halifax, Nova Scotia, which I have in my hand, the leader of the Conservative party in the legislature of that province moved a resolution asking for a referendum in Nova Scotia on the question of secession of that province from the Canadian confederation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You are wrong again.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am quoting from this despatch.

Mr. BAXTER: He is not the leader, whatever you are quoting from.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I would ask the hon. member for St. John to say in what respect my quotation is wrong.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Corning is not the leader, that is all,

Mr. LOGAN: Mr. Corning is the leader.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is half of the party.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I submit that the hon. member of the Conservative party in the legislature of Nova Scotia, be he leader of the Conservative party or not, did not move his resolution asking for a referendum on the question of secession from confederation because they have good conditions in that province. I think it is only fair to infer that it is not because he wants higher duties as proclaimed by the leader of the Conservative party in federal affairs at St. Catharines. If I know anything about conditions as I learn them through the press and from members of this House it is that the people of the province of Nova Scotia find themselves in somewhat the same position that we in the western provinces are in. We are forced to buy in a protected market and to sell our products in open markets in competition with the whole world. I imagine that the farmers of Nova Scotia would like to be able to buy fertilizer for their soil to produce crops at the same price that their neighbours across the boundary line in the United States are permitted to buy theirs. I think the farmers of Nova Scotia and producers generally in that province would like to buy their implements of production at the same price at which they are procurable in the United States. I think too they would like to have the United States market open to them as we had a chance of having it under the reciprocity pact in the year 1911. Had it not been for the action of my right hon. friend and his party and their friends in the country in that year we might have had a market to-day sufficient unto our needs in the United States, but with the leader of the official Opposition in this House preaching in the town of St. Catharines that what is needed is higher customs duties—

10 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that at all. Quote what I said.

Mr. JOHNSTON: "Strong protective tariff." If that does not mean higher duties—

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said was a strong definite statement of protective tariff.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I do not see why my hon. friend should ask for that. Surely it is definite enough already. It is in force in this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is in force all right, but there is a very great uncertainty of statement and conflict of statement on the part of the government as the hon. member knows himself.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I cannot understand that because last year we had our neighbours to our right condemning the government because they had not lived up to their platform, and it has been charged in this House and out of it by our friends to my right that hon. gentlemen opposite have a platform to get in on, and then do not live up to it. If they are not living up to their platform they must be keeping pretty close to the platform of hon. gentlemen to my right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHNSTON: At any rate, I think when you have coming from the old province of Nova Scotia, and from a leading gentleman of the Conservative party, which party has always claimed to be the ultra-loyalist party of this country a resolution calling for a referendum on secession, it is time to take some notice of it. I remember that during the election campaign the hon. leader of the Opposition was reported to have stated in this same province of Nova Scotia that the Progressive party had grown up in western Canada during the last twelve years, and had in its trail all the theorists, and many other classes. Now if such a resolution as the one I have referred to had been moved in one of our western legislatures I am sure the people of this country would not have been so much surprised, remembering all we have been charged with, but coming from the staid old province of Nova Scotia it was a great surprise to me, and I am sure to the people of western Canada.

While I am directing my remarks to the right hon. leader of the Opposition I want to say to the government that there is thought and some talk of secession in other parts of Canada as well as Nova Scotia. It is not because the people of this country are tired of our Empire connections. Not at all. The reasons are wholly economic, and there never was a time in the history of this country when we needed wider markets as badly as we need them to-day. I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that the more trade treaties we can negotiate and ratify the better, and if we cannot start by effecting such arrangements with our allies the chances in this direction would seem to me to be pretty poor.

Another thought is this: We should not reject this treaty—and I am sure my hon. friends to my right would hesitate in doing so—particularly at this time when relations between Great Britain and France are somewhat strained over the occupation of the Ruhr. The adoption of the treaty would, I should think, help to restore the relations which formerly existed between the two countries.

Let me say in conclusion that I support this treaty because, to some extent, it tends to meet one of the principles to which I firmly adhere, that is freedom of trade. For the reasons I have outlined, and for the further reason that so long as I have the honour of occupying a seat in this House I intend to stand by those principles and the platform upon which I was elected.

Mr. W. G. RAYMOND (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of regret I heard the last speaker state that there was talk in various parts of Canada at the present time of annexation or secession from the British Empire. I am sure that is a matter we all should regret in this House. The hon. member in question expressed his regret for it and I am sure that every hon. gentleman on this side must feel regret that any such state of mind should exist in any part of Canada. In that connection I would like to remind the hon. gentleman, and in doing so bring the fact to the attention of the House, that such a movement was never commenced by the members of the Liberal party at any time in Canada's history, nor was it ever countenanced by the members of the Liberal party at any period in the history of the Dominion. You will find by examining the traditions of that party that they have always favoured legislation that has tended to more strongly cement the bonds beween Canada and Great Britain.

Mr. JOHNSTON: May I interrupt the hon. gentleman in order to set him right. I think he said that he had understood the last speaker to state that there was talk in other parts of Canada as to annexation and secession from the Empire. I am sorry to have to interrupt him but I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. RAYMOND: I understood the hon. member to quote a motion that was made

in the Legislative Assembly of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That was to secede from the Canadian confederation.

Mr. RAYMOND: From the Canadian confederation? I beg your pardon. My remarks however, would equally apply to such a proposition as that. It has never been any part of the tradition of the Liberal party in any province to separate from confederation. Anyone who has made a study of confederation must see that it was based and carried out almost entirely upon the principles of the Liberal party.

Mr. BAXTER: I wonder if my hon. friend has ever heard of the movement for the repeal of the union which was so widespread in Nova Scotia some years ago, and which carried a party into power—the Liberal party?

Mr. RAYMOND: I never heard of it being associated with the Liberal party.

Mr. BAXTER: Oh, yes it was.

Mr. RAYMOND: Perhaps by you but not by others.

Mr. BAXTER: Ask the Finance Minister.

Mr. RAYMOND: I do not know why the hon. gentleman should wish to think that such movements originate only in the province of Nova Scotia. I have a different opinion of that province. I look upon Nova Scotia as one of the most loyal, one of the most steadfast, one of the most stable of our provinces. I am sure that if there is any such movement in that province at the present time it does not originate with Nova Scotians who are members of the Liberal party. Furthermore if there is any such movement in any other province it does not derive its origin from those who owe adherence to the Liberal party or Liberal principles. I merely say this because I think it well, Sir, that the facts should be thoroughly understood. I am sure it is well within the knowledge of those who have read the history of Canada that when any such matters have come up they have originated with the party that was opposed to the Liberal party. Any legislation tending to strengthen the ties between this country and Great Britain—such as Imperial penny postage and the British preference—was entirely originated and created by the Liberal party. I have made this statement because it presented itself to me while the previous speaker was talking. I thought the motion of which he spoke not only referred to secession from Confederation but to annexation with the United States.

Now, with reference to the treaty I shall not take up the matter schedule by schedule, as the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) did, or enter into any enumeration of the individual articles with which the treaty deals. The hon. member at the outset of his remarks spoke of this as a matter of practical commerce. I think we may all, perhaps, regard it in that way and each of us perhaps has some views as to how this treaty affects his individual constituency. At any rate, I think that is the way in which the country will regard it. I do not think the people will be drawn away by remarks made by hon. members in criticism of a treaty of this kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite have declared that they were in favour of the French treaty, that they would like to see a good treaty arranged with France. If so I have only this to say: The two ministers who went to France to make this treaty went with the full approbation, consent and confidence of the people of Canada. The Canadian people felt that they could send to France no two men who were better qualified for the task. They went to France, and they did their very best; they arranged a treaty and they have brought it back. That treaty has received the approbation generally of the country; not the approbation of hon. gentlemen opposite because nothing that could emanate from this side would ever receive their approbation, and the more an arrangement was in the interest of Canada and the more it redounded to the credit of the present government the more strenuous would be the opposition it would receive from my hon. friends across the floor.

I was just a little sorry when I heard the right hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) deliver the oration he did upon this treaty. It was a very fine oration but I was very sorry that he should find it necessary to go back to an election which took place in North Essex and drag that in for the purpose of making certain party and political allusions. I regret it, because I thought there was something else before the House. We do not need to discuss party politics all the time, and it was a matter of great regret to me that a man of his standing, and I would say of his ability, would do such a thing. I say "ability" advisedly, Mr. Speaker, because we know he has ability. It may be that he has ability to burn, but we regret to see him always burning it on the altar of party politics. We would like to see him devote that

ability to the real interest of the country and to look at this treaty in a fair way, to try and consider it as though it were something that was going to benefit this country, instead of trying to make out that it is going to injure the country. I do not think in the long run that anything can be gained by misrepresentation, and I never did.

I must say that the whole basis of the argument that has been made by hon. members on the other side is nothing more or less than misrepresentation. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) stated that 5 per cent of his own constituents were clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously ever day. If there is a population in his riding of 30,000, that would mean that 1,500 people were clothed in purple and fine lined and fared sumptuously every day. He says those are the only ones who would benefit by this treaty. Why? Because braids, cords, embroidery, silks, satins and so forth, are imported with a little less duty from France under the treaty. That member is too well informed and has been too long in public life not to understand what is meant by these items in the tariff. They are not articles of clothing. They are not imported in the form of silks, satins and so forth that can be worn. The buttons that he introduces also come under the same category. He knows as well as I know, Mr. Speaker, that these articles come over here to what we call the costume makers. He knows there are people in this country whose business it is to make clothes in our cities, and that if they did not make them we should have to import them from foreign countries, the United States, Germany or France. The treaty will help these people in their business. These articles are practically their raw material. The silks, the satins, the embroidery, the cords and the buttons that are used in these articles are the raw material of the costume maker. That is an industry which few people take the trouble to look up, but it is one of the industries which have developed to a great extent in the larger cities such as Toronto and Montreal during the last few years. It is not fair to represent these articles as expensive finished silk or satin dresses, or anything of that kind. They come in as the raw materials for garment making of the costume houses. For all we know some of the satin might be put in the sleeves of a farmer's coat. Would that form part of the clothing of which the hon. member speaks when he refers to his friends who are dressed in purple and fine linen? No, it would not. This is clearly a matter of relieving the duty on these things to which I refer, and not as a benefit to the wealthy class, and it is not taking the duty off luxuries, as represented by many hon. members. I think each alternate speaker on the other side of the House took the ground that it was taking the duties off luxuries and benefiting only the wealthy class. That is not a fair statement. It is taking the duty off the raw material of a very important industry in this country. Lessening the duty on these articles gives an advantage to an industry which enables it to compete with industries of other countries, where otherwise it would have to pay a high rate of duty upon the material which goes into these garments.

There is another respect in which it appeared to me that the arguments of hon. members were not in accordance with what I considered to be the facts or a fair logical consideration of the question. I think the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) said there was a slight advantage in regard to agricultural implements, and that parts of agricultural implements would be exported to France at a slightly lower rate. He said the owners of agricultural implements would be anxious to get these parts, and after all it did not make very much difference where they got them. I think that is about the way he stated it—that it was not really an important thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not the statement.

Mr. RAYMOND: Then what was the statement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said was that inasmuch as the owners and users of these implements in France would require these things themselves, would be wanting them, and could not get them anywhere except here, they would naturally press their government to admit them under low duties, and though it was important to have these duties lowered it was no triumph under those conditions.

Mr. RAYMOND: The right hon. gentleman says it was no triumph to get them under those conditions. I want to show the value of getting those articles at a less rate of duty. It is not the duty on the articles themselves, as I take it, that is the important point. There is another much more important feature. There has been in the past very considerable trade in agricultural implements in France. Canadian agricultural implements have had a very great reputation in France. They stand high there, but they had a rival in the American agricultural implement. When a French farmer was about to buy an implement, if he was canvassed by an American salesman it was

always within the power of the American salesman to put the proposition up to him, "Now, if you buy an American implement you get your parts whenever they wear out and you get them at a lower rate of duty than you can if you buy a Canadian implement." That would always be an argument and would help to sell American implements in preference to Canadian implements. It is not the matter of the duty on the parts of these machines; that is a mere bagatelle, a trifle, not worthy of consideration, but the whole business depends upon being able to put an article on the market in such a way that it is to the advantage of the buyer or consumer to take it, and this treaty gives our salesmen a chance to go there and say—this was not the case formerly—"Now, you can import our implements at as low a rate of duty as you import the American implements, and you can get the parts as cheaply as you can get the parts of the American machines."

Mr. LEWIS: If it is possible for the Canadian manufacturer at the present time to put an implement into France as cheaply as the American manufacturer can place it there, what becomes of the hon. member's argument for a tariff against the United States? Why cannot the manufacturer do the same thing in Canada?

Mr. RAYMOND: Just at the present time I am thinking of the French treaty. The question of the hon. member, while it is quite a sensible question, opens up another vista which is a long way to leeward, and I am not thinking of it. I am thinking of the greater advantage that is given to our manufacturers and the greater their output in foreign countries, the cheaper and better they are able to make their implements for home consumption, and by this French treaty they will be enabled to sell implements in France. The difficulties in the way in regard to the tariff will be removed.

Now it was said no advantage is given to the agriculturist under this particular treaty. I do not know. We have had conditions in the years since the war that so displaced trade that I think it is impossible to judge as to what would be our chance of exporting agricultural goods to France. I think it is fairly difficult to judge what would be our chance of exporting any of our principal agricultural products to that country. We have to remember in that connection that the land of France is more evenly divided among the population than the land of any other country in Europe. We have to remember that there is more intensive cultivation in France than there is in any other country in Europe. We have to remember that some of the very finest farmers in all branches of agriculture live in France. Therefore, it is not a country that is importing very much in the way of agricultural products, and I do not think our farmers in the West expect that France will ever be a large market for wheat, because I think they know that, while in some years the position of France as a wheat growing country will vary, in one year before the war commenced, France came to be the third producing country of wheat in the world. France at that time, a little before the war, excelled even Canada in its production of wheat. Therefore, when the French bought from the farmers of the West even that quantity of wheat that was quoted this afternoon of twelve million bushels, I think it was, that was exported to France in the face of a duty, we were told, of 7 francs per 100 kilograms, or something like 50 cents a hundred, or something less than half a cent a pound. They must have needed that wheat; they must have been short for that particular year; but it does not follow that we shall always have a trade in that direction, and, therefore, it is unfair to expect and I do not think sensible farmers would expect to send very much in the way of agricultural products to France, any more than they would expect to send a great deal to the Argentine republic, because by sending them to France, they would be sending them to one of the finest agricultural countries in the world. So it seems to me that there is no basis for the argument that no benefit is given to the agriculturists under this particular treaty.

I do not wish to weary the House, because I understand the desire is to draw this debate to a close and the ground has been fairly well gone over. I thought, however, it would be just as well to point out those few items that occurred to me from the remarks that were made by hon. gentlemen opposite, especially those with regard to the manufacturing interests. Those articles which are imported are, as we know, the raw material for certain of our manufactures, and I know from personal experience that the advantage that has been gained as regards our machinery has benefited my constituency. A year ago the largest implement factory in my constituency was shut up tight; but for months it has been going on with some 900 to 1,000 men employed there, working and taking home their pay envelopes, with the whistles going regularly as they went before. Those men are employed in manufacturing agricultural machinery that is going to France. That, it seems to me, is a benefit. We know it is

a benefit in my constituency; we know that we have those men employed that otherwise would not be employed, and I am sure that the recollection of that incident, while I sat and listened to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, was more than a contradiction to them. While in South Wellington it may not be the case that there is any benefit under this treaty except to those who are clothed in purple and fine linen and who fare sumptuously every day, those men in my constituency, who are working men, are benefited. They are the men who carry the dinner-pail, who go to the factory and earn their living. For months before this House went into session, some time before the 1st November they were started on an order of agricultural implements from France, largely in prospect of the success of this French treaty that the Minister of Finance has been able to negotiate.

Before resuming my seat, which I intend to do immediately, I would deprecate, as I said at first, with the regret that I sincerely feel, that men of energy and ability in this House should devote their energies and abilities simply to waking up old party feuds, or working overtime on some political faction fighting that exists in their minds and that sometimes, I believe, exists in their minds alone. It seems to exist in some men's minds all the time. I am sorry for them; I think they ought to pluck it out and cast it from them as something that it would be well for them to get rid of. Then they would smile and the world would appear differently to them. I believe they would find then, when they looked out and viewed the world abroad, a pleasanter aspect. They say that if you want to have a friend, you must be one, and I would advise one who wants to see the world look good-natured, to try and be good-natured himself. If he has that party rancour that turns to gall and that turns the milk of human kindness sour, for heaven's sake, let him pluck it from him and cast it away. As long as I have the honour of being a member of this House and indeed, as long as I have the privilege of living in this country and can raise my voice, I always want to be able to feel a sympathetic chord vibrate in my heart when I see a good Canadian, moved by high motives of public duty, leave the comforts of his home and family, go over to another country, and stay there patiently for months working and negotiating to do something for his native land. I want always to be able to applaud that man. That is what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has done, and he should receive the thanks of this House and this country. Sitting in this House as we are, making a treaty with France, we can always make a bargain very easily until we meet the other man with whom we have to deal. Hon. members have sat in this House and made a treaty with France without having any French representatives present. Hon. members have compared duties under the trade agreement which has been denounced, which duties, therefore, do not exist, with the duties which obtain under this treaty. That is manifestly unjust and unfair. I regret that men should depart from the plain path of honesty, rectitude and justice in order to belittle a great work that one of their fellow countrymen has succeeded in accomplishing.

Mr. HAROLD PUTNAM (Colchester): Mr. Speaker, the range of the phases of this question which I shall assume to touch at this stage of the debate and at this hour, I promise shall be very limited. There has been at least some discussion, however entertaining, however instructive, which has not been strictly relevant to the issue, and if I should transgress in the same manner, I know I shall have the same unsought forgiveness which has been accorded to all in this debate.

We have heard a great deal from those hon. members immediately to your left, Mr. Speaker, upon our alleged scorn, our alleged neglect of everything that we represented to the people before the last electoral contest. They have been, in season and out of season, insistent in preaching, by sermons and even by sermonettes, that peculiar charge against ourselves. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) dropped a few remarks in his speech the other day, before six o'clock, and in his speech this afternoon, which leave me in a state of confusion as to whether he is charging us that it is a sin, our high tariff or our hy-pocrisy. But I was relieved to hear the right hon. leader of the Opposition for the first time this session credit the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) with some little shred of respect for what the right hon. gentleman announced the hon. minister had told the people before the last election. He said that the hon. Minister of Finance sat at the commercial gates of France with his hands tied, that he could not raise the duties against French goods coming to Canada because he had promised so differently during the campaign. But he did not commend the hon. minister for that attitude, Mr. Speaker. He said the minister should have raised those duties in spite of his interpretation of what the minister had promised to the people before the election. Now, as a new member in this House I confess that I have looked to the leader of the Opposition for some definite leadership along the line of political morality

which he has made his hobby. I think that if all his preachments and teachings and admonitions on this particular subject were culled from Hansard they would make a volume which he himself would admit was respectably bulky. And as one who desired to be consistent myself I have been watching the consistency of the self-appointed teacher who sits in opposition directly opposite to me. I am very sorry to find—and I say it in all sincerity—that he has departed from his tenets. We were only here a little while after the last election until the right hon. leader of the Opposition supported a solemn vote of want of confidence in the government because his friends around him and he himself urged that we had not given the soldiers a cash bonus according to our pre-election promise. And what was the attitude of the right hon. gentleman? It was this: I do not care if that was a wrong promise, I do not care if it was fiscally unsound, you should carry out that pledge and vote the bonus; you should put the sacredness of your pre-election promise before everything, even though in carrying it out you would have to do something utterly unsound fiscally. But the other day I was surprised that the right hon. gentleman varied his line of admonition—that would be putting it too mildly —really he turned directly back in his own tracks and told the hon. Minister of Finance: You should pay no attention at all to your pre-election promises, you should look strictly and solely to the fiscal soundness of your action and should raise the duties against French goods even in violation of those pre-election promises. In the face of that I have to say to the distinguished leader of the Opposition that on matters of political morality and national honour I must forsake his leadership and look for guidance a little more consistent and, I hope, a little more sincere.

I listened with interest to the speech of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I am sorry he took such a pessimistic view of the capabilities of Canadians, such an erroneous view of the fact that once trade runs in certain channels it is not easily diverted. He told us that last year our wheat exports to France had jumped up by about three million dollars in value, but he seemed to hold the dismal belief that no such heavy shipments would ever go to France in the future. I think this country in the long pull is only in the infancy of the great business of raising wheat, and I believe that the French people having once got a taste of our wheat—of quality unsurpassed—will have their appetites whetted so that they will be eager to continue further importations. And I see great possibilities in this treaty being the pioneer agency of a far larger volume of Canadian trade with France in wheat and other commodities.

The hon. member for South Wellington spent considerable time in giving us a list of articles whereon the French duty was the same against America as against Canada. He did not tell us that even now the United States is supplying large quantities of those goods to France, thus at once raising the question, either expressly or impliedly: If they can do it why not we? I venture to answer, yes. I recollect that in 1911 no man was more insistent in his speeches than the member for South Wellington that we could meet the Americans on even terms; because we are made of the right stuff to do it. Now, if the Americans are shipping to France boots and shoes and these other commodities which he enumerated, why in the world cannot we compete with them now as well as he so vigorously asserted we could away back in 1911?

The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) is to be commended for his industry, but not for the cogency of the reasoning which he applied to what he had collected with such laboriousness. To him was assigned the duty of launching the attack and his tactics were very simple and very clear: he would pick out an article from the treaty which it was supposed might be exported to France, but as to which he had knowledge or suspicion that it was neither made in Canada nor, if made, exported at the present time. He would carry that same fiery torch to the hilltop of another article similarly treated, and he would multiply these and parade them as instances of the imbecility of the hon. ministers of this government who negotiated the treaty. But there is no doubt at all that the hon. member for Lincoln in 1911 joined his voice to the chorus: Leave well enough alone. And the argument which he uses now is that the variety of what Canada manufactures and exports shall never be enlarged. "Leave well enough alone" was his slogan in 1911, and I am sorry to say it seems to be his slogan still.

I was amused at the airy, easy way in which the member for Lincoln would have us think that all our ministers had to do was to go to Paris and ask and they should receive even to the half of the kingdom of France. The hon. gentleman picked out a certain article—I forget what it was—and he exclaimed: You succeeded in getting that

down to 45 per cent: why didn't you get more? He said that in a tone of scorn as though the Minister of Finance was not the solemnly accredited representative of the Canadian people and responsible to them, but rather as though the minister were his own hired man. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance did not answer that poser, and I suppose it will stand until there shall be no more sea for Canadian delegates to cross in an endeavour to negotiate trade treaties with any foreign people, whether those delegates be as wise as gods, or whether they have all the simplicity which the hon. member for Lincoln and a few of his associates who have spoken in this debate would evidently relate to the present Canadian negotiators. I must congratulate the hon. member for Lincoln upon the vast amount of work which he undertook in giving item by item the schedules of this treaty. I cannot congratulate him upon the use he made of his very laboriously obtained facts.

Another hon. gentleman who spoke in this debate assumed an easier air, an attitude more offhand, more debonair, more cavalier even than any other debater on that side. I refer to the gay and hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). He was insistent that these two hon. and distinguished negotiators on behalf of Canada had acted not only like schoolboys, but I think he classed their actions as being those only of idiots or lunatics. He asked, with an air of bravado: "Why did you not hire a good Yankee to negotiate this treaty for you?" Well, Mr. Speaker, he did not suggest any American name, but I was just wondering whether we could not again have hired the Griffenhagens. I will say this: If they were rewarded for their disservice toward Canada we should easily have found them out of a job and very glad to be hired again and to accept a few more hundred thousand dollars of Canadian money.

Then the hon. member reached the climax when he used the word "gullible" as applying to these two ministers.

Mr. Speaker, I have about concluded. It is so late that I shall not go further down the few notes I did take. But seriously I do not think this House is treated with common courtesy when certain members on the opposition side would have it appear that the two distinguished, experienced, able and patriotic delegates who negotiated this treaty were over in France, not to study what they could get, not to see how little France would take in the arrangement of a treaty that would be worth something to us. I think this House will regard it as an axiom that these two hon. gentlemen had the motive of getting as good a bargain as they could for Canada: that having arrived there, their first step would be to make discreet investigation as to what tariff concessions France would make to Canada, and, in turn, what would be the minimum tariff concessions France might exact and expect from Canada. I have no doubt that they proceeded on that basis. I listened to the speeches of those two hon. ministers, and I saw not one symptom that they had betrayed their trust, or that they had not done the best they could and the best that could be done. I was delighted to be confirmed in that elementary opinion by the hon. leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) who admitted that while the treaty was not anything like as long a step as he would desire in the right direction, it had merit; that it was good as far as it went, and he did give the hon. gentlemen who negotiated it the credit of having, on the very face of things, done the best they could. But when the question comes to a vote I want hon. members to weigh the utter absurdity of the attitude taken by some hon. members who stand up and either throw out the implication or make the direct statement that these two negotiators could easily have got more for the very asking. That sort of thing is simply a waste of words. They are words not builded into the order of any edifice; they are words, Mr. Speaker, which fall as far short of the goal of proof as though they had been left unsaid.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Fielding which was carried on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,	Drummond,
Bancroft,	Duff,
Beaubien,	Elliott (Dundas),
Béland,	Elliott (Waterloo),
Benoit,	Euler,
Binette,	Evans,
Black (Huron),	Fafard,
Boucher,	Fansher,
Bourassa,	Fielding,
Brethen,	Findlay,
Brown,	Finn,
Cahill,	Fontaine,
Caldwell,	Forke,
Cardin.	Forrester,
Carmichael,	Fortier,
Carroll,	Gardiner.
Carruthers,	Gauvreau,
Chevrier,	Gendron,
Chisholm,	Gervais,
Copp,	Good,
d'Anjou,	Gordon,
Davies,	Gould,
Déchêne,	Graham,
Delisle,	Hammell,
Denis (St. Denis),	Hatfield,
Desaulniers,	Healey,
Deslauriers,	Hoey,

Hudson,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jacobs,
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Knox,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Leader,
Leger,
Lewis,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Mackinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
McBride,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McMaster,
McMurray,
McTaggart,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Milne,
Mitchell,
Morrison,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Reed,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Robichaud,
Robitaille,
Ross (Simcoe),
St. Père,
Sales,
Savard,
Shaw,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Stork,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—134.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Baxter,
Bowen,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark,
Dickie,
Duncan,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hubbs,
MacKelvie,
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Ryckman,
Senn,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Thompson,
Tolmie,
White—25.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Logan,
Murphy,
Power,
Kyte,
Bureau,
McCrea,
German,
Kay,
Chew,
Morin,
Low,
Clifford,
Lavigueur,
Morrissy,
MacLean (Prince),
Casgrain,
Fournier,
McConica,
Bristol,
Porter,
Mewburn,
Boys,
Drayton,
Stevens,
Chaplin,
Wilson,
MacLaren,
Hanson,
Preston,
Stansell,
Sheard,
Spence,
Harris,
Simpson,
Ladner,
Hocken.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was paired wih the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Chew). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I was paired with the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MORIN: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. KAY: I was paired with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. PRESTON: I was paired with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Low). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. CLIFFORD: I was paired with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Stansell). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. LOGAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the bill, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not assume the House would like to continue further to-night. I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

DUKE AND DUCHESS OF YORK

RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATION ON WEDDING OF THEIR ROYAL HIGHNESSES

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

Mr. BAXTER: May I take the liberty of suggesting that the Prime Minister should move and the leader of the Opposition second a resolution expressing the congratulations of this House to the Duke of York and his bride on the very happy event that has occurred to-day. It seems to me that it would be extremely fitting if that were done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may inform my hon. friend that the government assumed it would be the wish of hon. members that an expression of congratulation should be sent to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York on the celebration of their marriage

to-day, and earlier in the day His Excellency was requested to convey such a message on behalf of the government and people of Canada. I think notwithstanding it would be wholly appropriate, and indeed it is a great pleasure, to act upon the suggestion of my hon. friend and have a formal expression by this House of what, I am sure, we all sincerely wish, namely that the married life of the Duke and Duchess of York may be a long and happy one. I would therefore move:

Resolved, that this House extends its congratulations to Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York on the occasion of their marriage, and that the expression of the best wishes of the Canadian Commons be communicated to Their Royal Highnesses by His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No words of mine are necessary on seconding the motion. This country not only entertains a feeling of profound devotion to the Empire, but has the highest regard personally, and in every way, for the Royal family. The happy event of to-day may well indeed be followed by a message of congratulation from the House.

Mr. FORKE: I would like to say a few words in support of this motion. I have had a rather long experience and am perhaps in a better position to express an opinion on the subject than the Prime Minister or the leader of the Opposition. I wish to congratulate His Royal Highness upon the fact that he has taken a Scotch lassie. Should there be any doubts about his happiness they can in view of that fact be dismissed at once. He will have a happy life, but I cannot prophesy as to the length of it. However, I join with my right hon. friends in wishing their Royal Highnesses long life and much happiness.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Might I add, Mr. Speaker, that the House will look to your Honour to convey its congratulations to their Royal Highnesses in appropriate terms.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Friday, April 27, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Third report of the select standing committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. —Mr. Cahill.

Second report of the Joint Committee on Printing.—Mr. Gauvreau.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That the name of Mr. Healy be substituted for that of Mr. Murphy on the select standing committeee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 139, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

He said: This bill provides for amendments to the Bankruptcy Act as follows: (a) To abolish the system of authorized trustees and to accept the English system of administration of estates by trustees selected by the creditors, assignments to be made to the creditors at large and deposited with an official receiver who will be chosen from among local legal officers, such receiver to appoint a custodian with authority to conserve the assets of the estate under the direction of the receiver. The custodian shall call the creditors together, who at their first meeting will choose a trustee, and from that day the custodian's duty will be completed. In cases of petitions—that is to say, compulsory assignments —the appointment of custodian is to be made by the court rather than by the receiver, the latter directing, as in the case of assignments, the conservation of the assets. (b) To provide for sales in the province of Quebec of property subject to hypothec in the same mode as to notices, etc., as in the case of sales made by the tariff. (c) To restore to the landlords the privileges which they were entitled to under the laws of the different provinces on the first of July, 1920. (d) To provide for the examination of the debtor by the official receiver on the causes of his insolvency and the distribution of his assets. This is a very important feature of the English act. It is hoped that the debtor will be deterred from assigning by the prospect of this compulsory examination. (e) To enable a composition between the debtor and creditors only after the assignment. This is to protect the creditors and prevent debtors from defrauding their creditors by disposing of their property. Many requests for such a change have come to our department. (f) To compel trustees in every case to apply to the court for a discharge within fifteen days after the payment of the final dividend and to prohibit appointment of such trustees in any other matter until he has obtained such discharge. It is further proposed to amend the law which refuses the claim of a wife as the creditor of an insolvent and to enable her to rank equally with the ordinary creditors;

to extend the section which authorizes the examination of persons connected with the affairs of the debtor so as to enable the examination of relatives or any other persons who may have received gifts or preferences; to provide for the distribution to the creditors of any property acquired by the debtor between the time of his assignment and his composition with his creditors. There is a difference in the present law as to assignment and receiving order, for reasons which we cannot discover. Other amendments are introduced to remove doubts with respect to the meaning or interpretation of the different clauses of the Bankruptcy Act. I shall give to the House a list of the local officers that we intend to choose as receivers. The following officials, or the persons for the time being exercising the functions of such officials, shall be official trustees:

(a) In the province of Quebec, the prothonotaries of the Superior Court;

(b) In the province of Nova Scotia, the prothonotaries of the Supreme Court;

(c) In the province of New Brunswick, the Circuit Court clerks;

(d) In the province of Prince Edward Island, the deputy prothonotaries of the Supreme Court;

(e) In the province of Ontario, the local registrars of the Supreme Court;

(f) In the province of Manitoba, the deputy registrars of the Court of King's Bench;

(g) In the province of Saskatchewan, the local registrars of the Court of King's Bench;

(h) In the province of Alberta, the clerks of the Supreme Court;

(i) In the province of British Columbia, the district registrars of the Supreme Court.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 137 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eliza Harvey Northgraves.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 138 (from the Senate), for the relief of Olivette McMaster.—Mr. Hocken.

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House do to-morrow go into committee of the whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide that the time within which the various provinces of Canada may earn and be paid the sums allotted to the said provinces under the provisions of "The Canada Highways Act", chapter fifty-four of the statutes of 1919, be extended for a further period of two years.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution, has given his assent thereto and commends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SHIRE HORSES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): My attention has been called by the Prime Minister to a question that was asked yesterday by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Elliott) with respect to the Shire horses that have recently arrived from Great Britain and are now stationed at the Experimental Farm here. The question was asked as to the disposition of these breeding animals throughout Canada. Our natural desire, Mr. Speaker, is to place these animals in conformity with the wishes of the donors, since they have been made a gift by the Shire Breeders' Society of Great Britain. It is equally our natural desire to place them where some attention has already been given to the breeding of Shire horses, and we find on examining our records that the two places that have paid the most attention to the breeding of Shire horses are Lacombe in the province of Alberta and Lennoxville in the province of Quebec. There are very few, however, in the latter place, consequently it was thought that for the best use of these breeding animals and to carry out the wishes of the donors it would be wise to locate them in Alberta, at Lacombe. This, however, is only a tentative arrangement and the final disposition of the horses will not be made until the return of Mr. Archibald, Director of the Dominion Experimental Farms, who will return on Monday or Tuesday next. In the meantime we shall be very glad to have any representations from Ontario or elsewhere as to where these animals could be placed to better advantage than under the arrangement already made.

So far as locating them in Ontario is concerned, there are a few Shire horses scattered here and there throughout the province, but we have had no intimation from any source that they would like to have the Shires mixed with other breeds here.

Mr. BRETHEN: I had the pleasure of examining these horses to-day and they

certainly appear to be a typical lot of Shire horses of very high quality. I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the district around Weston, Ontario, near the city of Toronto. I may say I am not a resident of that district, but I know that for a number of years the breeding of Shire horses has been conducted in that district, and I think that at least one of these horses could be used there to very good advantage.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): There was a little misunderstanding between the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson) and myself regarding a delayed return. I was under the impression that it referred to a matter in my own department, but I find that what he had in mind was a return touching another department, and I have called the attention of the proper department to it.

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: May I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) what day next week he expects to bring the budget down? I understood it was to come down next week.

Mr. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): My hon. friend has indicated next week. There was a time when he had a right to fix the date, but not now. I share with my hon. friend the feeling that it is desirable to have the budget down at a very early day, but I really would not care to fix the day at this moment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could my hon. friend tell the House, because many members are interested in the matter, whether the budget will be brought down before Thursday of next week?

Mr. FIELDING: I think I can assure my hon. friend it will not be before Thursday; possibly on Thursday, but I do not wish to be too precise.

GRAIN COMMISSION INQUIRY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MANION: I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to a despatch I notice in one of the journals at the head of the lakes wherein the statement is made that the Board of Grain Commissioners are at the head of the lakes to make a thorough investigation into the grain screenings question. Has the department given orders for a thorough investigation of the screenings question? I have not heard of it.

Mr. ROBB: I have not read the despatch to which my hon. friend refers, but that will be one of the subjects submitted to the proposed Royal Grain Commission for investigation.

Mr. MANION: I just mentioned it because it was stated positively that the Grain Commission was there for that purpose. That is why I asked that question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask what is the cause of delay in appointing that commission and, when the government expects to be able to surmount the obstacles in the way of its appointment?

Mr. ROBB: We hope to make the appointments and to make an announcement to the House within a very few days.

IMPERIAL SOLDIER DEPORTED

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): I wish to bring to the notice of the government a case of inhuman treatment meted out to a British soldier who came to this country in 1922 but was deported as a common criminal because he contracted tuberculosis last March. The man was so ill with tuberculosis in a hospital at Saskatoon that the army authorities refused to be responsible for his upkeep any longer, and on the recommendation of the two army doctors there, Dr. Creighton and Dr. Walker, as well as the medical health officer of the city, he was advised to go home to die. He was advised to let the army authorities take him back to Wales, his native place. The following is an extract from his letter written to a friend in Saskatoon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. member that while he may draw the attention of a minister of the Crown to some matter of urgent public importance, he is hardly in order in reading a letter from some person with regard to this matter.

Mr. EVANS: I just wish to give a short extract. He says that he received good treatment at Winnipeg, but on arrival at Montreal after an uneventful journey he was taken to the immigration office. In the hallway there, he says, was a table at which was seated a fellow who told him to take off his overcoat.

This he took from him, and conducted him upstairs to a room that was nothing more than a cell, with two single beds in it, one of which was occupied by a Chinaman suffering from tuberculosis as well as a most loathsome skin disease, in all probability leprosy, he says. He determined to spend the night—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must call to the hon. member's attention that he is not in order in the address he is giving to the House on this matter. If he desires to draw the facts briefly to the attention of the minister of the Crown or to ask a question on a matter of urgent public importance he may do so, but an explanation in detail such as he is giving now is not in order.

Mr. EVANS: I would ask the government if they are aware of such inhuman treatment being meted out to a class of men who have done nothing worse than facing death in the trenches for the Empire to which we belong.

Mr. BELAND: I did not catch every word of the statement made by my hon. friend. I do not quite know whether he refers to a Canadian soldier or an ex-Imperial.

Mr. EVANS: An ex-Imperial.

Mr. BELAND: Then it is a question of immigration entirely, not a question of treatment by the soldiers' department, is it? It is a question of deportation?

Mr. EVANS: Deportation.

Mr. BELAND: That does not come within this department.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) is not here at present, but I will see that his attention is drawn to the hon. gentleman's question.

FRENCH TREATY

BILL TO RATIFY CONVENTION CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

House again in Committee on Bill No. 23, respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the French Republic, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Convention approved:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend the Finance Minister take the position that if we carry this clause we approve of the whole matter?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I think we should discuss the details before we take up clause 2.

Mr. FIELDING: Clause 2 declares approval of the treaty, and therefore the whole matter comes under review.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was challenged, Mr. Chairman, as to the accuracy of certain figures which were taken from the returns of the government as supplied by the Bureau of Statistics. In view of that fact I want to find out, if I can, what the true figures are. For example, figures which have to do with the amount of silk and manufactures of silk exported from France, from Switzerland and from Japan were challenged. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) told me yesterday that my figures were ten per cent right and ninety per cent wrong. Now, they happen to be official figures supplied by the Bureau of Statistics, and I want to know whether they are wrong or whether the Minister of Marine was merely, when he spoke as he did, using a figure of speech, as he so often does, to embellish his eloquence. If I am wrong in regard to these figures I want to be put right.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not quite understand what my hon. friend is calling in question. At an early stage of the discussion we were asked to produce a lot of information. It was a fair request but it involved a great deal of time and trouble. Nevertheless the department prepared that information and submitted it. I do not understand that my hon. friend is questioning the accuracy of any of those figures, and if not I have some difficulty in understanding what the purpose of his present comment is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not object to the figures; the objection was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now I want to find out whether the official figures are right or whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is correct in his statement. Let me repeat: In debating this question I dealt with the benefits which accrued to France. I took the item of silk and silk manufactures. I speak from recollection. My recollection is that under the item as to silk and its manufactures, for the year to which the figures applied—and I think it was the year 1922—we imported in round figures $1,000,000 worth of goods from France, $3,000,000 worth from Switzerland, and imported $4,000,000 worth from Japan. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries when replying told me that I was ten per cent right and ninety per cent wrong.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not on that point.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: According to the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) this treaty had to be entered into having regard to the position of France—in view of the tremendous extent to which France had suffered. Yet it would now appear that, so far as the item to which I have referred is concerned, it is not a treaty for the benefit of France but a treaty for the benefit, in far greater proportion, of Switzerland and Japan. I pointed out to the minister that it is somewhat difficult to say you are helping any one producer in a common market if, at the same time, you help in exactly the same proportion every one of that producer's competitors. As to that I was told that my figures were only ten per cent right. What I am now trying to find out is this: Are the returns of the department correct? Take the item of silks and manufactures of silks—

Mr. FIELDING: To what returns does my hon. friend refer?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was speaking of the returns of the department that has to do with the collection of trade figures.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know that anybody has contradicted them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I certainly understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say—

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:—that my statement in regard to silk and the manufactures of silk was ten per cent right and ninety per cent wrong.

Mr. LAPOINTE: On a certain item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be that to-day we shall learn that the minister only made that statement for the purpose of turning a corner and that the figures as to exports which I gave are right—that there was an import of only $1,000,000 from France of silks and the manufactures of silks as against $3,000,000 in the case of Switzerland and $4,000,000 in the case of Japan. That was the gravamen of the charge that I made. Perhaps the minister will say to-day "I was not referring to the real business at all. All I was referring to was a quoted rate as to the duty that had nothing to do with it." There would have been something in what the minister said as to specific rates of duty if there was one specific rate for France and another specific rate for Switzerland. But that is not the fact; they all take the same rates. The one matter that I was referring most to was the fact that France's exports to us under that item, were only one-third of Switzerland's and only one-fourth of Japan's.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The trouble arises out of the fact that my hon. friend was speaking of one thing and I was speaking of another. I was not speaking at all of the proportion of silk exported from France as compared with the exports of Japan or Switzerland. My hon. friend has only to take Hansard and read my remarks as to that. I stated that my hon. friend, in discussing item 851 concerning silks, said that we had reduced the duty to a fixed rate of twenty per cent, and I said that he was ten per cent right and ninety per cent wrong, for the reason that only ten per cent of the silks imported into Canada come under that provision for a reduction of twenty per cent, the balance, ninety per cent of silks imported into Canada, remaining at 27½ per cent, less the ten per cent provided for in schedule B. That is where my hon. friend was making a mistake, according to the figures which had been given me by the Finance department. I was not referring to Japan or Switzerland in any way whatever.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All my hon. friend was doing was putting up a straw man in order to knock him down.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I was knocking the hon. member down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was never any complaint by me or anybody else, having regard to that part of the discussion, as to a particular percentage here or a particular percentage there; the point was this—and my hon. friend knows it perfectly well—that there were reductions made—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do not talk so loudly; it does not frighten us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No. The hon. member does not care, I know he does not care.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I have the habit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But the point was that reductions were being made in the tariff for the assumed purpose, for the advertised purpose, of helping France, and I pointed out, that similar reductions are made to Switzerland and Japan. Is that true, or not?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What my hon. friend was contending in his main speech, and what I objected to, was that the reduction was only on luxuries; he instanced silk, and said that we had reduced the fixed duty to 10 per cent.

I told him that it was only on ten per cent of the silk imported into Canada that that duty applied, and I still maintain that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister does not answer my question. He comes back to the same matter. I will read what I stated:

> I wonder whether my hon. friends really realize what the treaty does, and what further excuses we are going to have for letting in this large amount of articles which can be described only as luxuries, under such circumstances as indicate that the contention that this treaty is for France is very largely absolutely wrong.

I was pointing out that this was not a treaty for the benefit of France. That was the argument I sought to elaborate. I pointed out the different articles of commerce which other countries ship to us to a greater extent than France, and I said these other countries got the same concessions as were given to France. That is the point I was talking about, and I am going to ask the minister: Is it true that all the countries that were mentioned—take for example, silks in the first instance sent to Switzerland and Japan—got under this treaty exactly the same concessions that France got?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend wanted to clear the ground as to the subject of discussion and difficulty between himself and myself. Here is the point of difficulty. In his speech, at page 2008 of Hansard, my hon. friend said:

> However let us proceed. Let us take item 581, silk fabric. This is something that is pre-eminently in the class of luxuries and there is a fixed duty of 20 per cent against the intermediate tariff of 27½ per cent.

That is what I was telling him. I told him there was only ten per cent of the silk imported into Canada coming under item 581 with a fixed reduction of 20 per cent. That was the point of discussion between us. The other features in regard to Switzerland and Japan I did not touch.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know why the minister referred to it at all, because that is all I was trying to get at.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I wanted to remain at peace with my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was the minister's turn yesterday and he did well yesterday—splendidly. Will he tell me, does Switzerland, and does Japan, get exactly the same benefit under this treaty as France obtains?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am going to ask him again in regard to my figures: Is it true, as shown by the reports of the statistical department, that in one year Japan sold us in silks and the manufacture of silk $1,006,000 worth of goods?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no doubt it is true, when the hon. member says so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not want it put in that way.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not the figures which the hon. member has, but that is not the point of discussion between us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understand the minister does not dispute the fact. And that of the same article Switzerland sold us $3,970,706? Does he dispute that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not the figures here. I am sure that my hon. friend states the real truth.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am only saying what I was told. These are not my figures. Now will my hon. friend tell me what particular benefit he claims from France under this item and under the reductions, when France is selling merely a fraction of what Swizerland and Japan sell in this market under that item? He gives both of them the same reduction.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is quite another subject of discussion. I understand my hon. friend is leaving the other matter and is turning the corner.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, not at all, I am staying with the same question.

Mr. LAPOINTE No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What benefit is this treaty to France when the same reductions are given to the chief competitors of France in the market?

Mr. LAPOINTE: France knew that, and she asked for it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was asking my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And I am answering my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He tells us that France knew, but I am asking for my hon. friend's answer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We were looking for the benefit of Canada, rather than for the benefit of France. The hon. member should ask France that question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very glad to have that statement from my hon. friend.

I hope he will remember that, and that it will not be charged, as has already been hinted, that this is a factious opposition by the party on this side of the House to the interests of France.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I never said that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That being so, will he tell me on what ground he bases his belief that it is a good thing to have a lower rate of taxation on an article of luxury such as silks, and how Canada is helped by it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will not say that. I have given my argument on that yesterday. He is not asking a fact, but he wants me to discuss the principle now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, Mr. Chairman, what did we have yesterday? We had one of my hon. friend's eloquent orations, very well done, as he was running true to form he got us back to that old joke of his about the Bourbons, and it is a good joke, but he has given us that joke twenty times.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But it still has an application to the question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He also paid compliments, and we were glad to have them. But he said just a moment ago that in connection with the item of silks, he was considering the interest of Canada and not that of France. We have got that far. I ask him: Considering the interest of Canada, on what ground does he think it is a good thing to reduce taxation on luxuries such as silks?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The provision respecting silk is a benefit to Canada on the ground that to obtain concessions, we have to make concessions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us see just where we are. This item, as my hon. friend said just a moment ago, was not considered for the benefit of France. Now he says that this item was not considered for the benefit of Canada. How was it considered?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend of course, wants to go into a cross-examining duel between himself and me. I do not think that is of much interest to the other hon. members. I told my hon. friend that this question of silk arose between himself and me because he had stated that the duty on silk had been reduced to 20 per cent, and I said that only ten per cent of the silk imported into this country was reduced to 20 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we are entitled to find out what was actuating our ministers and where the real benefit comes in. Here we have a concrete case and where is it left? In the first instance, we learn that it was something done to help France because of those other competitors. In the next instance, it was something done to help Canada. In the third instance, it is a concession wrung from Canada. Are we not to find out why it was done? What difference does it make how big the concession is when the question is one of principle? My hon. friend will agree that, in some instances at least, he reduces the duty on silk to a fixed rate of 20 per cent, in others he takes 10 per cent off the intermediate tariff| I ask my hon. friend again whether, in connection with the negotiations for this treaty, he was proceeding on the idea that it was a good thing for Canada to lower the duties on the luxuries of life; whether that is where he thinks Canada gets the benefit.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We had to lower the duties on the things that were of interest to French trade, and some of those articles, of course, are rather articles of luxury. But my hon. friend knows he is wrong when he says that all the articles reduced are luxuries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I dare say that is right, and my hon. friend can find a few that are not luxuries. Can my hon. friend say that the great majority are not luxuries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What will my hon. friend say about silks?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am speaking about the majority; I am not speaking of silks.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We shall endeavour to arrive at the majority. What will my hon. friend say about silks?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would rather that my hon. friend should make his speech, mentioning all the articles, and I will answer afterwards. I do not think this is of great interest to the members of the House. My hon. friend likes to hear the sound of his voice. I do also; but really we could proceed in some other way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rather like to get my hon. friend talking. I always like to hear from him. He is always very effective, and he is making the best he can of a horrible case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is that so?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But my hon. friend says that the majority of imports from France into Canada—and he will correct me if I am paraphrasing him wrongly—are not luxuries.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The majority of the articles mentioned.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not talking about that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what I am talking about.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will my hon. friend say this, that in volume of returns—the real thing that counts—the majority are not luxuries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A question of opinion is involved. My hon. friend knows that some people regard some things as luxuries and others believe they are not—buttons, for instance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be pretty hard to make a list of luxuries if you do not include ninety per cent of all the articles reduced by this treaty. I know the minister got through with his speech yesterday. I admire his brain too much to allege that he imagines it was an argument. He is a master of banter and humour, and yesterday's exhibition was one of his best in that regard. But he never got to the meat of the treaty at all; he never got near it. Let us see if we cannot establish two premises, and I should like to get them into the minister's mind, or any other person's mind. The first is that by this treaty we have heavier duties against us for Canadian exports to France than we had before—I do not say heavier than the French general tariff, but heavier than we had before. That is correct. The second is that they are heavier altogether on agricultural exports. A few trivial things in connection with our manufactured products—and they are spare parts at that—are reduced. They are worth while, but relatively they are trifles. Let us have it established in our minds that we have a higher tariff against us for Canadian exports to France than we had before, and that for our agricultural exports to France—and this is very important when we are speaking about wider markets—we are getting by this treaty a narrower market that we had before. Nobody can dispute that in the frankness and serenity of his own mind. He may say, as an hon. member said last night, that is a departure from rectitude to refer to that. I do not so regard it, and I do not regard that remark as worth answering. In the next place, we have a lower tariff than we had before on luxuries imported into Canada. Of that there can be no doubt, and it is not worth while arguing to establish that. I ask another thing to be considered, that if we had been free to increase our tariff on luxuries and the French government knew we were free—I mean on the goods on which they have now a lower tariff—then we would have been on an equality or better than an equality in the negotiations with France; because, aside from war years and the immediately subsequent years, if you look back over all the normal years of our history, French exports to us are about five times ours to France—they average almost five times for the five years preceding the war. Have I made that premise clear, that had we been free to exercise the weapon that was in the hands of France, we would have been on more than an equality in the negotiations? I do not ask that to be conceded, I do ask it to be conceded that we would have been on an equality. These things nobody can dispute at all; First, we have a higher tariff against our exports to France than we had before, chiefly as regards agricultural exports; second, we have a lower tariff against imports of luxuries into Canada; and third, had we been free, aside wholly from the history of our politics, to have used France's weapon on the goods France sent to us, we would have been on at least an equality with the French negotiators. If those are conceded, let me put the matter in this form. Leave out of account the history of the Liberal party and the history of the Conservative party, and assume that bound by nothing and considering the interest of Canada and nothing else, our negotiators went to France. Did they not have to choose between two things: first, a higher tariff against luxuries into Canada and a lower tariff against agricultural products into France, or, on the other hand, a lower tariff against luxuries into Canada and a higher tariff against agricultural products into France? Which would they have chosen, had there been no commitments and no political history to tie their hands? There is not a man at large in this country who would not choose the higher tariff on luxuries coming into Canada and a lower tariff on agricultural products going into France. Then why have we not that? Had there been no political history in this matter, we should have had it; had there been no political commitments that would have been the state of affairs. And we have not got it just because of those commitments. That is all I want hon. gentlemen to admit; and while I do not expect them to admit it aloud, it is nevertheless the truth. If hon. gentlemen opposite think the matter over they cannot help being convinced that this is the fact.

And therein is a lesson. This is one of the products of wrong pre-election commitments and principles. I know there are other products, of course; another product we had last session when there was a violation of those commitments,—a very bad harvest indeed. We have not the same consequences to-day; we have to-day another product of false political commitments, not as bad morally but financially worse; the harvest this time is the sacrifice of Canadian interests. And while you may have it in one form or the other, you are bound to reap a harvest of ill if you make commitments that are false. This is one product of such a policy; as I have stated, last session we had another. And these are not the last. Now, I have stated in very brief form the way I sincerely view the whole history of this French treaty negotiation; and this government in other negotiations must either abandon and prostitute its principles or sacrifice the interests of Canada. Last session it chose the first; this session it chooses the second.

Mr. FIELDING: I much regret that the right hon. gentleman has deemed it necessary to repeat and to adhere to an absolutely unwarranted and unfounded position in comparing the present condition of affairs with the terms of this treaty. Again and again the hon. gentleman has made comparisons between the rates now existing and those set forth in the treaty, and in assuming this position again to-day he is thereby conveying for the hundredth time to the country the impression that the present rates are available to us.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, no.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. gentleman's (Mr. Meighen's) position in this matter is most unfair. But he has advanced it, and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) spent half an hour repeating the same thing. My right hon. friend knows that the existing rates are as dead as Julius Caesar. Why then does he compare the live body of this treaty with the dead corpse of that old arrangement? Does the right hon. gentleman not know that the present condition which he speaks of, and which he compares with the rates as set forth in the French treaty, cannot be taken advantage of now? Again and again we are told that this treaty is not as good as the old one; but my right hon. friend knows that the French government gave definite notice abrogating the old one. He knows also that after certain negotiations, succeeding the termination of the old treaty, an interim arrangement was made—and made by himself and his colleagues—which begins with the statement that pending the conclusion of a new commercial convention, with a view to which negotiations would begin immediately, the French and Canadian governments had agreed to "the following provisions". The leader of the Opposition is also aware that the French government called him to account for this engagement to begin immediately; and for reasons which I have not assailed, and which might have been good, he did not fulfil the terms of that engagement. Well, we have fulfilled the engagement of hon. gentlemen by entering into negotiations; and whether we had entered into such negotiations or not, we had notice that the French government would not continue the old arrangement. What, then, is the good of hon. gentlemen again and again quoting the existing rates as if they were at our disposal? They are not at our disposal. I say, they are dead and gone; and if we did not adopt this treaty, wise or unwise as it may be, fair or unfair, we should have to come under the operations of the French general tariff. A comparison between that tariff and this treaty is a fair matter; a comparison between the existing rates, which are dead and gone, and the treaty before us is not a fair matter. And no one knows that better than my right hon. friend. I am amazed therefore that, in the light of the discussion that has occurred on this subject, he should continue in the stand he has taken. But there is another thing. The right hon. gentleman says, why did we not arm ourselves when going over? He said that we were not in a position to deal with the French government and threaten them with this, that or the other thing. Well, if that is good policy, why did not the right hon. gentleman himself arm the representative of his government, Sir George Foster, when he sent him over only a few months before we went over?

4 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: That gentleman went to make an arrangement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; this was made in 1921, and there was no session between the making of the interim treaty and the exit of the late government.

Mr. FIELDING: The treaty was not made in a day. My right hon. friend sent Sir George Foster over to make a treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: Did he go without authority?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was over on other business. The government cannot raise duties; parliament only can do that; and there had been no session of parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: But before my right hon. friend sent his representative over he should have armed him with power to jack up the rates, and then threaten the French government with a high tariff. Now, I do not think it would have been good policy for the right hon. gentleman to fix exorbitant rates merely for the purpose of threatening the French government. I do not think that would have been wise, and evidently my hon. friend was of that opinion too; because if his government had deemed it good policy to do that they would have armed themselves to that purpose. If they had thought it wise to adopt that course, when they sent over Sir George Foster they would have done what they are now suggesting that we should have done; they would have asked Parliament to jack up the tariff rates and threaten France with them. But they did not do that, and I commend them for having avoided that course, because it would have been folly to do anything of the sort. Yet this is the very thing my right hon. friend is asking us to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In so far as the historical account of this matter goes, I do not find much, if any, fault with what the minister says. Not at all. I do not say that, situated as they were, because of what they had done, they could have had the old treaty renewed. I have not argued that. I have argued, however, that if they had not made certain commitments they could have insisted upon as good a treaty as the old one. My hon. friend says, why did we not jack up the duties on luxuries before Sir George Foster went over to negotiate a treaty? In the first place, Sir George Foster did not go there to negotiate a treaty.

Mr. FIELDING: Then he went without authority.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, he was over on other business.

Mr. FIELDING: So were we.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend wants to escape responsibility by a quibble of that kind, he may. But what does that matter? We had a treaty that was satisfactory so far as we were concerned. The old treaty was satisfactory and if it had been renewed we should have been pleased. It might have been better, of course, but it was fairly satisfactory as far as it went. The French government knew that we were not tied to what the hon. gentleman was bound to; they knew that we had not stripped ourselves of every weapon of negotiation as he had done; and they naturally would take that into account in framing a treaty. Now, I have only argued that, and why does the minister continuously misrepresent me? I have never argued that, situated as he was by reason of his past commitments, he could have got as good a treaty as he could have secured otherwise. The minister says it is true we are worse off than we were. He says: It is true that Canada is not in anything like as good and as satisfactory a position as she was before in this matter; but I am not to blame. That is precisely what I dispute in his case. I say that he had no need to sacrifice the interests of Canada and to accept a treaty in any respect worse than the one we had before, had he not been in the situation in which he placed himself, which situation he must have known was economically unsound, and which indeed he has himself declared in the House he does not believe to be a sound one. That is the reason he could not secure a renewal of the old treaty; the simple fact is that Canada was not as strong in the negotiation as was France. Must it always be that we are to get the worst of negotiations? Are we always to take the worst position whenever we make a treaty?

Mr. FORKE: I want to get this matter straight. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) continually refers to the fact that the Minister of Finance did not arm himself with a weapon. What is the weapon to which he has reference?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall come to that in a moment, but I have stated it three of four times.

Mr. FORKE: You hinted at it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend opposite, I contend, should have been in an untrammelled position in negotiating with France.

Mr. FORKE: What do you mean?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He should have been in a position to put a tariff on the goods that France sends into this country. What in the world is the harm to the country in a high tariff on silks and brandies?

Mr. FIELDING: Or anything?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend did not think it harmful to put the tariff on sugar, and some other things of that nature, but

he seems desperately averse now to having any high rates on brandies and champagnes and silks.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman is complaining of brandy; I am not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not complaining about the duty being up. What does the hon. minister mean by that?

Mr. FIELDING: I have not referred to brandy, and my hon. friend has; that is the difference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says he is against putting the duty up on it. If he had not been tied by commitments, he would have been known to be in that position by the French negotiators. Had he not been tied by commitments, at the first session of parliament—for parliament alone could act—he would have armed himself and put himself in a position which would have lent additional strength to his side of the negotiations. I do not want the minister to be continually saying that I am telling the country that he could have got the old treaty; he could not have got it. Because the French negotiators knew his history; they knew his cards, they knew that he had stripped himself of every power under it before he left these shores, and that what he had not done his party had done for him. That is why he could not get it. I have no doubt these duties are lower than the general tariff, but we are worse off than we were. Had we had no party or political commitments we might have been at least in as good a postion as we were, if not in a better one, because France had more to lose by the loss of Canadian trade than we had to lose by the loss of French trade. The minister follows that argument just as clearly as I do; there is no clearer mind in the House. But I ask him not to misrepresent my position. I know it was a case of taking this treaty or taking the general tariff—I presume it was; I accept his word in that respect. But that that was the case was the fault of the minister himself.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is it not a fact that before my right hon. friend's administration went out of power the French consul at Montreal had repeatedly asked them to make a new treaty?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know, but I have assumed it to be correct. If I had been a French statesman and knew the government in power here I should have done the same thing.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The right hon. gentleman should know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose so. But how does that conflict with my position? I know we were under obligations to treat; I admit freely that France called upon us to fulfil those obligations. But is that a reason why an otherwise strong position should be imperilled by the minister's own record and the record of his party? We had to make the negotiations, but the fact that we could not succeed in them and had to take a far worse position than we were in before—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What was the reason?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reason was simply that France knew we dare not raise the duties on her products because of the minister's commitments.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: There were no minister's commitments at that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no Liberal convention? There was no resolution two years ago?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My right hon. friend was in power at the time. France was not treating with the Liberal party then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: France was treating with the late administration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: She was not treating with us when this treaty was made; if she had been, there would not have been this treaty. We were not tied up by commitments of that sort; we would have stood on an equal footing with the French negotiators.

Mr. FIELDING: Why did you not raise your tariff, then?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did make a tariff, and I wish it was the tariff still.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My right hon. friend is trying to get away from the point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I admit that we had to negotiate—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Then why did you not negotiate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because we were out of office.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Why did you not negotiate before you went out of office?

Mr. MEIGHEN: How could we negotiate between the summer of 1921 and the 6th of December?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What did you negotiate in 1921?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We got an interim treaty. What more could we do?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is it not a fact that after the interim treaty was passed the French consul repeatedly asked the late administration to make a new treaty?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know whether he did it repeatedly or not. I am informed that there was a request for the negotiation after the interim treaty had been passed.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Why did you not raise the tariff, then?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For one thing, I was at the Imperial conference. Then, there was an election campaign. The hon. gentleman would hardly suggest that we should, with an election pending, go to France to negotiate a treaty. If we had done so, I know what would have been said; I know how eloquent the hon. member would have been, and how justly eloquent, in denouncing us for taking that responsibility.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question respecting an item in the treaty under the head of cobalt products. I asked the question before. What are the present rates of duty into France upon oxides of cobalt, hydrated salts of cobalt and other salts of cobalt, and what were the old rates? The book of particulars that the minister gave us does not include that article.

Mr. FIELDING: I could not at the moment give the hon. gentleman the rates. I I will endeavour before the third reading of the bill comes on to answer his question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister remembers, that was specially requested in the speech made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) a week ago.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not recall it. Another hon. member asked me for some information on that subject, which I gave him, and I rather thought the point was covered.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In his address of yesterday the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) made reference to item 404, which I had dealt with in my address. I had pointed out that the exports of that item amounted to some $75,000 and that none had been sent to France. The minister says:

> Well, I wish my hon. friend would consult with his friends the manufacturers of agricultural implements. They will tell him that reapers and binders are exported to France and that the cotton that is used for the wings goes there in a knocked-down state and is adjusted in France.

If we are shipping this article under the head of tissues of cotton, where is it in the export returns? I cannot find any indication that one dollar's worth went to France. Is it the case that agricultural implements exported as a whole are virtually taken to pieces when they get on the other side and each article separated so as to make possible the application to it of the French tariff? That does not seem reasonable. The minister could not have meant that; what he must have had in mind was that some of these parts subsequently went over as spare parts and for the purposes of customs taxation were charged separately. But, even if that was the case, where do they appear in the customs or the trade returns? I have been unable to find them.

Mr. FIELDING: We will endeavour to find out, to please my hon. friend, though I do not quite see the importance of the question.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The importance of it is this: When a minister makes a statement of that kind he should be in a position to verify it. I made a certain statement based upon the official returns, and I made it in good faith. I would like the minister to say where he gets his information. It certainly cannot be taken from the returns.

Mr. FIELDING: My point is this: Whether it is in the returns or not has no bearing on the question whether it should be included in the list of things that could be exported to France.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I agree with that statement, especially when these articles are parts of a machine that are required for repairs. The minister may be glad that he has been able to get even that concession. But I would like to know from the Minister of Marine just what he meant by the statement he made.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have received the information from agents of manufacturing companies, who state that these pieces of cotton go through, as I said yesterday, to be adjusted on the wings of binders and reapers. That means that very little went from Canada, because the duty was prohibitive—1,240 francs per 100 kilograms. Most of it was going from the United States, and it was desired

that the Canadian manufacturers should be put on the same footing as those of the United States.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes, but the minister must realize that while that is absolutely true, and I do not wonder that the manufacturers want such a concession, the thing must be very small when you cannot find it in the return. My objection to this treaty amounts to this. I have been an exporter of goods—I have tried to keep my own goods out of this discussion altogether, but I have exported goods for forty years to all the countries of Europe except the southern ones —and during all that time, during all the time of the previous treaty as well, owing to this high minimum tariff of France I have never been able to export a dollar's worth of goods to France during that whole forty years. It is not because I have not tried. I have tried to do it. My objection to this treaty is that the minimum tariff of France is an adequate protective tariff that prohibits goods from going in.

Mr. FIELDING: Will my hon. friend suffer any harm by having these items put on the list of possible exports for the future? What harm comes to him or any other citizen if we are not exporting them?

Mr. CHAPLIN: No objection except this. One likes to see something on the list that is going to be of some benefit during his lifetime, and not to have to wait for years. You should consider the people in business now as well as those to be in business ten years from now.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, and we are not forgetting the people in business to-day, but we are also thinking of those coming in the not distant future.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I have tried to be perfectly fair in my criticism. I have said more than once during my address that there may be some things that can now be exported to France. There is nothing in my line so far as I can see. We may be able to export to France; we will try and see what we can do. If the minister will get me the information regarding the present rates of duty on the cobalt items and at the same time include those for nickel I shall be very much obliged.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall be very happy to give the hon. member the information later. I am anxious to give every reasonable information that is asked. We have everything to gain by giving the fullest information.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if we can get the information now as to the effect of this on the other nations clearly, truthfully. So that no one is going to say that I am making a mistake of ninety per cent or any other per cent, I am going back to the trade figures of 1922. I am going to put the figures as I have them before my friend, the whole of them—the few items that I referred to the other day. Perhaps it will not be necessary to go over all of them. I am going to take first the item of silk and silk manufactures. The expert of the department is here and I am sure he had to have these figures before him before he ever advised the Minister of Finance, and I have no doubt he has the figures absolutely at hand. The first figure I give my hon. friend is the sales of France to Canada. Under that item for the year 1922 the sales amounted to $1,006,141. I ask if that is correct.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend is reading from any official return I take it for granted the figures are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am sorry to say that all I have got is a copy of the figures. I believe it to be right, but I cannot say that.

Mr. FIELDING: If they are drawn from any official return I take it for granted they are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is merely copied from them. I did not do the typewriting, but I am going to get at the real truth, I am not going to have it said afterwards that I misrepresented facts to this House to the extent of ninety per cent; I am going through these facts, and I think I am entitled to get the information. A charge has been made and I propose to go into these figures and ask the gentlemen that know about this thing if the figure of imports into this country of silk and the manufactures of silk from France for the year 1922 is correctly stated at $1,006,141.

Mr. FIELDING: If it is so stated in any official document, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get on and get the facts? The expert is here. Surely to goodness my friend knew what he was dealing with. Surely to goodness they were old things to him. They must be familiar to him. The only time we can get the facts so that we are not going to have that kind of vague charge made again of insincerity and untruthfulness is here and now. Now I want to know whether that figure is right or not.

Mr. FIELDING: I thought I had made it clear. If the information the hon. gentleman has is drawn from any official document submitted to this House I have no doubt that it is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we are entitled to more than that.

Mr. FIELDING: No, you are not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My friend says, no. Surely I am entitled to know on what information he proceeds in connection with this item. Surely I am entitled to know what he has before him. These figures I think are correct. I think they are; they have been attacked. I think I am entitled at least to get the figures as my hon. friend understands them.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand them as they appear in the official returns.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I would ask my hon. friend what they are.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not carry them in my head.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That may be so. Will my hon. friend say his expert has not got them?

Mr. FIELDING: I will ask him for them now. If the hon. gentleman desires any additional information I will get it for him in the proper way, but I am not going to cross-examine the expert.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not want him to cross-examine the expert. If my hon. friend wants to take the attitude that we cannot get this information while the bill is in committee—

Mr. FIELDING: You cannot get it now

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid it will take a long time to get the bill through.

Mr. FIELDING: I have time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend wants to take it that way we will have to wait till we can get the information. Now I am going to give these figures to my hon. friend. During the same year that those exports were made by France, the figures show an export by Japan under the same item of $3,970,706. I want to ask my hon. friend if he takes issue with that item.

Mr. FIELDING: If it is so stated in the document it is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know what document my hon. friend is referring to.

Mr. FIELDING: The official returns of the trade of Canada. I take it for granted my hon. friend is reading from that. I have no other source of information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What figures did my hon. friend have before him in considering this matter?

Mr. FIELDING: The documents, the documents.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: "The documents, the documents," says my hon. friend. Let us see, now. We have got Japan at $3,970,706. We have Switzerland at $4,093,045 under the same item. Now what does my hon. friend say as to that? Is that correct or not?

Mr. FIELDING: If it is "so nominated in the bond," it is true.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, perhaps it is fair to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) this, whether his strictures the other day were intended to apply to these figures.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What figures?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The figures I have just read.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What I said had no application at all to the trade of Japan or Switzerland as compared with France. I did not refer to that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to point out to the committee this, Mr. Chairman, reserving for the future that corroboration I am to get: In the year 1922 the exports of France under this item amounted to $1,006,-141 as against $8,063,751 which Japan and Switzerland sent us. I ask my friends if they considered that.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, we have considered the whole business—yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I say that figure, then, was present to their minds when this treaty was arranged; that, having regard to that item of silk and silk manufactures which our total imports, I think my hon. friend will agree with me, amount to as much as $35,000,000 in some years and perhaps average $30,000,000 or $32,000,000, they had before them and considered the fact that the sales of France to Canada were as 1 to 8 as compared with the combined sales of Switzerland and Japan to

Canada. That is what my hon. friend told me. Now I am going to ask him: When he is negotiating a treaty which, in the case of silks from France on one side and from Switzerland and Japan on the other, involves a ratio of 1 to 8, would he entirely disregard the claims of the silk manufacturers of the province of Quebec?

Mr. FIELDING: Not only now, but many times in this discussion, the hon. gentleman has been conveying the impression not only that silks are luxuries but that, under this arrangement, they are being introduced into Canada at a very low rate of duty. If that is so my hon. friend looks at this thing from a different angle when he talks of it as involving some sacrifice. From our point of view when you reduce a duty you are conferring a benefit upon the people of Canada. That point my hon. friend wholly fails to understand. These reductions, be they large or small, properly viewed, are reductions for the masses of the people of Canada.

Now, with regard to silks the idea might easily be drawn from the speech of my hon friend that we are making great reductions in the duty on silks. The fact is that the greater part of the silks imported into Canada, no matter from what foreign country they come, will enter at a duty of 27½ per cent, less 10 per cent discount, which will bring the duty down to nearly 25 per cent. Well, that is a rather respectably sized duty. I am sure my hon. friends sitting angularly opposite, if that is the correct description of their location in this chamber, will feel that 25 per cent is a pretty stiff duty. So that it is not a great sacrifice when we have, as we have here, a duty which is practically 27½ per cent. My hon. friend has striven to create the impression that in making the rate what it is we have made a sacrifice whereas we think what we have done will be very useful to the people of Canada.

Then my hon. friend seemingly has made a discovery. He solemnly asks us a question in reference to the favoured nation treaties. I presume that when he does so he wishes for information; he surely would not ask a question in reference to a matter that he knew all about. He does not know, I suppose, that favoured nation treatment is not a new thing? He does not know, I suppose, that there is nothing in that respect which did not obtain in previous treaties. My hon. friend would imply that by this agreement we were giving something away to Switzerland, Japan, and other nations which we should not have done. I do not think my hon. friend is as lacking in intelligence as his speech would seem to imply. I want to tell him, if he did not know the fact, that these favoured nation treaties have been in force for a great many years. Does not my hon. friend know that the treaty which his own friends made with France in effect provides that any concession given to France must apply to Germany—no not to Germany because she has not now favoured nation treatment—but must apply to Switzerland and to all the other favoured nations. This whole idea that we, by this treaty, are giving something to Japan, something to Switzerland, and something to other countries is a delusion. We are not doing it. These concessions have been given under favoured nation treaties which have existed for many years. When my hon. friend knows that in the treaty with France which his own friends made they had to give concessions to other countries enjoying favoured nation treatment why does he come here and ask do we not know that concessions are going to be granted to Switzerland and Japan.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I congratulate the Minister of Finance. He is always most astute, always very happy, and he is such an old hand at the game that he knows that one of the best things is to belabour the other side when you have not a good answer to make. He does it very well too, very nicely and very pleasantly. I do not object to it at all. I rather think these things show the absolute paucity of anything like good reasons in support of this treaty. Now, let us see what the facts are. My hon. friend says that I do not know anything about—

Mr. FIELDING: No, my hon. friend said he did not know.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are not in the happy position of having a phalanx of experts and clerks working out everything for us. When we want information we have to do everything as best we can ourselves. My work has been challenged by no less a person than the Minister of Marine nad Fisheries.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Keep within the limits of the challenge.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Minister of Finance says that I do not know anything about the most favoured nation treaties. Well, my hon. friend is not really doing himself justice. Why, I actually congratulated my hon. friend on the good work he did, on a former occasion in having the most favoured nation provisions abrogated as regards Germany and I am pointing out how very much

better it would have been if he had done the same thing in the case of other countries before he entered into this treaty. The minister no doubt realizes that he is in charge of this treaty and that we have some right to be given information as to the principles on which these items have been treated. He tells me that I cannot possibly understand this treaty because I cannot get it into my head that a low duty on luxuries is a good thing for Canada. I will be frank with my hon. friend; I cannot get it into my head that a low duty on luxuries is a good thing for Canada. My hon. friend says that we have certain reductions. He took this very item relating to silk that we are discussing and he says that these reductions will be a benefit. I do not know that he made use of the word "inestimable" but he said they would be a benefit to the great mass of the people of Canada. I am going to ask my hon. friend if he really seriously thinks that the great mass of the people of Canada are benefited.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not use the words "the great mass of people" as applied to silks. My hon. friend has added these words himself, I did not use them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very glad to hear it. I only want to get the government's viewpoint. It is a fact from the point of view of the minister that it is not in the interest of the great mass of the people of Canada that low rates of duty should apply on silks. Am I right in that?

Mr. FIELDING: No my hon. friend is not right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well then we are in this wonderful position in connection with this wonderful treaty that it is in the interest of the great mass of people to reduce the duties.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think they are very much interested.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what my hon. friend says. I wonder if the mind of my hon. friend ever goes back to his own platform. I wonder if my hon. friend has ever thought of the platform to which he is pledged. We have heard so much about the scrapping of other platforms that the disease may be communicable. I hope it is not a disease which may be communicated. I have a distinct recollection that in the platform of my hon. friend and his party there was a call for heavy taxes on luxuries.

Mr. FORKE: The ex-Minister of Finance is enjoying himself this afternoon.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am going to ask my hon. friend if he considers silk a luxury.

Mr. FORKE: Silk stockings.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend think they are luxuries? He thinks they are luxuries? Well, then we have it in the first instance that it is not good for the people of Canada to reduce these items.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does my hon. friend say?

Mr. FIELDING: All I ask my hon. friend, when he is attributing statements to me is, that he shall not credit me with words that I never uttered.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I certainly do not want to do that. What did my hon. friend say?

Mr. FIELDING: I think a duty like 27½ per cent, less 10 per cent discount, is not a low rate of duty. I do not think the mass of the people of Canada will consider it is a low rate of duty. Many of them will consider it is a pretty stiff rate of duty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That was not the question. The question was whether it was a good thing to reduce the taxation on luxuries in the interest of the masses—I will not say the great masses.

Mr. FIELDING: Reductions of duties generally are in the interests of the masses.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister apply that to silks?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think the duty on silks has been reduced to a very low figure. On nine-tenths of the imports of silk into Canada to-day the duty will still be 27½ per cent, subject to ten per cent discount. That is not a low rate of duty. It is a luxury duty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend think he should leave the duties on the necessaries of life higher than the duties on luxuries?

Mr. FIELDING: In some cases they might be. There might be instances.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the minister will admit that, even before the duties were reduced, the duty on silk was lower than the duty on woollens?

Mr. FIELDING: In same cases, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And so a further reduction is made in the duty on silk. Will the minister tell me whether silk is manufactured at the present time in the province of Quebec? I am told that it is.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: By a company at—

Mr. FIELDING: I do not remember where, but silk is manufactured in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the minister more interested in getting silk from Japan than he is in having it manufactured in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is an even break, or what? Does he expect silk to be manufactured in Quebec with this treaty in force?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it will be, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What particular item in silks is it to which the fixed duty applies, and what are the other items?

Mr. FIELDING: They are set forth in the treaty. I can only answer in the words of the document itself. It is item 581 of the treaty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not any analysis, of course.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not, either.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But the Minister of Marine must have an analysis.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is item 581.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would the minister give me an analysis of the amounts which apply to the different rates.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was informed that ninety per cent of the silks imported into Canada come under the duty of 27½ per cent intermediate tariff, and that only 10 per cent come under that reduction to twenty per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister give me the figures? I have the items. I suppose he had something before him when he made that statement or he would not have made it. The item is to be found at page 27 of the treaty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Schedules D and E.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it not in D, at page 27 of the treaty?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: Schedule D gives the fixed rate of 20 per cent on a certain part of item 581, and in schedule E the balance of the item 581 is mentioned, and comes under the intermediate tariff.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can you give me the particulars of the export?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who told my hon. friend there was only 10 per cent in one and 90 per cent in the other?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A gentleman called an expert.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who was he? I got my information from a governmental source, believing it to be true.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think my information is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who gave my hon. friend that information? I think I am entitled to an answer. He says my statement is 90 per cent wrong.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do you challenge that?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I only want the authority. That is all I am interested in.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is information I have received from government officials.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the hon. member give me the figures?

Mr. LAPOINTE. I cannot give more than I have.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It stands in this way—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I may say also to my hon. friend that there is no division in the present report as to the various forms of silk coming under the tariff, but this is the information the officers gathered, and they estimated that about 90 per cent would come under schedule E, and 10 per cent under schedule D.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister see where he has put himself?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have pretty fair vision wherever I happen to be.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does he see that he has now admitted that it was impossible for me to deal with that item in any other way than the way in which I dealt with it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I certainly do not. My hon. friend made a statement that the silk imported into Canada would be imported

at a duty of 20 per cent, and he had in his hand a document showing that part of the silk would come in under a duty of 10 per cent, and the balance would come in under a duty of 27½ per cent. I admit that my hon friend had not in this document the proportion that would come under schedule D, and the proportion that would come under schedule E, but he had enough to know that there were two divisions or portions, one coming under schedule D and another under schedule E, and he made a statement implying that all the silk would come under schedule D.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the hon. member correct when he says this item is not divided in any of the government returns?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what I am told so far, because they had no division in the duty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It has not been divided.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What basis did the minister use to get at these figures of 90 per cent and 10 per cent?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The basis of men who were supposed to know, who know the imports coming to Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And further deponent saith not. Is that the attitude? The minister will not give me any information further than that somebody told him?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The information has been acquired in that way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is one thing I will not be ashamed to do every time, and that is to give the source of my information, I will not say somebody told me, I will say who told me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will say officers of the government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is not telling me what department?

Mr. FIELDING: What difference does it make?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to get the truth.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend wants further information in detail as to this matter, he will be good enough to frame his question and, so far as the information is in the power of any department of the government, he will get it but one can ask fifty questions on an occasion like this which nobody can answer offhand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will frame the question immediately. In connection with the statement made by the Minister of Finance that 10 per cent of the figures given the other day were correct and 90 per cent were wrong, I want to know the basis on which that calculation was arrived at, supported by the amounts of the different exports into Canada coming under that head? I only want the facts.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does the hon. member admit he was wrong when he stated that silks imported into Canada would come in at a reduced duty of 20 per cent?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I said they would come in at a reduced duty in any event. I was not caring whether it was 20 per cent or 27½ per cent, but I was addressing myself to this fact; that while my hon. friend is talking about meeting France and what he is doing for her, pretending to help France, he is helping Japan and Switzerland under that item just in the proportion of eight to one.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is another question altogether.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In my address the other day I asked for some information in regard to two articles; one was item 469 in schedule B. Under that head you will notice in the book of particulars that there are no figures at the end of the two last items, but a note of interrogation. I ask to have these figures filled in. In schedule B, under No. 533, sex, there is another item with two more notes of interrogation on the last two columns. I should like to have those filled in.

Mr. FIELDING: If there are any omissions of that kind, I will promise my hon. friend that before the third reading, we shall examine his speech and endeavour to bring before the House the information if it is available.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Another thing which I should like to call the attention of the minister to—and I have already done so in my address—is the necessity for improving the books of information, especially the trade returns. I called the minister's attention to some things in the index, and I complimented his deputy on the way in which his index was written, because it was a great improvement on the index of the Customs department. But I should like to point out that there are items that do not get into the customs returns. I have had three or four members of the House, particularly the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Min-

ister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) attack me upon the question of the mistake that was made with reference to bronze powder. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) also said, "Why, for years, these people have been exporting this article." I have looked through the customs returns; I have looked through the returns which the Minister of Trade and Commerce laid on the Table only the other day and which were signed by him, and I cannot find that item of bronze powder. If an article is being exported to any considerable extent, it should get into the returns, and the minister should tell us under what item or where that article appears, because it does not appear in the returns. Somebody in the department should be able to tell us where that item has been lost, because it would be interesting to get that information.

There is just one more thing to which I should like to call the minister's attention. I have looked through the returns of this year to get an idea of the exportation of grapes, but they must be mixed up with some other fruit and very likely are. Where the amount of export of an article gets beyond a certain figure, say $10,000 or $20,000, it should be put in an item by itself, so that we might be able to get some reasonable information in regard to it.

Mr. FIELDING: The point of the discussion at that time was whether or not it was worth while mentioning bronze powder in the list of articles that might possibly be exported. The question of whether it appeared in the customs returns or not did not touch the point at all, and it is not worth while spending much time on that. I have no doubt that the trade and commerce returns are the fruit of long years of experience by capable officers; but there is always room for improvement, and if there is any defect in the forms used in making up the returns, I am sure, as a minister, I am glad to have my attention drawn to the matter by my hon. friend. All these matters will be brought to the notice of the proper department and, as far as possible, the returns will be made complete. The point of importance, however, was not whether articles were in the returns or not, but whether they should be put on the list of articles that might be exported to France. As regards bronze powder, the hon. member argued that it was waste of time ot put it on the list. He was wrong in that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I admit that I was wrong as regards that, but in regard to many hundreds of other articles, no reply has been made.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member's argument was that articles that did not appear in the returns had no business to be in our treaty. Who cares whether an article is mentioned in the returns or not; if it is an article which is being made in Canada, did we not act wisely in putting it in the list of possible exports? My hon. friend is right in his suggestion as to the accuracy of the returns; I am glad to have his suggestion, and I will have it brought to the attention of the proper officers.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I did not refer only to one item. The hon. member was able to find I was mistaken as regards one item, not amongst two or three, but amongst several hundred that I mentioned. What about such an item as borax or cyanide of potassium? They have been on our import list for years, and yet those are listed as articles that we can export to France. There is no use in my going through the same thing again, and I do not propose to take up the time of the committee in making another address. I do not, however, want the minister to say that because I have been corrected on one thing, there are not dozens and dozens of articles that have never been made in Canada and possibly never will be.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member may be wrong in that also. He does not know so much about the matter as he thought he did. He makes a mistake like the rest of us. But what harm can come to him or anybody else by putting those on the list of things we can export to France, if they are made in Canada? Will he tell me that?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows very well the use that was made of that slip, not of my hon. friend, but in the customs returns. It was made use of for the purpose of showing that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) did not know what he was talking about. That one little slip was magnified to such an extent that it was made to cover dozens and dozens of cases in which apparently he was perfectly correct. My hon. friend knows the argument on the matter, and there is no good in going into it any further. I think he appreciates just as well as I do that that is not a very good way of fairly meeting an argument.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To pick out one little thing in which an error has been made?

If that is true, if everything done by my hon. friend was to turn upon his errors, how did he introduce this treaty? What understanding did he have of the question of border countries and the like? He was absolutely wrong. But because he was absolutely wrong in connection with something about which he should know a great deal more than the hon. member for Lincoln knows about bronze powder, I would not say for one moment that my hon. friend is wrong in everything. He is not. My hon. friend appreciates just as well as I do that his type of argument was very unfair.

I was dealing with these imports into Canada from countries that get the same benefit as France does out of this arrangement. I am going to ask whether item 575, braids, cords, fringes and tassels, has been reduced from 35½ per cent to a fixed rate of 27½ per cent. Is that correct?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not answer the hon. gentleman at the moment. I will apply the same answer as I did a moment ago. As regards any of these questions which I cannot answer at the moment, I will undertake to see that the information, if it is within our power, will be given later.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I assume it will be given when this matter is still in committee, because after it is out of committee, the information will be of no value.

Mr. FIELDING: From 32½ per cent to 27½ per cent intermediate, I am informed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like that checked. Is the expert quite sure that the rate of 27½ per cent is not a fixed one?

Mr. FIELDING: We think not, but we will look into it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us look at the particulars. I think the expert is wrong. At page 27 he will find item 575.

Mr. FIELDING: The rate is 32½ per cent, and the reduced rate 27½ per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it not a fixed rate?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, it is in schedule D.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that the fixed rate is 27½ per cent. The information I have as to imports into Canada under that head shows that France sold us, under the item of braids, cords and fringes, which are covered with other things, $47,847 worth of goods while Switzerland sold us $112,407 worth. Is any objection taken to that statement?

Mr. FIELDING: If it is in the returns it is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to check my figures where he takes exception to them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why should I? You must know whether they are right or not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, they come from the government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are your own figures; they were quoted in your speech.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, they come from the government returns and have been carefully scrutinized by the ministers. I want to know whether the statement I have just submitted is correct.

Mr. FIELDING: I have no doubt the figures are correct if the hon. gentleman is quoting them from the returns.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are in this position; sometimes when we quote from the returns we are told we are absolutely wrong, and at other times we are told that the ministers do not know anything about the matter, but that if the figures are in the returns they are right. It is therefore somewhat difficult to know when the figures are right and when they are wrong. We were told, for example, that we were wrong about bronze powders because we relied upon the returns; now, on the other hand, we are told to look at the returns. I wonder if we can take this for granted, that, except for the challenge to the figures submitted in the case of bronze powders and the rates of duty on silks, everything else we have quoted is correct?

Mr. FIELDING: Such figures as are quoted from the official returns are correct. Any comments made upon them in the course of argument may or may not be correct. Concerning them this deponent saith not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister said that the member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) was wrong when he quoted from the returns in regard to bronze powders.

Mr. FIELDING: No, he did not rely on the returns in that case.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister bear with me a moment?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister will remember that the returns showed imports into Canada of $46,000 worth of bronze powders, but no exports. Would he not say that was wrong?

Mr. FIELDING: No, I would not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that my hon. friend thinks the returns are right. Now, then, I want to know whether I am wrong about brushes. Let us take item 653, brushes. Am I right in saying that the intermediate tariff there was 25½ per cent?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend has the tariff; no doubt he quotes it correctly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I have not the tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not dispute his figures.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then there is no dispute concerning that item. For that year France sold us $42,941 worth of brushes while Japan sold us $114,415. Is there any challenge to these figures?

Mr. FIELDING: If they are from the returns they are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I understand that the minister is not challenging the figures in regard to brushes?

Mr. FIELDING: I am not challenging the returns.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quoting certain figures. I have a pretty shrewd idea that they are right, and it was a rather small thing for the Minister of Marine to hang his hat on. However, I propose to go through with it and see if I can find anything else except a quibble.

Mr. FIELDING: "Quibble" is not parliamentary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I will withdraw it if my hon. friend can furnish a better description.

Mr. FIELDING: I could.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us take next item 651. The intermediate rate there is 30 per cent. Is that right?

Mr. FIELDING: Correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under this item France sold us $11,332 worth of goods and Japan $107,761. Is there any question of the rates there?

5 p.m.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: If they are given in the returns they are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But so far as my hon. friend is advised, are they properly given in the returns?

Mr. FIELDING: I know nothing to the contrary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very good. Let us take next item 368. The intermediate tariff I think is the old rate of 27½ per cent. Is that correct?

Mr. FIELDING: Correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is ten per cent taken off that, I believe. The sales under this item were, from France, $3,829, and from Switzerland, $75,586. What does my hon. friend say about these figures so far as he is advised? Are they correct?

Mr. FIELDING: I have nothing to the contrary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, item 453—

Mr. FIELDING: Suppose we shorten it by agreeing that all the quotations from the returns are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the minister says that all the things I have said here are correct, I am quite content to stop. I thought I was seriously challenged the other day.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not want my hon. friend to stop, but I am serious when I say I take it for granted that all these figures, if quoted from the official returns are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not like that expression "if quoted from the official returns." The statement was made that a very large preponderance of benefit under this treaty went to Switzerland and Japan instead of to France, and the veracity of that statement has been challenged. So long as it is absolutely clear that that is right, I do not propose to delay the minister. But I want to get it perfectly clear that it is right; if there is any doubt about it, I will go on.

Mr. FIELDING: As you please.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the minister says it is clear that I am right, I stop.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. friend is quite right when he gives us the figures from the official returns; I readily agree that they are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not want it suggested that there is any doubt about

these figures being from the official returns. There is an "if" each time.

Mr. FIELDING: I will go further and say that when my hon. friend purports to quote from official returns I will assume he is quoting correctly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All these quotations of quantities of goods are assumed to be from official returns.

Mr. FIELDING: If they are from official returns they are correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: An "if" comes in again.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not wish to imply that my hon. friend is misrepresenting the official returns. If he says he is quoting from the official returns I will assume they are correct.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I read in one of our agricultural reports a short time ago the suggestion that Canadian butter manufacturers should reduce to the lowest possible point the amount of salt in their butter in order to suit the European trade. I have communicated with two or three butter factories and I cannot find that any of them have been making anything other than salt butter. I would like to ask the minister if any unsalted butter was shipped out of Canada the last year. There is nothing in the returns to show that there was.

Mr. FIELDING: When I was in Brussels it was represented to me that Belgium was taking orders for fresh butter from Canada. I do not know that any went to France but if it can be sent to Belgium there is a fair chance of its going to France.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister gave us certain economic reasons why, in connection with article II, France is allowed to give, without extending them to Canada, special privileges to Germany in connection with goods for reparation. But why are Spain and the Netherlands also given a position of superiority to Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: When that matter came up before, I was asked for an explanation of article II in regard to border states and I said that at the moment my impression was that it corresponded to a similar article in the old treaty. Thereupon the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) quoted the language of the old treaty and showed me that in that respect I was incorrect. He was right on that point and I was wrong; I was asked the question while on my feet and had no opportunity to reflect upon it. The clause that is put in giving some privileges to France to deal with border states is now inserted in all the French treaties. I have one or two cases here. For instance, the Anglo-French commercial treaty made in 1922 provided as follows:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding paragraphs, His Britannic Majesty will not be entitled to claim for raw materials or manufactured articles the produce of the territories of his Britannic Majesty the benefit of any special treatment which his Catholic Majesty has conceded or may concede to the products of Portugal or to those originating in and proceeding from the Spanish zone of Morocco.

In several other treaties the French are now inserting that provision. I admit that it is susceptible of the interpretation that my hon. friend suggests, but I am assured and believe that that is not really its main purpose; it is intended to deal chiefly with the matter of reparations. Belgium, for instance, is a neighbouring country; France may wish in connection with accounts between France and Belgium to bring in Belgian goods; and German goods may have to go into France by way of reparation. This arrangement is also contemplated by the Treaty of Versailles —that in the adjustments of commercial relations regard is to be had to the needs of France in the matter of reparations. I do not think there is any danger to be apprehended in that connection. Our real competitor in France is the United States, and if we are assured of the most favoured nation treatment as respects that country I think we may reasonably be content. However, on that point my hon. friend was right; the clause is wider than I thought it was, but I am satisfied that it brings no harm.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I quite appreciate the suggestion regarding what is in the Versailles treaty, but we go beyond that. Did France want to go beyond it, or is it an error in drafting?

Mr. FIELDING: It is not an error of drafting; it is based on what we understood to be French policy. I find that article 23 of the Covenant of the League of Nations provides:

> Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the League—

That includes France, and includes Canada.

> —will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league. In this connection, the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-1918 shall be borne in mind.

This is part of the Treaty of Versailles, to which we have agreed. The intention there clearly is to provide for the matter of reparations, and that, I am satisfied, is really what France intended.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend does not quite get my point. I quite agree that France was to have the right of getting in these goods on the account of reparations. My hon. friend was quite right in making that exception; I am not objecting to that at all. Then my hon. friend goes on to say that that is really all France wants—at least I think I was right in so understanding him.

Mr. FIELDING: Possibly that is the way it will be applied—yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is rather hard for me to get anywhere in this discussion unless I take what my hon. friend gives me. Was I right in understanding him to say that that was all France wanted—to look after her right of getting these goods in on reparation account and having perhaps some special arrangement in that regard with Belgium as well as with Germany? Was I right in understanding that?

Mr. FIELDING: Hardly. What I meant to say and what I do say is this. France requires and puts into all her treaties that provision. I could show my hon. friend several treaties with that provision. I understand and believe that the intention of France, although it is possible to give the clause another interpretation, the main purpose of France in requiring that provision is not to get a general trade but to deal with reparations and questions between the neighbouring nations. I believe that is the intention of France, although I admit it is possible to interpret that clause in the way my hon. friend says.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Did France put forward any other claim in the demand she made for this clause except to look after her reparations?

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot recall the discussion in detail. The language is there and I admit it is capable of the interpretation my hon. friend suggests, but I believe that is not the main object and that it will not be so applied.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is unfortunate, if that was not the object, that the wording is as we have it. It was a mistake in draftsmanship, was it not?

Mr. FIELDING: Not necessarily

[Mr. Fielding.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be in for some other reason; I do not know. But does not my hon. friend think it would have been better just to cover what was intended? Take the very question of these small tools that my hon. friend is providing for. He says our real competitor is the United States. Is my hon. friend quite sure of that? Is he quite sure that before the war Belgium was not making a larger amount of many of these tools and exporting them to France? I think my hon. friend will find that is the fact. I do not like to put it forward as a fact because I have not the same opportunities of finding out that my hon. friend has, but I know it used to be so at one time. I ask my hon. friend if that is not true to-day.

Mr. FIELDING: It is possible.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, then, would it not have been better to have had this confined just to what the hon. gentleman had before him?

Mr. FIELDING: It is possible, again.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems not only possible but obvious. Well, I think we understand that, at any rate. We understand that Belgium, the Netherlands and Spain may be put in a position of advantage over Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not catch the question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The position is that, under this treaty, nations that have nothing whatever to do with reparations may be put by France in a position of advantage over Canada. You have Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands, at any rate, that are adjacent, and you also have Switzerland. Now is it a fact—I am not going to debate it if we have it admitted—that under this treaty those nations are all allowed so far as we are concerned, to get terms more advantageous than Canada gets?

Mr. FIELDING: I admit it is possible, but having regard to the general tenour of the article I am quite sure that is not the intention. I do not know that it adds much to the debate but of course if this treaty seems to be such a horrible thing as hon. gentlemen suggest it can be terminated on six months notice at any time. I cannot imagine any serious trouble likely to arise. If my hon. friend asks me if it is possible—yes, it is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is possible that these advantages may be given under this treaty. Now I want my friend to contrast

the covenants contained in article III with the covenants contained in articles X and XI and give us something which will occur to him as a real reason why these covenants are not interchangeable covenants, for usually we have interchangeable covenants in agreements.

Mr. FIELDING: Would my hon. friend repeat the question? I am sorry to ask him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I would like my friend to do would be to give me the reason why, having particular regard for the moment to article III and articles X and XI which provide certain covenants—contrasting in particular article III, our covenant, with the covenants contained in articles X and XI,—why these covenants are not made reciprocal covenants as is usual in agreements.

Mr. FIELDING: Often covenants are not reciprocal. If my hon. friend will point out any error in either covenant I can more readily discuss it with him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All right. As we go through it we will see if I understand the matter correctly. I take it that under article III we obtain in France the benefit of the percentages of differences between the general and minimum tariffs and that those percentages are to remain the same. I point out to my hon. friend that the covenant really stops there. There is nothing to provide that there shall be any difference between the general and the minimum tariff. In other words, if everything was lifted up to the general tariff there would be no percentage at all. Or putting a case not so extreme, my hon. friend has a case where he gets a reduction in a tariff where the general tariff, we will say, is 100 and the minimum tariff is 50, and he gets 50 per cent of the difference. He there would get a tariff rate of 75. Now let us assume that the minimum tariff is raised to 90. His percentage of 50 would still remain, but he would pay a rate of 95. Am I right?

Mr. FIELDING: This is a case where we could not get the minimum tariff on all these goods, and so we agreed to have a percentage of reduction. Does my hon. friend think that is unreasonable?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is not what I am addressing myself to.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, I do not quite see the point. If he insists that there must be exactly a corresponding clause in the other part of the treaty, I do not see that it is necessary. I do not think it was important for us to insist that there should be the same difference between the general and minimum tariff. We did not attach importance to it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would not my hon. friend attach importance to the case I gave him, which I think he will agree is perfectly possible under his own contract? Take a general rate of 100 and a minimum rate of 50. We are entitled to 50 per cent of the difference between those rates. The minimum tariff rate is raised to 90. Under the contract rate in each case you would just have this difference, in the one case you would have a duty of 75 per cent, and in the other case a duty of 95 per cent, if I understand my hon. friend's clause. Am I right?

Mr. FIELDING: The words as respects percentage, I am bound to admit, are not ours. They were taken from the treaty of the late government. If article III is read in connection with article IV it will be seen that we are given the assurance—and I am coming back to what was the main object of the treaty—that we shall be granted the same rates that are extended to the United States: It is provided in article IV that:

> If France shall at any time grant to the United States of America as regards any of the products mentioned in schedule B to the present convention percentages more favourable than those mentioned in the said schedule, or the benefit of the minimum tariff the same or similar products originating in and coming from Canada shall immediately and unconditionally enjoy the benefit of the said concessions.

I do not think we could ask anything more than that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has not answered my question, I think he knows exactly what I am asking. Is it or is it not permitted under your contract for France in the case of any item—100 we will say, being the general rate, 50 being the minimum rate —to advance the minimum rate to 90?

Mr. FIELDING: Suppose that was done what great hardship would come? My hon. friend is imagining things. If this treaty proves to be anything like as dreadful as he pictures we can get rid of it after six months' notice. I cannot imagine these things happening.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has now given absolutely the strongest argument in favour of the treaty which has yet been advanced, namely that it can be got rid of in six months. I again ask the Finance Minister if under this contract with France, where the general tariff is 100 and the minimum tariff is 50 the latter could not be advanced to 90. Cannot France do that?

Mr. FIELDING: The essence of these clauses is that we get the same treatment as the United States. If France makes any such changes as my hon. friend describes and gives advantages to the United States she must also give them to Canada. That is the essence of the arrangement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I want to know is whether France can do what I have suggested?

Mr. FIELDING: France might possibly do it but she would have to give the benefit to Canada as well as to the United States.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is not following me. I will use this illustration: Suppose we have a general rate of 1,000 and a minimum rate of 500. Now then we will assume that the minimum rate is increased by 50 per cent which would bring that rate up to 750. Is there anything to prevent France from bringing that minimum up to 750 or even 900?

Mr. FIELDING: It could not be done while the arrangement with the United States exists. If that arrangement terminates we have the assurance that we shall get the best terms that are going.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: France could do it apart from that arrangement could it not?

Mr. FIELDING: It could.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It could do that? So that that is the result. We would suffer that loss and practically get no advantage at all. I point out to my hon. friend the advantages enjoyed by France under article X and ask my hon. friend why it is that different treatment should be handed out to Canada. In article X it will be observed, France enjoys a discount of 10 per cent in addition to the benefit of the intermediate tariff. France retains any benefit she enjoys under the contract but the benefit which is granted to Canada may be taken from her. Why is that?

Mr. FIELDING: It was something which pleased France and did not hurt us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It does not hurt Canada to get terms which are unfavourable to her and are favourable to France? Is that right?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is arguing the matter. I am not bound to agree with his argument.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If any wrong is done to Canada under this contract I want to understand it. There is an absolute covenant in article X, as I understand it, that the proportionate difference between the intermediate and general tariffs shall at no time be less than it is at present.

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no provision of the like protecting Canada herself.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no like provision.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says there is no like provision. Is there any provision which, although not of a like character, does protect Canada? If so I would like to have it.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid I will have to let my hon. friend proceed with his argument.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The question at issue here is not the argument I am advancing, that is not what the committee should vote on. They must vote on what the government has to say about its own legislation. This is a government measure. Is there any clause, even if it is not of a like character, which gives any protection to Canada at all? If there is will the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries kindly point it out. I do not think there is.

Mr. FIELDING: I have told the hon. gentleman that there is no such covenant. I have told him that the explanation is that the French government attached importance to one thing, we did not attach great importance to it, and in the framing of a treaty you have got to try and please both sides. In this case it was something the French wanted; we did not think it was of any importance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no clause granting similar protection to us.

Mr. FIELDING: We shall see how the treaty works out. It must be judged by its results.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is a bit lopsided.

Mr. FIELDING: Possibly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is my hon. friend quite clear that we shall always get the same treatment as the United States? As I read the treaty if France gives greater concessions to the United States in the future than it is now giving to Canada we shall have to pay for those concessions, and the United States will not.

Mr. FIELDING: We have the guarantee that in the case of the goods mentioned in schedules A and B we will get as good treatment as the United States and that is what we think is the main feature. In A and B we think we have covered practically everything that we are likely to export—hon. gentlemen opposite think we have covered a great deal more—but everything we can reasonably expect to export is covered by A and B. As respects other articles, if later on something new arises and the United States gets some favoured privileges and we think we are entitled to get similar privileges in return for some fair concession the two governments have agreed, they will recognize that obligation and by mutual conference will come to an agreement. If France gives the United States some advantage they must give it to us for a fair return. That is only reasonable.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it reasonable under this contract that we should have to give concessions to France for advantages which are extended to the United States without any obligation on her part? I ask my hon. friend if that is reasonable.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not quite understand my hon. friend's question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let me read the article in question:

> If at any time France grants to the United States of America for any products other than those enumerated in schedules A and B to this convention more favourable treatment than is granted to Canada, Canada shall be entitled to claim the benefit of the same treatment for any identical or similar products originating in and coming from Canada, on condition that France shall be entitled to ask from Canada a reasonable and equivalent concession. France undertakes to give due consideration to any claim thus put forward by Canada and promptly to make known what concession of a similar nature she wishes to receive in return. The governments of the two countries undertake to examine these questions in a friendly spirit and with a mutual desire to arrive at an equitable agreement.

I point out to my hon. friend that, under that reservation, valuable concessions can be granted to the United States for nothing, and that Canada has a right to get the same concessions, if she is able to make a new arrangement, a new treaty with France in connection with them, at the price of giving concessions of a similar, or some other nature. Perhaps I am wrong in saying of a similar nature. She has to give valuable considerations for further tariff rights or advantages in France which the United States may get for nothing. My hon. friends may think that is right, but I venture to think that it is not right, that in view of the tremendous amount that is already being given, that we ought, as a matter of course, to get the benefit of any further concessions granted to the United States without giving any further concession. We must remember that we have given this long list. While we have surrendered our autonomy having regard to a great many items which are absolutely fixed, while we give this exact percentage of difference as between the intermediate and the general tariff, the United States has given nothing. Surely my hon. friend does not mean that if the United States, on top of all this, gets something further it is reasonable Canada should pay to get the same thing.

Mr. FIELDING: The observations of my hon. friend may be well founded, perhaps, if he has the knowledge which his remarks would imply. In that case, however, I must compliment him on the fact that he possesses superior knowledge to that which I possess, because he tells us the United States are going to get something for nothing. How he knows the terms and conditions the French government are going to give the United States passes my comprehension; I confess I do not know. This agreement does not make any limitations as to the terms of any agreement between France and the United States. They can make their own arrangement. What is most likely to happen, I think, in view of events that are occurring at the present time, is that the present arrangement with the United States will not last long, and I have not any fear that they will get any terms or conditions not extended to Canada. This is not an agreement to determine what the United States and France will do, and the only relation of the United States is this: that if she is our chief competitor, and we take care that whatever France gives the United States in the matter of concessions she must give to us, I do not see anything wrong in that. I think it is reasonable, we have covered in A, and B, everything Canada wants to send to France. If it turns out there is something else, and France makes some arrangement with the United States, then she must give us the same terms, if it is something new. If the United States gets something new, what is unfair in saying that the representatives of France and the representatives of Canada may sit down and deal with it? France may say to us: "Well, we are giving this to the United States, and we will give it to you if you give us some concession in return". What is wrong in that? Nothing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon friend did not get me. What I was pointing out

was that we pay the price for what we are getting. The United States to-day has not paid the price for what she has got.

Mr. FIELDING: The United States did not get that in our day; they got it while other gentlemen were managing public affairs, and we have no responsibility for it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the hon. minister thinks he assisted the United States in getting the contracts. I suppose he thinks we have something to do with the United States' people getting the contracts.

Mr. FIELDING: No I do not think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, why did the minister make the remark?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is introducing the United States in the matter; we are not doing so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is really missing the point in this matter altogether. My hon. friends go over there and they find an existing condition of affairs. I am not dragging in the United States, this contract drags it in and my hon. friend drags it in. They say they want as good a deal as the United States. Very good. I point out to my hon. friend—and if I am wrong I want to be corrected, because I am only trying to get the truth in connection with this matter—that considerable trouble has been given by Canada in connection with this treaty. My hon. friend has said that this treaty puts Canada in the position of the United States, her chief competitor. These words were used by my hon. friend more than once during this debate. I point out to him that the United States paid nothing whatever for any of these things. If I am wrong I want to be corrected. I think I am right, and I point out that under this very contract that is the state of affairs which my hon. friend recognizes as proper, not only for the present but for the future. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is a lawyer; I have no doubt he looked after the drafting of the treaty; one would naturally expect that. Well, under this clause which is drawn here, France may give—I do not say must give—so and so. My hon. friend seemed to know an awful lot about what France would do. I do not pretend to know. All I know is about this contract, which is supposed to look after Canada's interest. I point out to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that France may give further advantages to the United States in her market, and she may give them for nothing—there is nothing said one way or the other as to the terms of agreement between France and the United States. And I further say that the effect of this agreement is that, although the United States may have got those additional things covered by this contract for nothing, Canada is not to get them for nothing as the United States did, but has to pay a consideration for them. I will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether that is not correct.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is wrong with the clause as it is?

Mr. FIELDING: This clause does not purport to deal with the relations between France and the United States. If I could only get that into my hon. friend's head it would save him a lot of trouble. This is an agreement, whether wise or not, between France and Canada. France and the United States can do anything they like in commercial matters. The only advantage is that in respect of a wide range of articles, if France is going to give certain concessions to the United States—and this list covers nearly everything we need—she must give those concessions to Canada and if something new arises, and she gives it to the United States, we can say to her "This is a new commodity, we have a right to it, let us sit down and arrange what we will give for it." I cannot see anything wrong in that. My hon. friends thought we were making an arrangement with the United States but we are not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I never contended that this was a contract binding the United States. I was speaking simply of sections of this treaty, drafted, I suppose, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe). I am not bringing into this contract anything that is not there now.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, the hon. gentleman is telling us that under this contract, the United States can do certain things. I say that this contract has nothing to do with the United States.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite in error about that. This contract, as regards this particular matter that we are discussing, says that if France gives the United States further concessions, we are to get the same concessions, if we can make an agreement. Am I right in that?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It says further that we are to give something for those concessions.

Mr. FIELDING: Further concessions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On both sides.

Mr. FIELDING: No, we are dealing only with the one side.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are we not dealing with France and Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are they not two ?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Two sides?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So, this is dealing with concessions on both sides. France makes concessions to the United States. Canada comes along and says: "I want those concessions from you." France says: "Give me so many more concessions," and that is the way the matter would be worked out. What I am poinitng out to the minister is that a treaty has been negotiated by France with both Canada and the United States, that while concessions are granted to the United States for nothing, a consideration is asked from Canada and that if further concessions are made to the United States we can only get equivalent concessions by paying for them. Am I overstating that?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why?

Mr. FIELDING: We will under this treaty enjoy, not many, but some concessions that the United States do not get. Again I must ask my hon. friend to notice this. This is a contract, not between France and the United States, but between France and Canada. Recognizing, whether rightly or wrongly, the fact that the United States is our greatest competitor, surely we want to claim the best terms that are given to the United States. Therefore we put in that list B, which guarantees the best terms given to the United States, a long list of items which hon. members think are too many. We put in schedules A and B practically all articles that Canada is likely to want included, and we may say that if something more arises, we shall make a special arrangement about it. I cannot see anything wrong in that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Except that again the United States gets something for nothing, and we pay. Apparently, however, we are not gaining anything by further discussion as to that. What is the effect in law, or what is the intended effect of article 17?

Mr. FIELDING: A clause of that kind will be found in every commercial treaty between two nations. It is simply guaranteeing between the two nations that they will have the same privileges as regards interior transit and so forth. I do not think there is anything new in it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The sales tax is something that is new since the old commercial treaty was made. What is the view of the government in connection with the sales tax, considering articles 17 and 18?

Mr. FIELDING: Both France and Canada have at present local taxes which, we think, balance one another, and I do not think there is going to be trouble on that score. It means that, practically speaking, there shall be mutual guarantee of equal treatment in these things. If the cost of applying these things seems to be a large matter, that might be a subject of negotiation. I think, however, there will be no trouble in regard to it. Our sales tax on the one hand and the French local tax on the other will balance one another.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend say that the point is covered or that he does not fear trouble?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is covered.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under the contract what is my hon. friend's view as to the sales tax on French goods coming into Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: We will treat the goods of France the same as we treat the goods of any other foreign country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that national treatment; is that the way in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries understood it; or when he was drawing that contract and advising the Minister of Finance in regard to the legal effect of it, is this not what he thought, that he was going to give the goods of France the same treatment as the goods of Canada, once he had exacted his lower duties?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What my hon. friend refers to is the last clause of article 18, which reads:

> Subject to the laws now in force in either country France and Canada grant each other national treatment as regards consumption dues or other duties imposed upon the sale of goods.

The sales tax will apply to French goods in this country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thank my hon. friend for reading the clause. I was asking what it meant.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend has done nothing this afternoon but read from the treaty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have been asking the hon. member what he meant by certain sections. What does this section mean?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It means what it says. It is very clear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does it mean that France and Canada agree with each other that the products of France in Caanda and the products of Canada in France shall both be subject to like treatment?

Mr. LAPOINTE: To the laws in force in France and in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is hardly an answer to my question. Are they both to be subject to like treatment under those laws?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We cannot adjust the laws in France and Canada so as to be the same on everything.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I really credited my hon. friend with more intelligence.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot say that of my hon. friend after some of the remarks he has made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On the terms of his considered clause, can the extra sales tax charged on imported articles be charged on articles coming from France?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The extra sales tax over the Canadian—can that be done?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under what section?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Section 18.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has an opinion been received from the Department of Justice on that question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely national treatment means that what is charged on Canadian goods shall be charged on French goods. It is so clear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend must know that is not the point. Does he not know—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know that is what you are talking about all the time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does he not know there is a difference—

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think you do.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend not know that there is a difference in the rate on imported articles and on domestic articles?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, we want to have this matter cleared up; we want to know what stand the government is going to take. In this contract Canada covenants with France to give France certain treatment in her markets, and we want to know whether, over and above the tariff duties reserved by the contract, the government can also charge a rate of sales tax on the imported goods of France, as of other countries, higher than the rate she levies on her own goods. We want to know what stand the government takes in this matter, and I think we are entitled to the information. In view of the covenant of the treaty, does the government concede that this internal tax of ours, the sales tax, is to apply to goods imported from France?

Mr. FIELDING: Read the concluding words of the article.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But I want the government's position.

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot undertake to explain it more clearly than it is stated in the act; I am not a lawyer. It seems that my hon. friend wishes to continue the discussion and I think we had better call it six o'clock. However, I shall not be able to be here this evening and I ask that the committee report progress.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Before we rise I will ask the minister to get some information in regard to item 214 in schedule B. This item refers to wheels, tires and wheel centres of iron or steel. I want to know what kind of tires this refers to, whether of steel or rubber?

Mr. FIELDING: I shall get the information.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 108 (from the Senate), for the relief of Violet Gardiner.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 110 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Fong Young.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 111 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Percy Eversfield.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 113 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jean Elizabeth Burgess.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 114 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Wesley Scott.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 121 (from the Senate), for the relief of Fannie Boyle.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 122 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Forbes.—Mr. Spencer.

Bill No. 123 (from the Senate), for the relief of Julia Tracey Kay.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 124 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Philip Roy McCabe.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 125 (from the Senate), for the relief of William George Haden.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 126 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gertrude Irene Wood.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 127 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Murray.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 128 (from the Senate) for the relief of James McAllister.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 129 (From the Senate), for the relief of David Albert Clayton.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 130 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hugh Russell Fulton.—Mr. McKillop.

Bill No. 131 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maybelle Elizabeth French.—Sir Henry Drayton.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 132 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Darton.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 133 (from the Senate), for the relief of Minnie Eileen Biggs.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 134 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Henry Bottomley.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 135 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Ritchie Dowd.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

HURON AND ERIE MORTGAGE CORPORATION

On the motion of Mr. White, amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 34, respecting the Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation, were read a first and second time and concurred in.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 102, to amend the Criminal Code.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Definition of "opium joint" repealed:

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Clause 1 and clause 2 will have for effect to strike out the criminal code provisions with regard to opium joints as it is considered that this subject is more satisfactorily covered by the provisions of sections 4, 10, 11 and 12 of Bill No. 72, an "Act to prohibit the improper use of opium and other drugs," which passed the House the other day. We have now in the Criminal Code a definition of such houses, and this is to put the definition in line with the act which was passed the other day.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Amendment to penalty clause in respect to advertising, printing, posting or selling intelligence on horse-races:

Mr. TOLMIE: Would the minister give us an explanation of that?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have already given an explanation to the House. This prohibits advertisements and the printing and publishing, exhibiting and giving of tips, selections and odds on horse-races. Reading the clause, which is very clear, the House will find that we propose that in the future no one shall be permitted to advertise, print, publish, exhibit, post up, sell or supply, or offer to sell or supply:

(i) other than on the premises of an association lawfully conducting race meetings in Canada, and during the actual progress of a race meeting thereon, any tips, selections, odds, winning money prices, pari-mutuel payments, or any similar intelligence with respect to or applicable to any horse-race, whether such race be held within or without the Dominion of Canada, and whether at the time of advertising, printing, publishing, exhibiting, posting up or applying such news or information such race has or has not taken place;

The second part of the section reads as follows:

(ii) any information intended to assist in or intended for use in connection with book-making, pool-selling, betting or wagering upon any fight, game, sport or race, other than a horse-race whether at the time of advertising, printing, publishing, exhibiting, posting up or supplying such news or information, such fight, game, sport or race has or has not taken place.

That is to say that no publicity as to betting, book-making and pool selling on horse-races will be allowed in any other place or at any other time than on the race-track during a race. By the second part of the section this will apply to all cases of betting on games or races of any kind.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think, perhaps, we should have some little further explanation as to why betting should be permitted during the time of a race on the race-track and made illegal at all other times; as to why a monopoly should be given in the matter of betting on horse-races at the time of a race meeting and should not be extended to other kinds of betting in other places. I do not quite see the principle.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This point was debated and disposed of by the House at a previous sitting. The pari-mutuel system was discussed and the House by a large majority decided that it should be retained. Betting on horse-races was also considered at the same time, and it would seem that the opinion of the House was in favour of its being allowed. The great abuse, as to which we have received complaints, is not the betting on race-tracks but the betting outside, and especially the book-making and the pool-selling not only on races in Canada but on races outside of the Dominion. I am afraid that the prohibition of betting on race-tracks, as it has obtained for years past, would have the result of creating difficulties.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Under this provision is it not impossible for a man to enjoy the practice of betting except on a race-track and during the time of the meeting?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The betting is only allowed on the race-track. It has been so for many years.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does that not give a monopoly of the betting to those who are conducting the horse-races?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Not necessarily. Anyone can bet on a race-track; everyone is free to do so.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In the case of a baseball game does betting become illegal.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes; that is to say the advertising of it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it illegal to bet on a baseball game while the game is in progress?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: On a private game you can bet any amount you like. What we want to do is to prohibit the book-making and the pool-selling on any games. In the case of horse-races betting is only allowed on the track during the course of the meeting.

Mr. SHAW: I think there was an amendment proposed last year if not to this section perhaps to section 236—a section at least allied to this one, and relating to guessing contests conducted by certain newspapers. I think the minister was asked some time ago if, in view of the decisions which had been recorded in the courts, it was the intention of the government to bring in an amendment.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I will bring it in immediately after this.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the bill?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No. One minute. I have other amendments to propose. I beg to move that the following section be added to the bill:

Section 294 of the said act is amended by striking out the word "fourteen" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the word "sixteen".

This amendment was inserted in the government's bill of last year. It was passed by the House but was defeated in the Senate. Section 294 as it stands provides, that the consent of a child under fourteen is no defence in a charge of indecent assault. The effect of the amendment is to change the age of consent from fourteen to sixteen years.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I now beg leave to move that the following section be added to the bill:

Subsection 2 of section 301 of the said act, as enacted by chapter 43 of the statutes of 1920, is amended by striking out the words "of previous chaste character" in the third line thereof.

This also was passed last year by the House but rejected by the Senate. Section 301 as it stands provides that

Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for five years who carnally knows any girl of previous chaste character under the age of sixteen and above the age of fourteen.

The effect of the amendment is to strike out the words "of previous chaste character".

Amendment agreed to.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I now beg to propose that the following section be added to the bill:

Section 412 of the said act is amended by inserting the word "badge" after the word "ticket" in the second line thereof and also after the word "ticket" in the third line thereof.

The amendment is asked for by the Toronto Transportation Commission, and appears to be unobjectionable. Section 412 provides that everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to six months' imprisonment who by means of any false ticket or order, or of any other ticket or order, fraudulently and unlaw-

fully obtains or attempts to obtain passage on any carriage, tramway or railway, or in any steam or other vessel. The effect of the amendment is to extend these provisions to the fraudulent use of a badge as well as a ticket or order.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I move that the following section be added to the bill:—

Section 1024A of the said act as enacted by chapter 43 of the statutes of 1920, is amended by inserting after the word "conviction" in the fourth line thereof the words "or acquittal".

This is the case my hon. friend for Calgary (Mr. Shaw) had in mind.

Mr. SHAW: No.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Clause 1024A was adpoted in 1920, Chapter 43 of 10-11 George V and reads:

Either the attorney general of the province, or any person convicted of an indictable offence, may appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada from the judgment of any Court of Appeal setting aside or confirming a conviction for an indictable offence if it conflicts with the judgment of any other Court of Appeal in like case.

I have the following memorandum on the subject:

This amendment is asked for by the Attorney General of Alberta, and appears to me to be unobjectionable. As section 1024A stands at present (1920, chap. 43, sec. 16), it does not cover the case of a person acquitted in the court below, and the purpose of the amendment is to make it extend to such a case. It appears that in the case of Rex. v. Stubbs, 24 Ca. Cr. Cas. page 303, the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Alberta decided that a certain kind of automatic gum vending machine, which paid rewards or premiums of varying amounts upon irregularly occurring times, was not a gambling device under section 228 of the code, whereas it has been held unanimously by the Courts of Appeal of both Ontario and Quebec that the machine in question is a gambling device, and this has also been held by the Court of Appeal of Manitoba. In the case of one MacNeil, subsequent to the Stubbs case, the Appellate Court of Alberta unanimously held that notwithstanding the decision of the Appellate Courts of the other provinces above mentioned they were not prepared to overrule their decision in the Stubbs case. The result is that the law of Alberta on this subject is not the same as that of the other provinces, and as the purpose of section 1024A was to provide a means of obtaining uniformity of interpretation of the Criminal Code throughout all the provinces, I think the section should be amended as above so as to cover cases like the Stubbs case.

That is to say, that under a special section of the Criminal Code the Appellate Courts of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba have decided that a certain machine was a gambling machine. The Appellate Court of Alberta has decided the contrary. To make sure what the real meaning of any clause of our Criminal Code is it was provided in 1920 that in such cases where decisions were contradictory, an appeal should be provided to the Supreme Court, so that the citizens of Canada might be sure as to the meaning of any of the sections of our Criminal Code. As the section was drafted, it only applied to conviction on appeal to set aside a conviction, and did not apply to the case of acquittal, so that in case of acquittal the attorney general or any other interested party had not the right to appeal. By adding the words "or acquittal" the whole case will be covered.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I think this was the amendment my hon. friend for Calgary West intended to introduce.

Mr. SHAW: The point I had in mind was in connection with some legislation passed last year. My recollection is that it was an amendment to section 235 or 236 of the code. The legislation introduced dealt with what were commonly known as guessing contests, conducted by newspapers, and based upon the results of football and baseball games and sports of that character. Apparently in most of the western cities, at least, means have been found to get around the provisions of the statutes, and I was simply inquiring from the Minister of Justice as to whether he proposed to amend that section since the act was passed last year.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Does the last part of subsection (f) not cover the case?

(f) Any information intended to assist or intended for use in connection with bookmaking, pool selling, betting upon any track, game, sport or race.

Mr. SHAW: I am afraid that would not cover the case. The minister is probably familiar with the legislation. It apparently originated in the Senate last year. It is a guessing contest depending upon the result of football or baseball games, the newspaper charging a small amount for each guess, and then paying a very large amount, usually dependent upon the number of subscribers, to those who guess most nearly the results of these events. I have not had time to consider this amendment, but I think it only deals with information supplied for a particular purpose and does not deal with the actual contest.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The actual contest is the game. The amendment applies to all games, except horse-races.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me there should be a protest against this class of legislation. I for one do not want to do anything that will encourage betting or gambling.

But I cannot see why certain exceptions should be made and others should be penalized for carrying on what is precisely the same kind of thing. There are certain men who bet on a horse race on the tracks, and apparently that is perfectly legal. Other men who seem to want to exercise the same right, whether it is good, bad or indifferent, and to do some betting, are immediately performing an illegal act. This thing was brought to my attention last year in connection with some of these papers that were carrying on guessing contests of this character. I am free to admit that personally I do not like this kind of thing; but these people who are doing this kind of thing are perfectly justified in protesting that if it is right for one group in the community to be allowed the privilege of betting, it is right for other groups in the community to be allowed the same privilege, and there ought not to be discriminatory legislation of this kind.

Section agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 43, to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): May I be permitted to ask the Minister of Justice if he will consent to allow this bill to stand over to another date? Certain of the British Columbia members on this side of the House, who intend to take part in the discussion and who are opposed to the passage of this bill, are unable to be present to-night. I believe also the minister is going to move an amendment. That amendment I saw this afternoon; but I think these other hon. gentlemen have not seen it. Under the circumstances and as this is rather an important matter, I would ask the minister if he would be good enough to allow the bill to stand until some time next week when the hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred will be able to be present.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We might have the second reading now, take the bill into Committee of the Whole and then report progress. Will Monday suit the hon. member?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Tuesday. It is understood, of course, that the whole matter will be open when the bill comes into committee.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Certainly.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I would ask to be allowed to propose an amendment which can remain before the committee for their consideration. I beg to move:

That paragraph (c) of subsection 2 of section 163 be struck out and the following two paragraphs be added as paragraphs, (c) and (d) respectively:

(c) The importation of intoxicating liquor into a province by any person duly licensed by the government of Canada to carry on the business or trade of a distiller where the intoxicating liquor so imported is imported solely for the purpose of being used for blending with or flavouring the products of the business or trade of a distiller carried on by him in the province and while kept by him in the province is kept in a place or warehouse which conforms in all respects to the requirements of the law governing such places or warehouses and is used solely for blending with or flavouring the products of his said business or trade as a distiller; or

(d) The importation of intoxicating liquor into a province by a person engaged in and carrying on the business of exporting intoxicating liquor from that province, where the intoxicating liquor so imported is imported solely for the purpose of his export business and while kept by him in the province, is kept in a liquor warehouse which conforms in all respects to the requirements of the law governing such warehouses, and when sold or disposed of by him is actually exported from that province:

Provided, however, that the exceptions contained in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this subsection, or either of them, shall not be applicable to any province in which this section is declared to be in force, unless in the order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council mentioned in subsection five of this section or in any subsequent order in council it is specially requested that the said paragraphs, or either of them, be declared in force.

Progress reported.

RADIOTELEGRAPH ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Radiotelegraph Act, chapter forty-three of the statutes of 1913, by providing that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of a portion of the license fees collected in respect of certain prescribed licenses, to a provincial government, private company, or other prescribed party, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any act, to any department or employee thereof, for services given in connection with the operation of broadcasting stations and for services performed for the minister in connection with the licensing and inspection of stations.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Section 10 of the present act gives to the Governor in Council the right to prescribe the tariff of fees to be paid for

licenses and for examination for certificates of proficiency held and issued under the provisions of the act. This amendment relates to radiotelephone broadcasting stations. During the past two years considerable progress has been made in the development of radiotelegraphy, and whereas last year there were issued about ten thousand licenses for receiving stations it is estimated that during the present year the number will be increased to about fifty thousand. These receiving stations are served by broadcasting stations that are rather expensive to maintain. Last year there were forty broadcasting stations but only twenty-five have renewed their licenses for this year. The cost of a broadcasting station varies from $7,000 to $20,000 and the maintenance cost from $2,000 to $5,000 or $6,000 a year. At present these broadcasting stations are operated either by the vendors of apparatus or by newspapers and big departmental stores for advertising purposes, and also by a provincial government and private companies. In Ottawa there is a broadcasting station operated by Mr. Booth. As I say, the upkeep is rather expensive and this bill proposes to meet the case of Manitoba, among others. In that province there were two broadcasting stations in Winnipeg operated by the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune, both of which have closed down. The Manitoba government however now operates a telephone line in the province and it is quite prepared to establish and maintain a first class broadcasting station; but the authorities want to have some remuneration. It is therefore deemed advisable that part of the license fee should be given to these broadcasting stations which serve the public. After all, they are affording enjoyment to thousands of listeners and it is only fair that they should receive some remuneration for their services. It is also provided that part of the license fee should be given for the services rendered the minister in connection with the licensing and inspection of stations. It is the intention to have the Manitoba government, or any other corporation with which the department may enter into an arrangement for the purpose, issue licenses on behalf of the department, for which they will be paid part of the license fee as remuneration for their services in collecting the fees for this government. The same thing applies to inspection; if they provide inspectors they will be paid part of the license fee for the purpose. I believe this is the best arrangement that could be made, and it is to that end that the bill is proposed.

9 p.m.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose we shall have an opportunity of discussing the matter in detail when the bill is brought down?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As my hon. friend desires; but really there is not much either in the resolution or in the bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would be of interest to the House to know who are operating broadcasting stations at present. The minister might also tell us what proportion of the fee he proposes to give to the stations. Is the act going to define that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, that will be for the Governor in Council.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The proportion of each fee will be as the minister recommends to council?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will be fixed by regulation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will that regulation apply to the general principle in regard to the fees or will the regulation vary according to the users?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As regards the last question, there is no change from the present act. The act provides that the Governor in Council shall prescribe the tariff to be paid for the license, and the only change is to make a part of that fee payable to the broadcasting stations for the services they render. Now, as regards the question of my hon. friend as to the broadcasting stations now in operation; there are none in the Maritime provinces. The stations in the other provinces are situate in the following places:

Province of Quebec—
Canadian Wireless & Electric Co., Quebec.
La Cie de L'Evenement, Quebec.
The Northern Electric Company, Montreal.
University of Montreal, Montreal.
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Montreal.
La Presse Publishing Company, Montreal.
Province of Ontario—
J. R. Booth, Ottawa.
Star Publishing & Printing Co., Toronto.
Simon, Agnew & Company, Toronto.
T. Eaton Co., Ltd., Toronto.
Canadian Independent Telephone Co., Toronto.
The Evening Telegram, Toronto.
Wentworth Radio Supply Co., Hamilton.
London Free Press Printing Co., Ltd., London.
The Radio Shop, London.
The Abitibi Power & Paper Co., Iroquois Falls.
Province of Manitoba—
Manitoba Telephone System, Winnipeg.
Province of Saskatchewan—
Leader Publishing Company, Ltd., Regina.
Province of Alberta—
W. W. Grant Radio Ltd., Calgary.
The Calgary Herald, Calgary.
The Albertan Publishing Co., Calgary.
The Edmonton Journal Ltd., Edmonton.

The Radio Supply Co., Ltd., Edmonton.
P. W. Shackleton, Olds.
Province of British Columbia—
Western Canada Radio Supply Co. Ltd., Victoria.

Sis HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend is wrong when he says there is no change from the present act. It is true that under order in council the amount of the fee is fixed, but that must be a flat level; no differentiation can be made. In the present case a portion of the fee is to be paid to the broadcasting station. What I want to know is whether that amount will be at the minister's discretion or whether there is to be a regular rule regarding the matter?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There will be a regular rule. I am of opinion myself that the same proportion of the fee should go for the same services rendered anywhere in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister think that he should help reduce the cost of advertisers by refunds of this kind? I notice from the list he has read that a great many of the people operating these stations are using them really only to advertise their business. Does he propose to help them to carry the cost of that advertising?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sure their intention is to advertise their business. Still, they are giving concerts, lectures and so on, and thus contributing to the enjoyment of the receivers. There may be something in my hon. friend's suggestion, but my present impression is that it would be hard to differentiate.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Take the case of broadcasting, which is entirely for the purpose of selling radio instruments and parts. Does the minister intend, in effect, to help to carry the cost of selling this equipment by contributing a part of the license fee?

Mr. LAPOINTE: These matters will all have to be considered; all we ask is the power of regulation. There may be a difference between a purely philanthropic company organized only for the purpose of giving enjoyment to the thousands of listeners, and a company which broadcasts chiefly for its own benefit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Complaints come from the receivers with regard to the tremendous misuse of broadcasting, resulting in conflict of currents, and the like. Has the minister considered that question at all?

Mr. LAPOINTE. Yes. The reason for the collection of the fee is to pay for the services of inspectors to prevent that very thing.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the regulations in that respect? I have not noticed anything in the statute that would cover it. How does the minister now police broadcasting?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have inspectors all over Canada, seven on the permanent staff and twenty-eight on part time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the regulations which govern broadcasting?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not the regulations here; if my hon. friend desires to have them I can furnish them. I do not see, however, that it is necessary to have them for the purposes of this legislation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the general interest is considered, it is that of the receivers rather than that of the transmitters. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but I am told that the receiver does not interfere with the currents, so that the receiver is not to blame for all these difficulties. It is the sender, the broadcaster who is responsible for that. Am I not right?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The trouble my hon. friend refers to arises in connection with the operations of transmitting stations of which there are 1,900 throughout Canada. It is the duty of the inspectors, among other things, to see that these stations do not get off what they call the wave-length and thus interfere with broadcasting. The transmitting stations are different from the broadcasting stations.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But there is conflict even on the part of the main broadcasting station themselves. Upon whom are the fees placed, upon the broadcaster and the transmitter, or upon those who listen?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The fee payable by the receivers is only one dollar per year. The broadcasting stations have to pay $50 per year. In Great Britain the license fee for the receiving stations is $2.50; and they are proceeding on the same basis as that on which we want to proceed. Of that fee of $2.50, one-half goes to the department and one-half to the broadcasting company. This system has been in operation only since December last. There are over 100,000 licenses for receiving stations in England.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hope the result will not be the multiplication of broadcasting, because the chief trouble to-day is that there is so much conflict in the waves. Is the service self-supporting?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the country is not making anything out of it, why should any of the fee be given away?

Mr. LAPOINTE: For the reason that I have stated. For instance, in Manitoba there will not be any broadcasting if we do not adopt this system. It does not pay the broadcasting stations to operate as under present conditions; the two stations in Manitoba have in fact, ceased operation. The Manitoba government is quite ready to give the service, but I think it is only reasonable that they should receive some compensation, and I do not see any better way of doing it than by giving part of the license fee to the provincial government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When the bill comes down I hope my hon. friend will be in a position to tell us how much of the fee has been asked for by the Manitoba authorities, how much revenue he is now getting from his licenses, and what is the cost of the service to the country, with the resulting deficit.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will have all these details when the estimates of the department come up. They really have nothing to do with this proposed legislation—unless my hon. friend wants to prevent my going on with the bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, no. But this information can appropriately be given in connection with the bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 144, to amend The Radiotelegraph Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

COPYRIGHT ACT, 1921, AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 24, to amend the Copyright Act, 1921, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 5—Commencement of act:

The CHAIRMAN: Section 5 was to stand the last time this bill was under consideration. Shall the section carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have not copies of the bill. While we are waiting for the bill I might say that I have received a telegram—I think many telegrams have been received—to this effect:

Sincerely hope you will resist indignantly—

That is something my friend will agree I never do.

—the attempt to reinstate legalized piracy in copyright law.

I think perhaps we ought to get some explanation from the minister as to this question of reinstating legalized piracy in the copyright law.

Mr. ROBB: What interpretation does my hon. friend put upon that telegram?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The interpretation I put upon it is that the minister's bill is going to steal somebody's writing from him. It would appear that the sender of the telegram looks upon the minister as a burglar, not for his own benefit but for somebody else's.

Mr. ROBB: Is this from the printers or authors?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it is from an author. It may be from a printer, but I think it is from an author.

Mr. MANION: I had a gentleman call upon me a short time ago who claimed that under this act Canadian song writers, for example, would be deprived of any remuneration for their songs used on discs for phonographs, for instance. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but that was the statement made to me, and I should like to inquire what the minister thinks about it.

Mr. ROBB: It is exactly the opposite. It is to protect the song writers that we are putting through this legislation.

Mr. MANION: Is there another bill on copyright going through the House?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I also have received a copy of the telegram that has been referred to, and I happen to know the gentleman whose signature is appended. The minister asked if it was from a printer. The gentleman in question is an author of some standing, a writer of articles, books, and so forth. I was going to make the same inquiry as my hon. friend for West York as to what legalized piracy was going to be perpetrated under this act.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—licenses, importations:

The CHAIRMAN: This section was allowed to stand with the consent of the committee.

Mr. ROBB: The bill as originally presented met with the entire approval of the authors but met with very much opposition from the printers and publishers. The committee will

remember that when this bill was before the House a few days ago, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), presented considerable opposition to this section that is now under consideration. I have had a conference with my hon. friend and have submitted to him an amendment which we hope will meet with the approval of both the authors and the printers and publishers, but I am bound to confess that to-night I am somewhat confused to find that my hon. friends opposite, who I thought were opposed to our bill as originally presented, now seem to indicate that they might be opposed to the amendment I had in mind to present to satisfy those whom my hon. friend for South Wellington represents. I am bound to say on behalf of the government that if the committee is willing, the government would be quite prepared to allow the bill to go through as originally presented, but my hon. friend for South Wellington presented an argument the other evening which almost convinced me that there were others who had some rights, and I was hoping that the amendment would satisfy all interested.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I must say that I have been taking no stand at all on the bill or the proposed amendment. I was simply asking for information, and I have not been given any information yet as to what the minister thinks of this telegram or as to what is going to be done. Perhaps it would be fair to ask the minister just what is being done by this bill. What rights are being created on the one hand, and what rights are being taken away on the other, either from the publishers or authors?

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps my hon. friend for South Wellington would present his argument again to the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would think the government would have some idea of what they were about. I would think that the minister ought to be able to tell the House what he thinks should be done. He tells us that there was an argument made against the bill the other day by the hon. member for South Wellington, but it does seem to me that the responsible minister in charge of a highly important bill like this should tell the House just exactly whose rights the bill will interfere with on the one hand, and what rights it will create on the other, and generally what the effect of the legislation is.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House when the bill was presented a few days ago. Had he been here then he would have known that not only the hon. member for South Wellington but the chief whip of the Opposition, the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) presented considerable opposition to this particular clause. My hon. friend will remember that the government of which he was a member put through a Copyright Act in 1921, which was assented to on the 4th of June, 1921, but after having passed both Houses of Parliament the government for reasons which I am not called upon to explain never proclaimed the act although they were in power all the balance of that year. It was contended that the act passed in 1921 failed to comply with the requirements of the Berne convention, and that consequently Canadian authors were deprived of privileges which they might otherwise enjoy. This amendment now presented to the House is to make the bill of 1921 acceptable to the authorities of the Berne convention and to allow Canada to become a member of that convention.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the minister been able to find any correspondence with the Berne convention to show that the convention itself objects to those particular clauses of the act of 1921? I might say that I made the statement when the bill was before the House on a former occasion that information had come to me that the only objection that had been made by the Berne convention was an article which appeared in a newspaper published in Switzerland which is supposed to be the official or unofficial organ of the Copyright convention. I stated that my opinion was that the article had been written by a civil servant in Ottawa, and that that was the only objection which the Swiss authorities had so far taken. Since that time the gentleman whom I have named, the member of the Civil Service, has done me the honour of calling upon me and explaining that the article in question which appeared in the newspaper in Switzerland was not actually written by him. He says he supplied the material and the records to the newspaper, but did not actually write the article. I think in justice to this gentleman named I should make that statement to the committee. While I am on my feet permit to say this: I was satisfied when the bill was up before, and I am just as firmly satisfied now that apart from the minister himself there is not a man in the committee at this present moment who understands this legislation

Mr. ROBB: You might include me.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And the minister himself admits that I may include him. I have tried

to get to the bottom of this matter; I have spent a lot of time on it and I confess I do not fully understand it now. My suggestion to the minister, when the bill was last up, was that he appoint a small committee, as was done in 1921, before whom the authors, publishers and printers can appear and state their claims. The committee will have to go to the bottom of the matter and report on this bill. I understood that my suggestion on that occasion agreed with the view of the minister. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) backed up the proposal very emphatically. He said that he did not understand it, that the committee did not either, and he refused to commit himself to legislation which he did not understand. I do not know anything quite as complicated or quite as involved as the coypright question. I do know this, however: In 1921 a special committee was appointed, the various interested parties were heard, and they agreed on the legislation then passed. The bill was passed but it was not proclaimed because under the peculiar situation which exists, as between Dominion laws and Imperial laws, it was necessary, or at all events it was deemed proper, to submit the legislation before proclamation to the Imperial authorities, because they reserved the right to proclaim our act in the London Gazette which is the official communication between Great Britain and the Berne convention. The bill was not proclaimed.

The minister says that intimation has come from the authorities of the British government that the particular provisions mentioned in section 3 are objectionable, that they are not in conformity with either the letter or the spirit of the Imperial act. Well, that is rather an old complaint in regard to copyright by the Imperial government. In 1910 when the late Sydney Fisher was minister he attended an Imperial conference upon this very question. An agreement was then reached between the Imperial authorities and the authorities of the various dominions represented at that conference, and the Imperial act of 1911 was passed which practically recognized the agreement that was then come to. So far as I can understand the Imperial legislation of 1911 and the act passed by this parliament in 1921, I do not see that we have come in conflict in any way with the Imperial act, nor do I believe that we have in any way come in conflict with the Berne convention. The authors and writers in Canada say we have. I do not see in what respect we have come in contact. The publishers and printers in Canada say we have not. They desire to have the act passed in 1921 put in force. The minister intimated when this bill was last discussed that he would produce a communication the department had received from the British government. I have not had the opportunity of seeing that communication, nor do I know just what the objection of the Imperial government is. It was stated that the copyright convention had made objection. My information is that it has not done so; but objection had been taken at the instance of a certain civil servant who had sent forward the article referred to for publication in Switzerland.

I am now going to renew my request to the minister that he appoint a special committee to consider this bill. I have said all that I can say on that subject. I know there is a great deal more to be learned on the subject than I know; there is a great deal more to be said than I have said. If the government take the responsibility of passing this bill—they have a majority and can do so—they will only do it over my protest. Again I ask that the minister, who admits he does not know the substance of the Copyright Act or what the effect of the amendment will be, let this bill go to a special committee. He has handed me the draft of an amendment which has been prepared since the matter was last before the House. I think it is a decided improvement on the bill which he introduced. I am neither going to consent to it—I have no power to do so—nor am I going to oppose it. But if this bill goes through in the form in which it has been introduced, or in the shape in which the minister wants it, he must take the responsibility. I know the publishers all object to it, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association object to it, and the printing trades throughout Canada object to it. Those in favour of the bill are apparently the authors or writers of the country. Their reason for supporting this legislation is this: If this bill, or if the amendment to the act of 1921 passes, it will not be necessary for writers to have their books published in Canada; they can publish them in the United States and avoid publication in this country. Under the law passed in 1921 where an author publishes his work in the United States provision was made for publication in Canada on payment to the author of the exact royalty or fee which he received from the American publisher. If the author would not agree to that then the publisher had the right to go to the Secretary of State, I think it was, or to the commissioner and get a license for the publication of

that work in Canada on payment to the author of the exact amount which he received for his work in the United States. That arrangement seemed to me to be pretty fair. That is the arrangement, I am informed, which was agreed to in 1921 before the bill was passed.

The United States does not belong to the copyright convention. The United States insists that anybody who gets copyright in that country shall publish there, otherwise you will get no copyright. A Canadian author is therefore in this position: There is a market for his literary work in the shape of 120,000,000 of English speaking people, it is the greatest book-buying population in the world. Naturally the Canadian writer wishes to sell his work and to get copyright in that market. He is bound to have publication there and when he sells the American rights he sells the Canadian rights as well. The American publisher then says "I am not going to publish in Canada, I will publish in the United States," and it has been objected that very often there is no publication in this country. Sometimes it is said that there has not been a supply even of the works of the author in this country. Now, the publishers of Canada ask merely the right to republish in this country on payment to the author of the same amount that he receives from the American publisher. It looks fair to me but the authors do not agree to it. They ask that the bill passed in 1921 be amended in that respect by striking out the four clauses in question. On the other hand the publishers and the printers desire the act passed in 1921 to remain as it is, in order that the book publication and printing be done in this country and, they say, without any loss whatever to the author. That is the case as I understand it.

There is this other point: My view is that we should stick to our act passed in 1921. If the Imperial government has objection to make to that act let us know upon what the objection is based, let us understand what the objection is. I am satisfied that we should allow the act of 1921 to stand or to be proclaimed in the form in which it was then enacted. If objection is taken by the Imperial authorities we will know of it at once. The Prime Minister, I believe, is going to the Imperial conference in October next. He would be in a position then to discuss this matter with the Imperial authorities and see what the foundation of this objection is. The Prime Minister himself happens to be one of the authors of this country, and would be a person specially informed and specially qualified to discuss the question with the Imperial authorities.

My suggestion to the minister—and it is only a suggestion—is that he drop his present bill and allow the act passed in 1921, after all parties had agreed to it, to be proclaimed. If the Imperial government objects, and says there is some way we have contravened their jurisdiction, that is a matter for further discussion between the authorities of the Imperial government and the Dominion government. I do not think there is any conflict over the jurisdiction of the Imperial government, or in regard to the rules and regulations of the Berne convention. I think the act passed in 1921 is strictly within our rights. I may be wrong in that, as I do not profess to be any kind of an expert in regard to copyright questions or copyright laws, but I would advise the minister to take one of two courses: either let the bill go to a special committee, and let that committee study the question, or withdraw the bill and let the act of 1921 be proclaimed. It will not take long to have the question settled, because the conference is meeting in October next, and it will probably deal with the matter and settle it. I think it is hopeless to ask the committee of the whole House to consider so intricate and involved a question as this, when I think, on the confession of everybody, including myself, we do not know the real principles at stake. We do not really understand the rules and regulations of the Berne convention or the attitude of the Imperial government, and I think it would be well to have this matter cleared up before the House attempts any further legislation.

Mr. ROBB: In so far as the difference of opinion between the printers, publishers and manufacturers and the authors is concerned, my hon. friend has presented the case fairly. I imagine however that he may not have been in the House that day, or he may have forgotten the arguments when the bill was presented to parliament in 1921. I think I can satisfy him that at that time parliament was not unanimous, and I remember distinctly that the present Prime Minister objected to these particular clauses, along with a number of other members of the committee. If my hon. friend will refer to Hansard of the 25th May, 1921, at page 3846 he will find this reference to the Copyright Act:

> Mr. Rinfret: If sections 13, 14 and 15 do not conform to the Berne convention, I should like the minister to state that the government will rather abandon those sections than fail to adhere to the convention.

Mr. Doherty, who was a colleague of my hon. friend and Minister of Justice, and had charge of the bill in the House, then stated:

If those sections are at variance with the convention, we shall have to come back to the House, because the law of this country would put the government in a position where it could not consistently adhere to the convention, and we should have to decide the question then.

That was the opinion of Mr. Doherty. My hon. friend wanted to know what evidence we have that the bill as passed was not satisfactory to the Berne convention and to the British authorities. We have here the official organ of the Berne convention, Le Droit d'Auteur, to which my hon. friend referred, and the statement of Mr. De Montigny that only an authorized editor is permitted to put articles in that paper. He points out very distinctly that our Canadian act did not conform to the requirements of the Berne convention and his objections are exactly along the line of the communication we have here from Downing Street, signed on behalf of the department over there by Winston Churchill, and I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friend, who was then a member of the government, to the fact, that this was received in Ottawa on the 27th October, 1921. It is pointed out that:

2. The only sections of the new act which appear likely to give rise to any serious difficulties are sections 4, 13, 14, 15 and 27.

3. Section 4 deals with the application of the act to foreign authors and works. It is presumed that the Canadian government are satisfied that they have ample powers under this section to meet any cases which may arise. It must also not be forgotten that any restrictions which may be imposed upon the published works of non-Unionist authors have to be notified to Berne under the additional protocol of 1914.

4. Sections 13, 14 and 15, relate to licenses, and section 27 to the importation of books. In considering these provisions, it will be convenient to discuss their effect upon (a) British authors, (b) Unionist authors, and (c) United States authors.

(a) British Authors. Objections have been raised to the requirements of section 13 as to printing a book in Canada, and to the provisions of section 14 relating to serial rights in a book The British author who does not print in Canada, will, if a license is granted, receive compensation, and whether a license is granted or not, he can still import into Canada. The expenditure incurred in printing an edition of 1,000 copies in Canada will not be lightly undertaken in these circumstances, particularly as the imported copies can probably be sold at a lower price than the copies printed in Canada.

Then it continues:

There remains the question as to what protection is to be given to Canadian authors in this country. As at present advised the board consider that an order in council might properly be issued under section 26 (3) of the Imperial act extending the protection of the act to works, other than books, first published in Canada. So far as books are concerned, the Imperial act does not permit of imposing conditions similar to those to be imposed by the Canadian act upon British works, and unless the whole act is applied unconditionally all that can be done is to leave Canadian books as at present to obtain protection here by first or simultaneous publication in this country under sections 1 and 35 (3) of the act. This is a very mild condition as publication here does not necessitate printing in this country.

Then he goes on and refers to the Unionist authors and concludes:

In the event of Canada not adhering to the revised convention it may possibly be contended that sections 13 and 14 of the act contravene the original Berne convention to which Canada is at the present time a party.

Coming back to the argument of my hon. friend, I am sure no person desires to do injury to the Canadian publishers or Canadian bookbinders or printers, and everybody wants to do, in so far as we are concerned, justice to the Canadian authors. I take it that they will each be put in a much better position if we adopt the amendment I suggested a few moments ago. The government proposes to present that amendment. I am told frankly to-day by the representatives of the manufacturers' association, who called upon me, that this matter has been hung up since June, 1921, and we cannot afford to delay any longer. We propose to present this amendment, and if adopted by the House the measure will go to the Senate, and I have intimated to the conflicting parties that if they wish to have a committee the Senate has very much more time than we have in this House, and they could thresh it out over there. Therefore I beg leave to move:

That clause 2 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

2. Sections thirteen, fourteen, firteen and twenty-seven of The Copyright Act, 1921, shall not apply to any work the author of which is a British subject, other than a Canadian citizen, or the subject or citizen of a country which has adhered to the convention and the additional protocol thereto set out in the second schedule to the said act.

The result of this will be that Canada will be in a position to come in under the Berne convention. Our friends in the Mother Country cannot object to that, and printers and publishers in Canada will have the same reasonable protection as regards the United States that they have been clamouring for until such time as the United States qualify to become members of the Berne convention.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The position of the minister reminds me of the position that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) found himself in last year. Of course, there is a little difference. The Minister of Agriculture—and I think, perhaps, this was the first time any responsible minister in this House ever did such a thing—introduced and carried through a bill which he characterized as a "rotten" bill. It was awful, as the min-

ister said; nevertheless he put it through. I do not, however, think any other
10 p.m. responsible minister in a responsible parliament ever before admitted that he did not know anything about a bill, admitted the statement made on the floor of this House by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who has had to leave, that the minister himself, who was supposed to know something about the bill, knew nothing about it and yet asked this House, that is supposed to act intelligently, to have some knowledge of the subject, more than that, to be able to get a definite statement from the minister as to the effect of his legislation, to put this legislation through. I canot think my hon. friend is serious in his proposition.

Mr. ROBB: I have told my hon. friend what the effect is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All the minister has done in connection with it is to produce a letter that is merely a comment from the British authorities. The minister distinctly told the committee ten minutes or a quarter of an hour ago that he himself did not understand this bill. The hon. member for South Wellington said that he was sure that no one in this House including himself understood it, and if there is now in the House any hon. gentleman who understands this bill, I should like him to stand up and say so. Then the minister himself says that he can be included in that description. Is it not a farce to ask the committee to pass the bill under those circumstances. The responsibility is on the government. There is nothing more that we can say or do.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. ROBB moved that the amendment be concurred in.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Robb) that the amendment be concurred in which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Beaubien,	Duff,
Béland,	Fafard,
Boivin,	Fielding,
Boucher,	Finn,
Bureau,	Fontaine,
Cahill,	Fortier,
Carroll,	Gauvreau,
Carruthers,	Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Chevrier,	Graham,
Clifford,	Hammell,
Copp,	Hatfield,
Hoey,	Munro,
Hudson,	Murdock,
Hughes,	Neill,
Humphrey,	Ouimet,
Johnston (Last Mountain),	Parent,
King (Kootenay),	Pelletier,
Lapierre,	Putnam,
Lapointe,	Raymond,
Leger,	Robb,
Lovett,	Robichaud,
Macdonald (Pictou),	Robinson,
McBride,	Savard,
McIsaac,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
McKay,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Martell,	Stork,
Morrison,	Woods—55.
Motherwell,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,	Kennedy (Edmonton),
Arthurs,	Kennedy (Glengarry &
Bancroft,	Stormont),
Baxter,	Leader,
Caldwell,	Lucas,
Campbell,	MacKelvie,
Carmichael,	Senn,
Charters,	Speakman,
Coote,	Spencer,
Dickie,	Stansell,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Steedman,
Forke,	Tolmie,
Garland (Bow River),	Wallace,
Gould,	Ward,
Grimmer,	Warner,
Hanson,	White,
Hocken,	Woodsworth—34.
Jelliff,	

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Logan,	Bristol,
Murphy,	Porter,
Power,	Mewburn,
Kyte,	Boys,
Rheaume,	Lesueur,
McKinnon,	McQuarrie,
McCrea,	Stevens,
Malcolm,	Duncan,
German,	Chaplin,
Kay,	Wilson,
Mitchell,	Manion,
Maclean (Halifax),	Guthrie,
Chew,	MacLaren,
Low,	Preston,
Marler,	Clark,
Sinclair (Oxford),	McKillop,
Lavigueur,	Sheard,
McMurray,	Ryckman.

LIVE STOCK ACTS AMENDMENT

The House again in committee on Bill No. 10, to amend and consolidate the acts respecting live stock, Mr. Marcil in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Mr. Tolmie has moved the insertion of a new section 18A as follows:

18A. Notwithstanding the provisions in this act or any other act or law pertaining to or relating to live stock or in connection with live stock yards, it is hereby enacted that in every case where in the opinion of a veterinary inspector duly appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Animals' Contagious Diseases Act, a contagious disease or contagious diseases of

animals exist, or are suspected to exist, the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and amendments thereto and the provisions therein shall prevail as against this act or all or any other act or acts relating to or pertaining to live stock or live stock yards as defined herein.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Since yesterday I have looked into this amendment. I have discussed it with the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) and I am prepared to recommend that this proposed provision be tried out, at least for a year.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It has been drawn to my attention by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) that there are one or two omissions in subsection 2 of clause 4. I move that the word "chartered" be inserted before the word "bank" in the third line, and that the words "shall be deposited in an account" be changed to read, "shall be deposited in a shippers' trust account."

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I should like the permission of the committee to revert to section 13 of the reprinted bill. That is the section providing a penalty for violation of the act, and it was the subject of some reference the other day by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr Gould). In order to meet his views, in some measure, at least, I would move that the word "four" in line three be changed to "five," so that the penalty will be $500 instead of $400.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to, bill as amended reported, read the third time and passed.

TRADE MARK AND DESIGN ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 21, to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil in the chair.

On section 1—Act amended so that Part II, Industrial Designs, will apply to designs of non-residents, etc.:

Mr. ROBB: The present act allows only residents of Canada to register industrial designs and trade marks. There is no good reason why that distinction should exist. Indeed that was recognized by the previous government and a bill was first brought in in 1920 to remove this distinction. For some reason or other that bill was dropped, but in 1921 another bill was brought in for the same purpose. From the record it appears that in connection with both the bill of 1920 and the bill of 1921 the Canadian manufacturers were consulted and approved of the proposed changes, but in 1921 when the bill was up for its second reading two sections of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association expressed some doubt to the government as to the regulations, and the bill was withdrawn. We are bringing in this bill at this time to make some corrections, believing that it is in the general interests of Canada. It is really along very similar lines to the Copyright Act which we were dealing with to-night, and the Patent Act which we passed a few days ago. If we are going to keep goods out of Canada the right method of doing it is through the custom house, and we now propose to remove the restrictions that exist in the Trade Mark and Design Act and bring that act into line with the Copyright Act and the Patent Act, so that generally all these goods will come under the Berne convention. The advantages of working under that convention are that Canadians taking out patents in other countries will be protected in those countries. It is also of some material advantage, I submit, to the people of our own country that we should not restrict the registry of trade marks and designs to our own people here. It is an advantage to them to be able to register their trade marks and designs abroad. Let me give my hon. friends an illustration of how it might be of material advantage to Canada. Suppose that a co-operative association dealing in butter establishes as their design a clover leaf or maple leaf. Now unless we so amend our legislation as to enable a Canadian to register that trade mark in other countries, after his business has been built up some person might appropriate that design, as happened recently down in Brazil where a very valuable trade mark on fish was appropriated. Those generally are the reasons for presenting these slight amendments to the bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose that the American act is free of these words?

Mr. ROBB: Canadians can now register in the United States.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This does not affect our business in the United States at all?

Mr. ROBB: No. It will affect it in Russia, China, and a number of the South American republics.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was interested in what my hon. friend said. When we were discussing the Patent Act he said that we had an arrangement whereby we kept goods out by the Patent Act while the Americans did it through their high tariff, and he said the same thing in connection with the Copyright Act. I would ask the minister now that these barriers are being taken down, whether he does not think that the customs should be rearranged.

Mr. ROBB: I will go into that with my hon. friend later.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But we are considering the bill now. The book of annual statistics for the United States shows for the last accounting year a per capita purchasing ratio or figure of $131.66 for Canada and $24 for the United States. Apparently the high tariff in the United States is much more effective than the Canadian low tariff plus these patent and copyrights acts to which my hon. friend has referred. Does he think that abnormality should be removed?

Mr. ROBB: That is another question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are considering now one of the safeguards and I do not know why we should not have a little frankness on the question. Why not? It is desirable, is it not, that we should know exactly what we are doing and I am giving the minister the latest figures and asking him for his view? Surely the point I am urging has something to do with this question.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend will observe there is a reciprocal advantage in removing this because of the benefit that our trade marks and designs will enjoy in some other country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Apparently the minister does not want to discuss the business of his own department.

Mr. ROBB: Not at this late hour.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can well understand that desire.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Conditions of registration:

Mr. ROBB: This amendment is necessary under the terms of the International convention and to make this legislation conform to the Patent Act in that regard.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Filing of application already filed in another country.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: Copies of this bill when printed and of the Patent Act were sent over to the British authorities. We have not advanced the bill further because some days ago we received a cable from them requesting that certain slight amendments be made so that the bill might very properly conform to the regulations. To meet the British government's requirements I propose to move the following.

That clause 3 of bill No. 21 be amended by adding an "s" to the word "section" in the first line and substituting for the word "is the word "are" in said line and by adding to said clause the following:

50. Any trade mark the proprietor of which is an association the existence of which is not contrary to the law of the country to which such association belongs, even if such association does not possess an industrial or commercial establishment may be registered under this act upon compliance with the requirements thereof and on such particular conditions as may be established by regulations to be made by the minister with the approval of the Governor in Council.

The object is to put co-operative associations on the same basis as incorporated companies or individuals.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Clause 3 as drafted, it seems to me, simply provides for a retroactive right to the extent of four months. Is that right?

The CHAIRMAN: That is what it says.

Mr. ROBB: After filing here at home the applicant would have four months to register in other countries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The foreigner after registering in his own market has four months in which to make registration in Canada, and when he registers here his registration is retroactive to the same extent?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why is the four months fixed? Is this in conformity with the Berne convention?

Mr. ROBB: The commissioner tells me that this is part of the regulations of the convention.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the Berne convention?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the motion of Mr. Graham for the adjournment of the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What will be the business for Monday?

Mr. GRAHAM: We will begin with the French treaty, followed by the Immigration Act, and other resolutions and bills, if reached, that may be on the order paper.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is not going to be any Supply on Monday?

Mr. GRAHAM: No Supply.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My reason for asking that question is that there had been a discussion on the subject between the Minister of Finance and myself.

Mr. GRAHAM: If it is considered wise to have Supply we will notify my hon. friend. At the present I do not think we will reach it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Minister of Finance told me he would be here. There was a matter I was going to bring up in Supply last Monday, but the minister was not here then and I would not go on with it. He said however, he would be here next Monday. I think, perhaps, we might have a little discussion about it in the interim.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will discuss the matter and let my hon. friend know in the event of our deciding to take up Supply.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Monday, April 30, 1923.

The House met at three o'clock.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

On motion of Mr. Gauvreau, the second report of the Joint Committee on Printing was adopted.

MOOSE JAW BY-ELECTION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I should like to point out to the government that it will be three weeks to-morrow since the by-election in Moose Jaw was held. I made inquiries of the Chief Electoral Officer to-day, and no notification has come to him of what happened at that by-election. In the case of the North Essex by-election the member was in his seat within two weeks of his election. I wonder if the government can give us any information as to why this delay has taken place. The House is now in session but Moose Jaw is not represented, and it seems an injustice to that constituency that the member should be kept so long from his seat.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I agree with my hon. friend that there does seem to be an injustice in the delay, but the government has no information as to the cause of it. I imagine that the returning officer has had some difficulty in getting full returns from the outlying parts and has been a little late in sending in his return. I have no doubt that my hon. friend's question will come to his attention and probably hasten the return.

CABINET APPOINTMENTS

MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS—ACTING MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I might mention, in anticipation of a question by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) and in confirmation of a report which is in the morning paper, that Hon. Mr. Graham has been appointed Minister of Railways and Canals, and Hon. Mr. Macdonald Acting Minister of National Defence.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I just want to call the government's attention to the fact that Supply is not called to-day. Doubtless the government will be wanting to go into Supply on Thursdays and Fridays, and I desire to point out that the usual practice is that Supply should be called on Mondays and Tuesdays so that members having different matters which they have a right to bring to the attention of the House shall have an opportunity of doing so upon those days. Of course, if Supply is not called they cannot do so. I spoke about this matter in the House on Friday night and I just wish to call the government's attention to it now. I do not suppose that this course is intended to be adopted as a practice.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I understood that the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) had come to an understanding that Supply was not to be moved to-day, and we desire to confirm that arrangement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, no, it was to the contrary. The position was this: I was intending to bring to the attention of the House the disallowance of certain statutes of the province of Nova Scotia and to discuss a constitutional question of prime importance. The Minister of Justice could not be here last

Monday, nor last Tuesday. Therefore I did not take advantage of the motion, I was expecting to go on to-day. As the matter now stands, if Supply is called to-morrow I shall be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. FIELDING: On reading the Hansard containing the proceedings of last Friday night I saw that there was some reference to the business to be taken up to-day and the ex-Minister of Finance referred to an understanding, or conversation, he had with the Minister of Finance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a mistake.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not understand what was meant by that so I telephoned to my hon. friend and he said it was the Minister of Justice to whom he referred, that the reference to the Minister of Finance was a mistake. My hon. friend, I understood, had had a conversation with the Minister of Justice with the object of bringing forward his motion to-day but hearing that the Minister of Justice was not likely to be here to-day he decided not to do so. It was in that sense that I spoke of there being an understanding.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is quite fair. There is no real understanding. I certainly would not go on with the matter in the absence of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps my recollection is wrong, but when, on the announcement on Friday night of the business for to-day, this question came up, I understood the suggestion to be that we take Supply on Tuesday but that my hon. friend rather demurred to it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, no. If we take up Supply to-morrow it will be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I understood it the Minister of Justice was prepared to go on on Tuesday but my hon. friend demurred to that and it was then decided to take Supply on Wednesday. There need be no trouble about it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If you take Supply to-morrow it will be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. FIELDING: Then it will be understood that we take it to-morrow.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): I would like to draw to the attention of the House a despatch which appeared in the western papers from the Associated Press dealing with the Hudson Bay project. It says that on the 332 miles of steel which have already been completed there has been an expenditure of $30,000,000. I would like to correct that statement because it is generally known and acknowledged that the cost of the railway was roughly speaking only $14,000,000, and the cost of the terminals some $6,000,000.

TARIFF COMMISSION EVIDENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): I wish to draw the attention of the government to this fact: In the committee which is examining into agricultural conditions in Canada we have references made from time to time to the tariff, and the year before last an extensive examination into tariff matters was conducted by the former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) who took evidence in different parts of the country. As far as I am aware the information—valuable no doubt—obtained by that commission has not yet been made available to members of the House. I was wondering whether it would not be possible to have the evidence made available by placing it upon the Table in order that reference might be made to it and duplication of work avoided.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not, perhaps, as well qualified to speak on that question as the ex-Minister of Finance. I know that in the case of former tariff inquiries the evidence was not printed but it was available in the department. If the evidence in the case of the inquiry conducted by the ex-minister is available, I will be happy to place it at the disposal of the committee. I am quite sure that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance is better informed as to that than I am.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite right. I think three copies were made and I suppose one copy is now available in the department. A copy of the evidence was made for each commissioner, but it never was printed.

Mr. FIELDING: If the evidence is available I will see that it is placed at the disposal of the committee.

UNITED STATES LABOUR DELEGATES DETAINED

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): I understand, from a resolution passed yesterday by a mass meeting of the miners in Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, that they are

protesting against the detention at the border of Mr. Howat, past president of the Kansas Miners, and a colleague of his, who are on their way to fulfil an engagement in Glace Bay. They believe this to be an infringement of the rights of public speech. I should like to know for what reason these men have been detained and what the government proposes to do in the matter?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization): It is quite true that Mr. Alexander Howat and Mr. Thomas Myerscough have been detained at McAdam Junction. They have sought entrance to Canada and have announced they are coming here for the purpose of speaking to the organization known as the United Mine Workers of America. They admit—at least Mr. Howat admits—that he has served a sentence, in the state of Kansas, I believe, and that he has been deposed as an officer of the United Mine Workers. Further than that we have no information. I am asking for more information before finally dealing with the matter.

GRATUITIES TO GRAND TRUNK DIRECTORS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I see the government has appointed a commissioner to inquire into those Grand Trunk gratuities and that Mr Congdon, ex-M.P., has been successful in getting this benevolence. Will the government be good enough to bring down the Order in Council, I presume under the Inquiries Act, making the appointment so that the House may know the scope of the commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 119, to change the name of the Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo Telephone Company—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 120, respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company—Mr. Denis (Joliette).

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 137 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eliza Harvey Northgraves.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 138 (from the Senate), for the relief of Olivette McMaster.—Mr. Hocken.

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 140 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mahlon Beach.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 141 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alfred William Kelly.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 142 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilmot Austin Pickell.—Mr. Martell.

Bill No. 143 (from the Senate), for the relief of Annie May Vogelman.—Mr. Duff.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. MacLAREN:

1. Were the services of any men in the employ of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Vancouver, British Columbia, dispensed with on or about March 1st, 1923?
2. If so, what were their names?
3. Did the government take steps to ascertain whether they were ex-service men, pensioners, or men with families?
4. If so, which of them are: (a) ex-service men; (b) pensioners; (c) men with families dependent on them for support?
5. Since March 1st, 1923, have any appointments been made to the staff of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Vancouver, or have any employees been taken on?
6. If so, what are the names of the appointees?
7. At what salaries are they employed and in what capacities?
8. Were any recommendations made to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment on behalf of such new appointee or appointees?
9. If so, by whom were such recommendations made?
10. On whose instructions were such new appointments made?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

5. Yes.

6. (a) Barter, Miss Beatrice, Alberta; $60 per month: Junior clerk stenographer. Previously employed in the department, was reappointed March 26, 1923, on the recommendation of the Unit Medical Director, Vancouver to replace Miss Violet Helen Carr, resigned.

(b) Bentley, Frank McPhail: $90 per month: 2nd class medical orderly, Shaughnessy hospital. Appointed April 1, 1923, on the recommendation of the hospital superintendent to replace James Dennis, promoted to fill the position vacated by William Clement Bamber, resigned.

(c) Bell, James: $90 per month: 2nd class medical orderly, Shaughnessy hospital. Appointed April 6, 1923, on the recommendation of the hospital superintendent to replace Robert William Hudson, dismissed March 31 1923.

(d) Hayward, Franklin Henry: $80 per month: clerk, unit headquarters. Appointed April 10, 1923, on the recommendation of the unit medical director to fill the position vacated by John Arthur Rylands, resigned.

(e) Smith, John Wesley: $208.33 per month: Head clerk. Appointed March 21, 1923, pursuant to instructions issued by the honourable the minister.

7. Answered by No. 6.

8. No.

9. Answered by No. 8.

10. Answered by No. 6.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—OPERATING DIVISIONS

Mr. HANSON:

What were the earnings and the expenses for the last fiscal year, or last accounting period, of the following divisions of the Canadian Government Railways: (a) the division from Montreal to St. Flavie; (b) from St. Flavie to Moncton; (c) from St. John to Halifax; (d) from Truro to Sydney?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

As pointed out by a former Minister of Railways on March 21, 1921, railway accounting methods do not provide for the presentation of receipts, expenses, surplus or deficits by operating divisions.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE—PROMOTIONS

Mr. DENIS (St. Denis):

1. On what date were the last examinations, for the promotion to senior Clerk in the post office of Montreal, held?

2. What is the name of the successful person?

3. How many years had the said person been employed at the Montreal post office?

4. Was the said person, after promotion, paid the sum of $1,100 in payment of arrears of salary?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. November, 1922.

2. J. A. E. Lamontagne.

3. Eleven years.

4. Mr. Lamontagne received no arrears of salary.

APPOINTMENT, AUDITOR GENERAL

Mr. BEAUBIEN:

1. How long has the position of Auditor General been vacant?

2. Can it be left indefinitely vacant without injury to the public interest?

3. Is not the Auditor General an official of Parliment though his appointment is made by the government on the advice of the Minister of Finance?

4. Is it proposed to fill the vacancy by promotion?

5. When will the appointment be made?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. The office has been vacant for several months, since the death of Mr. Sutherland. The duties are being performed by the Assistant Auditor General.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. Possibly, but not necessarily.

5. Shortly. Some legislation relating to audit may have to be proposed.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

VALCARTIER CAMP GROUND

Mr. DESLISLE:

1. Has the government, since peace was signed, ever considered the utilization of Valcartier camp grounds? If so, what was the result of such consideration?

2. Is it a fact that this land, formerly under cultivation, is now a complete loss to agriculture as well as to the municipality of Ste. Catherine, on the outskirts of the city of Quebec?

3. Is it true that the waterworks system on this property will soon be worthless?

4. Is it a fact that the whole property, situated as it is, only a few minutes distant from Valcartier station and lying on both sides of Jacques Cartier river, could be sold advantageously?

5. Has the government received any offer for this property or have any representations been made on this subject?

6. Who is the present caretaker of the said Valcartier camp? Under what circumstances and by whose influence was he appointed? Is his appointment subject to cancellation at the pleasure of the government? What are his duties? Who is his immediate superior? Does the government receive regular reports concerning this camp and this caretaker? Has the caretaker any assistants? If so, what are their names and by whom were they appointed? Is the said camp, as a military property, inspected from time to time? Are reports made to the Department of Militia? Is the government aware that last summer, 1922, there were a large number of people occupying the various camp buildings? In what right and under whose authority were said buildings occupied?

7. Has the Commanding Officer of military district No. 5 any supervision over this property and does he make reports? If so, will the government produce such reports? Is there any correspondence between the Department of Militia and the Department of Agriculture, concerning this property? If so, will the government produce it? What is the salary of this caretaker and of his assistants?

8. Is it a fact that one of the buildings on this camp was destroyed by fire in the month of January last? Was a military inquiry made as to the causes of this fire and to that end were all witnesses sought for or was the department satisfied with a mere report? Are there any correspondence or documents on the subject? If so, will the government produce them?

9. Is it a fact that in 1915 a road was built from the said camp to Quebec and that the Ste. Catherine public road between range IV and St. Michel was then closed by the Military authorities and that since that time the camp road alone is and can be used? Is not this road the property of the government and as such must it be looked affer by the government winter and summer. Were orders given to this effect and is there any control over the execution of the orders given? Is it the caretaker of the camp who is responsible for the maintenance of this road?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

PAYMENTS TO NEWSPAPERS

Mr. d'ANJOU:

For a return showing the names of newspaper companies and printing companies who have received federal moneys for printing since January 1st, 1918, with the respective amounts received by each of said companies

LACHINE CANAL—BRIDGE

Mr. MERCIER:

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams, petitions, orders in council and other documents regarding the construction of a bridge on the Lachine canal, in St. Henry ward, in the city of Montreal, at De Courcelles street.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT—CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. HANSON:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence and documents passing between Justice department or any officer thereof and any other minister of the Crown, having reference to a commission presided over by the late Augustus Power, K.C., investigating charges of the alleged maladministration of F. C. Congdon, K.C., during his term as administrator of the Yukon territory, and copy of the report of the said Power commission.

GRAIN ACT LICENSES

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

For return showing the names of grain dealers in the western inspection division who have taken out a license under the Grain Act. Also a list of those operating in grain and who have not taken out such license.

ILLICIT STILLS CASES—REMISSIONS

Mr. LADNER:

For a return showing a list of cases where remissions have been granted to persons convicted and fined for breach of the Inland Revenue Act in establishing or conducting or being connected with the establishment or conduct of illicit stills or illegal stills, and showing the names of the persons in respect of whom such remissions were made, and the counsels or lawyers acting for such persons; in each case, said return to cover all cases since the first day of January, 1922, and to show the person or persons directly benefiting in each case from such remission.

FRENCH TREATY

BILL TO RATIFY CONVENTION CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

House again in Committee on Bill No. 23, respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the French Republic, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): We were on section 2 when this matter was last before the House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) asked for certain information which I have prepared and will be happy to send to him when he takes his seat.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that when we adjourned we were discussing the effect of the provisions of the act having regard to equality of treatment, and I asked my hon. friends a question as to what they thought the effect of the contract was in regard to the sales tax. I do not think we have any information on that point.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a slight inequality between the local taxes in France and the sales tax in Canada, and in order to guard against any misunderstanding a clause was put in to provide that the existing condition of affairs should not be prejudiced. The essence of the arrangement is that we shall apply the same rate as sales tax on the French goods as we would on other goods and our own. If any change is made in the sales tax, then the tax would apply on the French goods at the same rate as on our own.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do I understand that the sales tax of Canada is to apply to the French goods just as it applies to the Canadian goods?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, if there be any change. It is true to-day, except, as I say, that there is a little inequality, and it was because of that the last part of the sentence was put in. But practically speaking the last statement of my hon. friend is correct. The present sales tax rate will apply to imports from France the same as to Canadian imports from other countries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend, if I understand him correctly, says that the changes in the present sales tax rate would apply to Canadian goods as to French goods. I was referring to the question of the operation of the sales tax in Canada. Is the same tax to be levied in Canada on the goods of France as on the goods of Canada in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: There is a difference in our sales tax between manufactured goods and imported goods; but the law will apply to the imported goods from France the same as to imported goods from all other countries. For all practical purposes, in our internal taxation we put France on equal terms with ourselves.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to get this clear myself. I know the minister intended anyway to say in his first statement that the sales tax on imported French goods will be the same sales tax as if the goods were imported from any other country?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In his next statement he said that they would be treated the same as Canadian goods.

Mr. FIELDING: As Canadian imports.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite clear the minister so intends. I must say I had doubt as to his power to do so after the reading of the clause to which my hon. friend referred last Friday, and whether he was not going

to be compelled to reduce his sales tax on imports to the same level as his sales tax on Canadian manufactured goods.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think that is the spirit or intention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know what the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) asked for, and I do not see him in his seat as yet. Would it not be possible for the minister to give the information to the committee? I should especially like an answer to the question regarding cobalt.

Mr. FIELDING: I will first hand the statement to my right hon. friend for his perusal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: While the right hon. member (Mr. Meighen) is reading that, I might go on to another clause. What is meant by the use of the words "prevention of unfair competition?" Does this in any way imperil the bringing down of the Combines Act or anything of that kind? In Article No. XXI we obligate ourselves to prevent unfair competition.

Mr. FIELDING: That means that any laws there might be as regards unfair competition at home would apply to them as well. We would be on equal terms concerning it. They have in France some special provisions—I do not recall the exact terms at the moment—regarding unfair competition; but if anything were to arise under the Combines Act, this would mean simply that we would treat the French as we would ourselves under similar conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have just had time to make a hurried perusal of this statement. As I read it, the minister has secured nothing as regards certain oxides of cobalt: zaffre, silicious oxide, vitrified oxides, smalt and azure, impure. That is to say they were always free and they are free now, going into France. But on the pure oxides of cobalt there is, under the treaty, an increase of 100; that is to say, the minimum was 350, but this has been increased to 450, which is an increase of about 30 per cent in the duty on pure cobalt going into France. I do not know whether the hon. member for Lincoln would know what our exports consist of; but from what I know of the treaty, I would be willing to take a guess that what we are selling is the real cobalt; that these other things we do not sell.

Mr. FIELDING: I would have to make a special study of the matter if my right hon. friend thinks it is of importance. I understand him to say that there is an increase as compared with the present rates?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: That brings us back to the old question whether we can compare these with the old rates or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is an increase of 30 per cent in the duty on cobalt, which is an important product of Canada. I do not know in what form it is exported, but it is one of our chief mineral products, and it is somewhat serious to have so substantial an increase in the tariff. I think this should have been mentioned in the original details. I would presume the information that is given in this statement as to wheels and tires is taken right out of the details.

Mr. FIELDING: Out of the French treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A slip has been pasted in. If it is not out of the details, nobody can tell what it means.

Mr. FIELDING: The words used are those of the French tariff. Sometimes an item in the French tariff is very comprehensive, and you get only a part of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what this item No. 214—wheels, tires and so forth—means, because there are no headings to the various columns. If the headings should be the same as in the details, then, of course, I can translate.

Mr. FIELDING: I am sure that is so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is not present to-day. I have been pursuing him with the question as to the allegations made in his speech, and I thought I had covered everything pretty well. I was going to see now, after his admission that it was impossible for any hon. member to know from the government returns how much of the silk imports took the 20 per cent duty and how much the 27½ per cent duty, if it were possible to get some information of a definite character as to this most important clause. The hon. gentleman told us that somebody had told him that 90 per cent came in under the 27½ per cent rate and that 10 per cent came in under the fixed rate of 20 per cent. I think the committee is entitled to a little more definite information as to that. I want to find out just exactly how that amount is made up. If we had been given even the common courtesy of being told that Mr. So-and-so knows about this; if the minister had said: "Mr. So-and-so supplied me with this

information, and he has figures to support it," we would be at least on the track of finding where the truth lies. I can, however, get nothing from the government returns, and that is now admitted by the minister. He has made a statement as to the fact which is, so far, absolutely unsupported.

Mr. FIELDING: I regret the minister is not present to answer that. I can only say that, if there is any information which is available in the government returns and which my hon. friend would desire, I would be happy to get it for him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend will see that the accuracy of hon. gentlemen was challenged in this House by a responsible minister of the Crown. Afterwards he admits that the public accounts do not give that information. He cannot get it nor can hon. members. But he says it is wrong because someone whose name he will not give declares that it is wrong—somebody in one of the departments, I do not know at the moment which department. Now surely, we are entitled to know who that someone is so that we can get a proper basis of calculation. It is a matter of moment to know just what volume of silk will come in under the 20 per cent and under the 27½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I can only offer such information as the customs returns will give. As to the controversy between my hon. friend and the Minister of Marine, of course I must not cut into that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, the hon. gentleman must surely know where he leaves the matter when he takes that position. He tells me he will give me the information which the public accounts show. But the public accounts show nothing, according to the later admission wrung from the Minister of Marine. The hon. minister has had a conversation, however, with someone whose name apparently he is ashamed to give. I do not know why he does not divulge it, and I think the House is entitled to know whether the statement was just simply a cheap remark made by the minister, entirely unsupported by fact. I should be sorry to think anything of that kind; I do not want to think it. I want to get the truth in connection with the matter, and I have tried to follow up all the items with this end in view. This is a matter in regard to which the Minister of Finance knows a very great deal more than the Minister of Marine. If the figures in regard to this particular item had come from my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) I should have had good reason to suppose that he had got it from his expert and was not simply talking of something about which he knew nothing. And I should have thought the same so far as the Minister of Marine is concerned; I should have supposed that he was in the same position. I must confess however, that I have doubts when I find that I cannot get the information.

Mr. FIELDING: In all frankness, I must say that this particular point has not engaged my attention. I know that there is a controversy between my hon. friend and the Minister of Marine, and if the facts in question were available in the returns I would gladly look them up for the hon. gentleman. As it is, however, I can only leave the matter between him and the Minister of Marine; I have not any special information in regard to the particular point in dispute, nor have I given it any special study. I made the statement rather relying on what the Minister of Marine said, and which I believe is correct, that the greater volume of silks comes under the 27½ per cent; as to what the exact percentage is I have not the information. As a matter of fact I do not know where my hon. friend the Minister of Marine got the information; I think he said he got it from someone in the silk trade, but I am not sure. Personally, however, I say in all frankness, I have made no special study of the point.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought I had exhausted everything else that was in controversy the other day, but the Minister of Marine went on to say that the percentages of ten and twenty just about portrayed the degree of accuracy in the rest of the statements I gave the House. So far the Minister of Marine has been entirely unable to show the slightest inaccuracy anywhere else, and the Minister of Finance has taken for granted that my figures are correct. I am not going to ask him if he knows of any further inaccuracy of statement made by me in connection with this treaty; I am only trying to find out what the truth is, that is all. If my hon. friend has no further allegations of inaccuracy we will know it comes down to the question of this percentage which someone has told the Minister of Marine,—someone whose name he will not give.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think I made any charge of inaccuracy or misstatement against my hon. friend; I simply stated that from his arguments I thought his inferences were wrong, if I may be allowed to use so strong a word. I did not however challenge any statement of fact made by my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think so.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not recall having done so, because I have no doubt whatever that his statements as to matters of fact were all made with the best intentions. What I was objecting to were his arguments, his inferences and his contentions, and I regretted to say that I did not think that in these respects he was right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not speaking about that, nor am I complaining of anything that my hon. friend has said. He has been kind enough to give me the source of his information; he has been frank in the matter, not desiring to withhold any information from the committee. But the Minister of Marine did. Now, I was asking the hon. gentleman, who knows about the treaty, whether he knows of any inaccuracies or misstatements of fact in reference to it on my part, and I gather from his answer that he does not.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. friend is over-sensitive. Many statements are made in the course of debate which may not strictly be accurate but which, nevertheless, are made with no intent to mislead. I believe I could quote statements made on the other side of the House, statements uttered hurriedly, and which while of no great importance are yet inaccurate. Still I do not think that such statements are made with any intention to deceive, nor do I attach any great importance to them. It was merely the arguments and contentions which I thought were mistaken, but I made no accusation whatever against the hon. gentleman implying any misstatement of fact.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no issue with my hon. friend; the issue I have is with the Minister of Marine, and it is this, that the House has a right to expect accuracy and facts from a responsible minister of the Crown in support of governmental legislation. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the statement made by the hon. gentleman when he carried the remark to the length he did was absolutely untrue, whether he knew it or not.

Mr. FIELDING: That is harsh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has been drawn to my attention that in addition to the treaty imposing a disability on growers of fruit for purposes of manufacture into homemade wine, who are at a disadvantage of some 15 cents as compared with the importer of the French article, the treaty gives a further substantial advantage to the importer of brandy from France or any of the favoured nations over the producers of Canadian rye whiskey. There are many in Canada who, instead of any favour given the producer of Canadian rye whiskey, would like to see him pushed out of the market and off the earth. But I do not think they would like to see that done by the successful invasion of French brandy. Whether we favour the retention of manufactured liquors or not, all of us must say that we do not favour putting disabilities on the Canadian manufacturer of this class of goods in favour of the imported article, any more than we would favour putting a disability on the Canadian manufacturer of any other class of goods in favour of importations. I think it will be admitted at once that there is a distinct preference here given to French brandy over the present excise duties on Canadian rye whiskey. Does my hon. friend intend to remove that disability or not?

Mr. FIELDING: If, as a consequence of the treaty, any disadvantages be imposed upon any home industry, that is a matter that deserves consideration and will receive it in connection with the budget. It does not follow that because a duty is reduced in the treaty it is not going to be reduced anywhere else. Touching brandy, I may say that the French treaty does not propose a general reduction on brandies. There is a particular French brandy which is likely to come in to a very moderate extent; it requires a certificate of purity, and it is a matter of pride with the French that this is not like any other brandy in the world, and they ask for special consideration for it. If any injustice is done any existing industry in Canada by the operation of the treaty then undoubtedly it will be our duty to consider the matter at the proper time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that this brandy which it is proposed to reduce in the treaty is very widely used and is a very popular brand—I cannot speak of my own knowledge. But I also know that the government of the province of Quebec affects at least to be engaged in an effort to reduce consumption of these classes of strong liquors —brandies, whiskies and the like—in favour of light wines and beer. I hope the minister realizes that by this treaty he is just doing that much more to balk the wishes of the Quebec government.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend's zeal for the province of Quebec is very encouraging.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is evidently more real though less flamboyant than that of the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: Let us hope so.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Repeal:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister give us the effect of this?

Mr. FIELDING: That is merely the repealing clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but what are we doing by repealing these acts?

Mr. FIELDING: The old treaty was in part continued by the modus vivendi. All the old acts are repealed now and this will be the only French Treaty Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no revenue act repealed?

Mr. FIELDING: No, I think not.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Suspension of inconsistent laws:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is rather an omnibus section, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is necessary there. It certainly can do no harm. It makes everything absolutely clear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This clause 8 may have been used before, but I never saw it. "The operation of all laws inconsistent with the giving to the provisions of the said convention and of this act their full effect shall from time to time be suspended to the extent of such inconsistency." Really that is a pretty dangerous clause and would, I think, likely make lots of work for lawyers. If the minister has not that clause there at all then the ordinary rules apply—rules that have been interpreted times without number and as to which the law is clear: the specific overrules the general; where there is conflict, and nothing else to weigh on one side or the other, the last legislation overrules the former, and so on. Now, the benefit and effect of all those rules of law obtain to-day and would apply to this bill. Why does the minister want anything further?

Mr. FIELDING: My impression is that it is not an unusual thing to make a general clause suspending the operation of all laws inconsistent with the proposed enactment. It may not be necessary. The most I can say for it is that it makes assurance doubly sure. If my hon. friend thinks it is gravely objectionable I would come back to it on the third reading of the bill and in the meantime have it looked into.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have seen a clause to the effect that anything inconsistent is repealed, but I do not know that that has any real force. This is a new section.

Mr. FIELDING: This particular clause was the work of the legal advisers of the department. In view of what my hon. friend has said, before the third reading of the bill is moved I will have the clause inquired into.

4 p.m.

Mr. MacLAREN: Do I understand correctly that the special tariff applies only to goods that are imported directly through Canadian ports?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. The provisions of this act as respects French imports are restricted to goods coming directly to Canadian ports. That clause was in our old treaty and is continued in this.

Mr. MacLAREN: And through our own ports only?

Mr. FIELDING: Goods may come through Great Britain, for example, or from France direct. If goods come direct from France or be sent via London, they are entitled to the benefits of the treaty; if sent by way of the United States they would not be so entitled.

Mr. MacLAREN: These goods must be imported through Canadian ports to receive the benefit of the special tariff. That being the case, and this treaty applying to other favoured nations, Japan, Switzerland and so on, will this condition also be required of the other favoured nations?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, they can only receive the same privileges by accepting the same responsibilities. I may say to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that I find in regard to the omnibus clause that in the act respecting the old treaty of 1908, chapter 28, the following clause appears:

> The operation of all laws inconsistent with the giving to the provisions of the said convention and of this act their full effect shall from time to time be suspended to the extent of such inconsistency.

So our legal advisers have merely copied the old clause. I think it can do no harm, it simply makes assurance doubly sure.

Section agreed to.

On schedule D:

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is only one schedule in the bill.

Mr. FIELDING: One schedule covers all in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: These separate schedules are part of the general schedule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So they are all carried in the one schedule.

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. FIELDING: Is there any objection to its being read now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Next sitting.

ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. FIELDING: I have not given notice, but perhaps the House will be prepared to take up the Italian treaty at once. I do not think it contains anything contentious.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As I take it—my hon. friend will tell me if I am wrong—what is done in the Italian treaty is in short to make Italy one of the most favoured nations.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, to give and receive favoured nation treatment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is free of a lot of objections that can be urged in connection with fixed duties?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not wish to press it. I have not given notice of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But I do not know what other members think of it.

Mr. FIELDING: Let it stand for another day.

TESTING AND INSPECTION OF SEEDS

House in committee on Bill No. 12 respecting the Testing, Inspection and Sale of Seeds, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definitions:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the minister would explain for the benefit of those of us who are not on the committee on Agriculture what is the effect of the amendments that have been made, prefacing that by a general statement of the purpose of the bill.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not expect to go into committee on this bill to-day and I have only a copy of the amended bill here without the new sections underlined, as I generally have them in a case of this kind, so I shall have to ask the chairman to read the amendments made by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 2 was amended in committee by striking out paragraph (h):

"Plants" means any agricultural or horticultural plant.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: "Agricultural plant" means a plant from a hot house or one of a supply of such as cabbage plants or tomato plants. It was thought by the horticulturists that plants should not be included in the Seed Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the general purpose of the legislation? Has the minister done away with the Seed Commission of western Canada and if so why?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This has nothing to do with the Seed Commission. This is the Seed Control Act dating back to 1903, I think, and has to do with the grading and specifying the grades and the qualifications of the various seeds that are placed on the market by our seed merchants. That is the main feature of it. The act has been consolidated twice. It was first consolidated eleven years ago, and this is the second consolidation. It specifies, particularly, the seeds for export and import; also the quality of the seeds sold by our various seed merchants throughout Canada; indicates the quality of those seeds and the name of the grades. The Seed Commission that my hon. friend refers to has to do more with the disposition of what we call commercial seed grain distributed from our different systems, mostly in western Canada. Well, not necessarily all western Canada; it has been distributed all over Canada but mostly from the West as a base of supplies. That has not been dispensed with. The commissioner is employed and paid a per diem allowance when his services are required. There has been very little distribution of seed this year. Owing to the fact that the crop was so generally distributed over the West there has been very little demand for the use of this commission. However, it is in existence yet and can be called into requisition at any moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the work that is under Mr. George Clark, is it not?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. Clause 3 contains provisions as to the sale of clovers, grasses, seed grain and fodder seeds. An addition has been made to clause 2 of the bill a provision to the effect that "grass, clover and alfalfa seeds that may be graded Registered

Extra No. 1, or No. 1, shall be free from the seeds of primary noxious weeds." This is for the purpose of designating a standard quality of grass seeds. Formerly it applied to clover seeds and cereals. Now the idea is to extend it to all grass seeds and clover seeds, and also to field and garden seeds, as to the grade and quality that constituted a standard grade. When a seed merchant sells a consignment of seeds of a certain quality, and it proves not to be up to such quality, the purchaser can get redress by calling for a survey, and all the usual procedure involved in the event of seed not coming up to the standard.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Regarding the term used in the section "primary noxious weeds" I do not find in the act any definition of "noxious weeds" or "primary noxious weeds." I understand—I hope the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that there is in our federal statutes no definition of "noxious weeds," but that dependence is placed on the definition given by the provincial departments of agriculture. Now, this difficulty may arise as a consequence: There may be weeds in Ontario, for example, that are "noxious weeds" or "primary noxious weeds" that in Saskatchewan are not, and vice versa. What protection is there for the purchaser of No. 1 alfalfa, or grass or clover seed if these seeds contain weeds which are classed as "primary noxious weeds" in Ontario but are not so classed in his own province?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We could not very well take the provincial noxious weed list because it varies so much. We would have to have a government standardized list. As to the federal act it has not been before this House since I have had anything to do with legislation of this kind. I am not familiar, I may say, with the entire list of noxious weeds as defined by the federal act. But that is what it refers to here.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Is it a fact that noxious weeds are defined in a federal act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): And also "primary noxious weeds?"

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The federal list does not necessarily correspond with the list in provincial acts because there is such a variety of weeds in the various provinces that it would take a list of tremendous length to include them all.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is a list of "noxious weeds" given in the regulations on the back of the old act.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What was the reference, Mr. Chairman, in the old act to "noxious weeds"?

The CHAIRMAN: We do not happen to have the old act here. What I have is simply the bill as it went before the committee.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Certain features of these acts are adjustable by regulation. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) has just sent me over a copy of the Seed Control Act of 1911 and on the back of it is given a list of the noxious weeds referred to. I find the reference to it reads:

> The species of farm weeds which shall for the purpose of the above mentioned act be included within the meaning of the term "noxious weeds" shall be as follows:—

It goes on to enumerate:

> Wild oats; twitch or quack grass; docks; Russian thistle; purple cockle.

And so on. That appears in the regulations.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): It does not appear in the statute?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It has the same effect in law. Regulations passed in pursuance of the provisions of any statute have the same effect as law. Of course the act itself grants authority for the enforcement of regulations based upon its provisions. Such regulations must not be inconsistent with the act. In order to afford facilities for a quick adjustment a great many of these provisions are left to regulations rather than embodied in the act itself. That is so that in case any new weeds spring up they can be included by regulation instead of waiting until next session for a parliamentary enactment.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Is the term "primary" defined, or is it a loose term which may be subject to adjustment from time to time?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is not defined in the statute, so far as I can see. There is a list of about twenty-five weeds enumerated, but I do not see the word "primary" mentioned. If my hon. friend wishes we can allow that sub-section to stand until we realize what the significance of the word "primary" is. I should think myself it would be "of first importance."

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I think the point is very important. I think the minister will also agree that when large quantities

of grass and clover seeds are being imported into the western provinces the purchasers should be protected against the possibility of those seeds containing weeds which, for example, although noxious there, may not be noxious in the place where the seed was grown. I think the term should be thoroughly understood and defined before it is used.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the list is quite complete. There are certain weeds that are very prevalent. For instance, wild buckwheat is very prevalent but is not considered to be a very noxious weed except in some places where it has proven to be so. If you include the whole list of noxious weeds the lists might be made very burdensome. The word "primary," I presume, has reference to the list given in the act. It is possible that some weeds may have to be added to the list when the new regulations, under the new act, are drafted. I have the list given in the old act if my hon. friend would like it read. It is as follows:

Cow cockle, stinkweed, false flax, ball mustard, wild radish, wild mustard, hare's-ear mustard, tumbling mustard, wild carrot, field bindweed, dodder, blue burr or stickseed, blue weed, ribgrass, ragweed, ox-eye daisy, Canada thistle, perennial sow thistle.

Mr. MARTELL: What is the method to be pursued by farmers in the province of Nova Scotia, particularly in the most important part of the province, the county of Hants, if they wish to get some seeds for new varieties of oats, or other seed, for the purpose of experimentation? From the experiments it carries on, the Department of Agriculture would undoubtedly know the best seeds to be used in certain sections of Nova Scotia. Having ascertained that fact, what would the farmer have to do in order to get some new samples of seed?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It depends whether he wanted to deal with a regular recognized seed merchant—

Mr. MARTELL: He would want to get them for nothing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think we have any such method, except by getting small samples from the experimental farm.

Mr. MARTELL: I think the minister stated that if certain progressive farmers would apply to the experimental farm they would get samples.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The season is pretty well advanced for distributing samples of seed. A certain distribution is being made yet, although not so prodigal as that of a number of years ago. It was thought there was a good deal of waste in the general distribution of these small five-pound samples of seed. The quantity distributed has been reduced, and distributed early enough so that it will be ready for seeding in the spring. It is rather late now.

Mr. MARTELL: Can the hon. minister tell me how I would get it? The season is not very far advanced in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand the season is late there this year. They have a supply still on hand at the experimental farm at Ottawa, and if my hon. friend will send an application to the Director of Experimental Farms, Ottawa, I have no doubt they would strain a point for my hon. friend, even if it is a little late.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): When this bill was up before the committee on Agriculture, the question regarding the taking over of inspection of seed potatoes for shipment to the American markets was discussed, and we from the Maritime provinces were disappointed that the inspection of seed potatoes was not taken over by the Seed branch. We found it impossible in this committee to have the inspection taken over by the Seed branch. I just wish to ask the minister if he has given further consideration to this matter, and if he has not received numerous communications from the potato growers association in the Maritime provinces asking for this. They believed they could get better inspection and they would have the men right on the spot the whole year round, or on the days the potatoes were shipped out, and it would be a far better method than the present system where the plant pathologists are only there for part of the season. They are very anxious for this to be taken care of by the Seed branch under Mr. Clark, and I hope the minister will still give it favourable consideration.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Officials of the Department of Agriculture have gone into this matter very carefully, and inasmuch as it will require additional plant pathologists to perform these services under the Seed branch, it would be more expensive to carry out my hon. friend's suggestion. At the present time seed potatoes are under the department of the plant pathologists, as it requires the services of a pathologist to identify potato diseases. It does not require such an officer to take care of the Seed branch, because if the potatoes were transferred to the Seed branch we would have to take on a new staff of

plant pathologists. The chief reason that it is not advisable at this time to transfer potatoes to the Seed branch is the additional expense involved. I recognize that Mr. Clark's staff is quite competent and quite efficient to deal with that question, but we cannot give the service through the Seed branch without a very heavy additional expense.

Mr. MARTELL: Are any experiments proposed to be carried on in Nova Scotia or in the Maritime provinces to ascertain whether or not certain varieties of apples could be grown so that young farmers of the provinces could conduct experiments on their own farms, with a view to adopting promising new varieties? I make the same inquiry with regard to plum trees and pear trees in Nova Scotia. Could the minister inform me if anything has been done in his department towards getting cheaper rates on nitrate of soda? That is a very valuable product for fruit growers in my part of the country, and in fact for all the fruit growers in the province, and the freights are found to be excessive. Is the department doing anything in the way of negotiating with the various municipalities with a view to taking up with the railways the question of freight rates on nitrate of soda? This matter may not be considered apropos of the question before the committee, but apple growing is somewhat akin to it. If the minister could do something for us in that regard, in order to introduce new classes of fruits in Nova Scotia, I think it would be a good thing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know how far, Mr. Chairman, you will let me take up these various matters. There is the Fertilizer Act and the Seed Act and other acts, but fruit has been disposed of by the act passed recently. There is a very substantial amount of experimenting with apples being conducted constantly, apart from the experimental farm. At the exhibition last fall I saw a number of very choice boxes of apples which looked very tempting, and I think their cultivation might prove very successful in many parts of Canada. The same experiment is being conducted on the experimental farm, and in the Maritime provinces. I think I have dealt with my hon. friend's question.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Provisions as to use of established variety names and the licensing of new variety names:

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This section has been amended in committee by adding in the third line the words:

Agricultural or garden vegetable seeds or plants.

Mr. MacKELVIE: What does that mean?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is to permit of the registration of new varieties of plants through the Canadian Council of Horticulture, which is making provision for registration of both plants and trees, so that a record may be kept, just in the same way as there is a registration of animals. I think this is the first of its kind, not only in Canada, but on this continent.

Mr. MacKELVIE: What steps have to be taken by an applicant for registration?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was mistaken in saying that this work was not done in the United States. It has been started there, but the proposal is to make it international. The secretary of the Canadian Council of Horticulture is Mr. Burrows of the Fruit branch, and any communications addressed to him would secure the information desired. I think they are not quite organized yet. In the estimates, there is an item, which I do not think we have yet reached, covering an additional grant to the Canadian Council of Horticulture to carry on this work.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is a regular standard established, or under what conditions will these registrations be accepted? I presume some varieties will be eligible for registration and others not. What will be the line of demarcation?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The idea is to make such a thorough description of a variety that the party who has discovered it cannot be defrauded. A man may have spent years of toil in propagating a new plant, and this is to prevent others who may find out about it from stealing it. Cases where such a new variety has been stolen overnight have been known. This registration applies to apple trees, etc., bulbs and plants of all descriptions.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Provisions as to sale of seeds for export when purported to have been inspected and graded:

Mr. MacKELVIE: Will these seeds, when exported, be marked as Canadian, so as to establish a standard for our home-grown seeds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Under paragraph (a) the name and address of the seller will be on the package, and under paragraph (e)

the package must be marked with the name of the province and country where the seed was grown.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—Time limit complaint may be made against person from whom seed purchased:

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is to give a longer time for prosecution, and there is also a provision under which a purchaser in good faith shall not be liable to prosecution.

Section agreed to.

On section 16—Official samples to be taken in presence of witness:

Mr. MacKELVIE: What process will be necessary to satisfy the terms of this provision?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Simply as outlined, in the presence of a witness, so that it may be certain that the sample was taken correctly, and that the sample is what it purports to be.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved the second reading of Bill No. 15, respecting Chinese Immigration.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definitions:

Mr. McQUARRIE: Will the minister make a statement as to how this bill will affect the entry of Chinese into the country?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member might wait until section 5, "Entry and landing", is called.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Powers of Governor in Council:

Mr. STEVENS: There is one question I want the minister fully to elucidate and that is in reference to subsection (b) of section 3 which gives power to the Governor in Council to appoint officers in countries other than Canada for the purposes of endorsing passports or performing other duties under the act. I wish the minister would explain as fully as he can that subsection, having in mind the experience of the department during recent years, particularly I believe in 1920 and 1921, when the British Consul viséd the passports of intending immigrants with the result that there was at that time an increased influx of merchants from China.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not very clear as to how that occurred, but it would appear that approximately 1,200 Chinese registered as merchants in the year 1920-21. I have a record taken from the reports of the department with regard to this matter, but I may say that our intention is that the officer in China shall be responsible for the carrying out of the provisions of the act; that is to say, before a national of China can leave the country of origin, he will have to have his passport viséd by our officer. That practice obtains to a certain extent now; the passport is viséd by the British consul. But we believe that the British consul's duties are too numerous to allow him to devote the same attention to this matter as could be given by a Canadian officer stationed in China for the particular purpose, and there would be greater probability of the law being rigidly enforced by the appointment of a Canadian officer than would otherwise be the case. That is all we have in mind in connection with the appointment of an officer in China. When the bill was drawn up I assumed that the appointments and the fixing of salaries would come under the Civil Service Commission; and that is as I desire, with the single exception of the chief controller. I propose to amend subsection (a) of section 3 by striking it out and substituting the following:

Appoint any official of the Department of Immigration and Colonization to be chief controller.

That is the only reservation in the bill in regard to which I desire to have control, because this official is more or less in the position of a deputy minister. He will be selected from the Department of Immigration, so that we are not going outside the service that exists to fill the position.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the officers in other countries be appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I move that the subsection be amended as I have proposed.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS: Before we leave this section I want to make this observation. I am very sceptical of the success that will attend the appointment of this officer, and I do not

say this by way of criticism of the minister; I make the statement simply from past experience and from the known difficulty that attaches to this matter. I think that very great care should be exercised in the choice of the person or persons appointed and in the making of the regulations which will surround their activities on the other side.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is speaking of the officer who will be in China?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes. I can furnish the minister with evidence which is in the possession of the department to show that persons in Canton were in touch with people in this country for the purpose of advising and indeed of helping Chinese to evade the head tax, and this by deliberate design. This happened, too, a year or two ago. So I merely refer this to the minister in order that he may be fully seized of the significance of the move.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many appointments does the minister contemplate making? I suppose he is going to confine this to very, very narrow limits in China.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There will be only one official in China. I want to strike out subclause (e) dealing with the fixing of remuneration. I want to make this conform to the Civil Service Act.

Mr. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, from what took place in this House last session I understood orientals were to be excluded. Why, then, are we arranging to send people over to China to encourage Chinese immigration into this country?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend will look at section 5 he will observe that the class of Chinese to be allowed entry into Canada is very much restricted. There was no promise made last session that there would be total exclusion of orientals.

Mr. McBRIDE: Yes, I see that you are allowing Chinese merchants to come in all right, but from the tone of the debate on the immigration policy of the government which took place recently in this House I understood that we did not want immigrants to throng our cities. Then why let Chinese merchants come in to run our business? In the West we have quite sufficient of them at the present time in our cities.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that section 5, entry and landing, will afford hon. members wide scope for debate on the whole question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I want to amend subsection (b) by inserting after the word "appoint" the words:

—and fix the salary and remuneration of

Mr. STEVENS: I think the minister must have misunderstood my question. I asked him a moment ago if under subsection (b) these officers would be appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My understanding was, Mr. Chairman, that without special reference at all these appointments would automatically come under the Civil Service Commission. I find that is not the case. Therefore we have to make these changes. The only officer who will come under their control is the chief controller. I have had the section carefully reviewed by Mr. Edwards of the Justice department with that object in view.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the chairman kindly read subclause (b)?

The CHAIRMAN: Subclause (b) as proposed to be amended is as follows:

Appoint and fix the salary and remuneration of officers in countries other than Canada for the purpose of endorsing passports or performing other duties under this act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am afraid Mr. Edwards has gone wrong there. I would ask that the clause be allowed to stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 3 stands.

On section 5—Entry and landing—Immigration confined to certain classes, etc.

Mr. BAXTER: Going back to clause (e) of the interpretation section, I find that a Chinese immigrant is defined as meaning "any person of Chinese origin or descent entering Canada for the purpose of acquiring Canadian domicile." Then follows "a person shall not be deemed to be of Chinese origin or descent merely because his mother or his female ancestors or any of them were of
5 p.m. Chinese origin or descent." That has a bearing of course on section 5 as to persons of Chinese origin or descent. I ask the minister whether it is wise to continue—I suppose it is from an old act—that definition. After all, we do not want any more Chinese here than we can help. Well, do we want half any more than we want full-blooded Chinese?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is it not generally understood that nationality descends on the father's side?

Mr. BAXTER: So far as national status is concerned it would depend on the father, yes, but—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are many cases where Englishmen are married to Chinese women. Their offspring would be barred if there were not such a clause in the bill.

Mr. BAXTER: If whites choose to let down the racial standard to that extent, should not they keep their progeny in the East instead of bringing them in here? Does the minister think the bill is quite definite enough as to the exclusion of Chinese women? Of course they have to fall within the definition of merchants or students, but even as merchants I fancy we do not want them here. Would it not be well to make it absolutely clear that Chinese women cannot come in under any circumstances? I am very glad to see that section 5 begins with a declaration that Chinese origin or descent is to be irrespective of allegiance or citizenship, so that we cannot, as I understand it, have under this section any so-called Hong-Kong Chinese claiming British citizenship. That is a very good provision, but I would suggest that it might be made a little more emphatic as to the exclusion of women. I would also suggest that the minister reconsider the definition clause.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Since the bill was published a great many representations have been made from people in British Columbia—I am bound to say that they have no other motive apparently than that of a desire to be generous—asking particularly that the wives of Chinese merchants be admitted. Such women are not provided for in this bill. There is a fairly wide clause in section 9 of the Immigration Act which gives the minister discretion to admit anyone whom he may think it wise to allow to enter Canada.

Mr. NEILL: Could the minister give us an idea of who these bodies are in British Columbia who are so generous as to want the wives of Chinese merchants admitted?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are mostly representatives of religious bodies throughout Canada who are interested in this question. In addition there are a great many legal gentlemen, who no doubt are interested because they have Chinese clients. In fairness I ought to state that to the committee.

Mr. LUCAS: Are these bodies in British Columbia?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Quite a number of them.

Mr. CLARK: Have any legal bodies in British Columbia made representations? I never heard of them doing so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. CLARK: What organizations?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not suppose I have this in confidence; I have a letter from Tupper & Tupper, of Vancouver, appealing on behalf of certain clients of theirs. I suppose it is a matter of business with them.

Mr. CLARK: I was not asking for individuals, but for organizations. Have any representations been made by the Law Society, for instance?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Only religious organizations, or representatives of religious organizations.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has the minister heard anything from Bishop A. U. de Pencier, of Vancouver?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The minister knows that he has publicly stated that in his opinion orientals should be excluded from British Columbia. I think the minister has been furnished with the newspaper reports of the bishop's speech.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would like the minister to explain what changes will be made effective by reason of the passing of this bill. As I understand it, at the present time Chinese labourers are not admitted to Canada. As a matter of fact, under the regulations as they exist now the only classes admitted are merchants and students. If I am right in that respect, is this bill making any changes at all? Is this bill carrying out in any way the terms of the resolution which was passed last session calling for effective restriction of oriental immigration, and if so in what way?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is quite right. Under the regulations merchants and students are practically the only people to be admitted. Under the old act, as my hon. friend knows, the admission of Chinese was permitted upon payment of a head tax of $500, and there was no restriction as to numbers; so they came in. By regulation we have been doing this for the past two or three months, but we have no statutory enactment under which we might act. We

have simply been acting under the regulations.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What you propose to do now is to abolish the head tax altogether?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, we will not charge a merchant or a student the $500 head tax.

Mr. BAXTER: You do not limit the time a merchant may stay in the country do you?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. BAXTER: Under the section that the minister referred to, authorizing him to grant a permit irrespective of the other provisions of the act, there was a limitation; but after all, what is a merchant? If a man chooses to come to Vancouver for instance, and open a little fruit store he is a "merchant," I suppose. He can get in and stay there as a merchant. Is a laundryman a merchant?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. BAXTER: I would not think so; he does not buy or sell anything. Just what is going to happen to us? Will we be fed on Chinese fruit and go unlaundered, or what is the object?

Mr. STEVENS: I was rather waiting for the reading of the clause to be proceeded with, for as far as I am concerned the main contention will be around sub-clause (c) of section I as to the word "merchant." That is really the crux of this whole bill, or very largely so. There are other points that will arise as we proceed. Unless the minister has some definition to supply in regard to merchants I am afraid the measure will be received with considerable alarm by a large section of the public. I wonder, would the committee be interested if I just gave a few figures—I think they have been given before by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) but it is just as well to refresh our memory—as to the number of Chinese merchants in Vancouver. In Vancouver alone there are the following businesses carried on by Chinese:

5 garages, 40 butchers, 65 barbers, 172 grocers, 144 candy, ice cream and fruit, 63 gents' clothing, 9 hardware, 30 jewellers, 89 restaurants, 38 express and dray, 201 tobacconists, 29 wholesale dealers, 154 hawkers and peddlers, 5 printers and publishers, 50 boot and shoe dealers, 54 stationers, etc. etc.

These are all in the city of Vancouver, and when you consider the number operating in a city like that, it must be clear that there is no necessity for special provision for merchants to be admitted to engage in merchandising in this country. I think what the minister has in mind, and what we all have in mind, is the facilitating of international trade, trade between China and Canada, and I think we are quite prepared for the admission of such business men as are required to carry on that trade. But that is not at all what is in the mind of the Chinese when he suggests that merchants be allowed to enter free. What he means is to build up in Canada a merchandising group in all centres as far as he can. I was down at Kingston near here last year, where there are over 300 Chinese engaged in business in the city, including laundries, which were not included in the list I have just read. These men are running restaurants, fruit and grocery stores particularly, and tailoring shops. The same thing applies to many other eastern cities, and most of this, in fact all of it in the East, has grown up I think in the last ten years, and the impetus will increase as the years go by unless the movement is checked.

I fully appreciate the difficulty of facing this problem with the officials from China, and the same thing applies to Japan. It is difficult, but unfortunately we have got to speak plainly and as far as I am concerned I do so, I think, without passion. It is merely a question of economic necessity to further restrict this class. I think the whole answer to their contention that they have no intention of abusing the privilege is found in the records. I am quoting from memory, but I know I am not more than one or two out. Prior to October or November, 1920, the record shows that about two or three merchants a month were admitted to Canada. During that year we succeeded in stopping the movement whereby they had been bringing in a lot of Chinese students in direct violation of the correct interpretation of that privilege. When that was stopped they found a method of evading the regulation regarding merchants, and they switched to that. Up to that time, as I say, they were coming in at the rate of two or three a month. Suddenly the number rose to 25, 30, 40 and even as high as 400 a month for some months, until one year I think 1,400 came in, or approximately that number. The point I am getting at is this: If during that period only two or three a month came in, if that was the number covered by the normal movement without any undue restriction at all and then suddenly it increased to 300 and 400 a month it would seem that the entrance of such numbers is for some other purpose than merely trade. Now that is a feature we have got to face, and face very frankly in regard to this bill. I have not an amendment to move; I understand there is an amendment to be pro-

posed by the member for New Westminster. I want to say, as far as I am concerned, that I am not offering this opposition in the way of captious criticism or in order to add to the minister's perplexities, but with a genuine desire to try and solve this point—for I think this is really the main point in the whole bill, if we could solve it. Then the bill would probably be a step forward in the handling of this problem. I still maintain together with no doubt many others—I think all the other members from British Columbia—that the position Canada must come to sooner or later—and I believe it is long past due—is the position of exclusion. I cannot see any other way of surmounting this difficulty. But the government is offering this bill with assurances that it is doing its utmost, and we are desirous of meeting them, for the time being, half way without abandoning our principles in the matter. But we do wish to make this a fully effective measure—that is, that the intent in the minister's mind and the intent, I think, in the minds of most members of the House, shall be carried out. Now, unless the minister has something more effective to give us in connection with this subclause C it will be necessary, I think, to find some amendment during the consideration of this bill by the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might take advantage of this moment to say just a word as to the point of view from which the government has introduced this legislation. In dealing with the subject of immigration from the Orient there are two aspects which it seems to me, the committee will do well to keep more or less continuously in mind. First there is the aspect of our international relations with the great countries that lie on the other side of the Pacific. There is the other aspect, which perhaps appeals more immediately to us, of our own economic conditions and the problems in this country that arise therefrom, particularly where certain classes of our labour are brought into competition with labour from countries which have standards different from our own. As long as we keep these two points of view clearly in mind and distinguish between them—as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has in the main distinguished—I think there should be little difficulty in solving the problem as between the Orient and ourselves. If, however, we lose sight of the international aspect and use expressions—either unguardedly or for other reasons—which are certain to be repugnant to peoples of another part of the world, I am afraid that instead of helping to relieve a very serious situation we shall only be creating—perhaps not for ourselves but for others—a situation which will be infinitely worse.

For years past it has been recognized that it is not in the interest of Canada to admit to this country large numbers of persons from the Orient. Different methods have been attempted to restrict immigration. One method adopted in the case of the Chinese was that of imposing a poll tax, not of a very large amount at the outset, but which has amounted to something like $500 in recent years. That was found to be an ineffective method. So far as that method is concerned I would like to say to the committee it has always seemed to me it was objectionable from a point of view altogether apart from any economic consideration. It was objectionable that a country calling itself a Christian nation, should attempt in such a manner to deal with a problem which immediately affects oriental civilization. I could never see how Canada, from any self respecting point of view, could impose a poll tax on working people coming from another country, and at the same time have its population subscribe to funds for missionary purposes to teach the heathen the most elementary principles of Christianity. The government has shared that view, and has felt that any indiginity of the character of the imposition of a poll tax upon a people in any other part of the world was something to which we, as a Christian community, should not lend our approval. So we have decided to abolish the head tax for that reason if for no other.

However, from the economic point of view, the position we have taken is that the head tax is ineffective as a method of restriction, and that some more effective method should be adopted. The question has mainly to do with industrial problems; with the classes of oriental labour that come into competition with our labour. Hon. members will perhaps recall that when the Chinese Minister resident at Washington recently visited Ottawa, he gave an address in these buildings in which he announced that speaking for China, he was prepared to say, that China would forego the privilege of sending a single coolie or wroking man into Canada rather than sacrifice the friendship of this country, if the sending of any labour whatever into Canada was liable to be at the cost of that friendship. He took the broad view that what the Chinese were anxious for was the good-will of other countries with whom they hoped to have dealings of different kinds. He recognized the immigration problem, and he said quite frankly that the Chinese people would not take offence at a law which was

aimed at restricting immigration. He let it be clearly understood, however, that the Chinese would still desire to have the just respect of other countries, or of the peoples of other countries, and would not want to be subjected to the indignity which exclusion from another country would involve. I do not think it is possible to talk of excluding the peoples of any country, of excluding all of the people—regardless altogether of what their standing or standards may be —and not offend the entire nation concerned; I do not think it is in the interest of Canada, or of any part of the British Empire, that any Dominion of the Empire should knowingly pass an act, which is certain to be regarded as an act of offence to an entire nation.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What about the United States?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking of British freedom at the moment. I am speaking of the conception of British freedom as I understand it; I have never known a time when the British flag has stood for inflicting anything in the nature of an indignity upon the people of any country in the world.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What about Australia and New Zealand?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think my hon. friend can point to an act of exclusion of all Chinese from Australia or New Zealand.

Mr. McQUARRIE: No, but that is the effect of the legislation in those countries at the present time, is it not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not saying what the effect of this legislation may be when it is passed. What I am saying is that no country that I know of, under the British flag, has ever attempted, or in the name of British justice and fair play, and fair dealings with the peoples of other parts of the world would attempt, to enact an exclusion law against another nation, regardless altogether of the status or standing of the classes that may be affected.

So far as labour, so far as the question of economic competition is concerned, the Chinese themselves have stated that they do not object, and will not feel that they are being subjected to any indignity by this parliament taking whatever action it thinks best in the matter of restricting immigration; and we are taking by this bill, a step which will mean the effective restriction of all Chinese immigration, indeed of all classes of Chinese, coming to this country other than such as it is admitted, come to this country in our interest as much as in the interest of the Chinese themselves.

We hope to have trading relations with the Orient. We hope in some way to make our contribution to their civilization along with what other countries may be doing in that regard. We have no desire to exclude from Canada the scholars of China. We have no desire to exclude the young men and the young women of China who may wish to come to our universities and study here with a view to gaining some of the enlightenment of which we boast so much, to carry that enlightenment back to their own country. If in the matter of world competition we are going to hold our own with the Orient eventually, it will be by the standards in the Orient being raised, rather than by any other means, that that great end will be achieved. To the degree that we help the Orient in this particular we will be benefiting ourselves. In the legislation being brought forward, we have made provision that certain of the classes whom it is in our interest as well as in the interest of the Chinese to have come to Canada, may be permitted to come, but permitted to come within such limits as the government at all times thinks wise—and not beyond that. The head tax is repealed by this law. In its place the bill provides that only certain persons are to be allowed to come to Canada. It makes no mention whatever in that connection of the labour class. To that extent the law is a complete exclusion of all labour coming from China. It is as regards Chinese labour in effect an exclusion law. On the other hand it does mention two or three classes which we think should be permitted to come. In regard to those classes, it leaves the control of the situation in the hands of the minister administering the Department of Immigration and the officers of that department. It is proposed to send to the Orient an officer under the control of the Minister of Immigration who will have to visé every passport before it will be accepted on this side. The minister has it in his power and will continue to have it in his power to make regulations under this act, with respect to any particular class that may be permitted to come in. Take the class to which my hon. friend has just referred, that of merchant. I agree with him absolutely that the list he has gone over is a list no government could ever countenance for one moment under the head of "merchants". I do think it is desirable, if we hope to trade with the Orient, that men who are in a position to carry on export and import trade to an

extent that is likely to be of service to both countries should come to this country and by so coming promote further trade relations. I think if we permit them to come we ought to permit their wives and children to come with them. I do not think we should take the position that we will allow a merchant, a man of high business standing, to come to our country and start up in business, and subject him to the indignity of not being permitted to bring his wife and children with him. I would stand for a very rigid guarding of that provision, to see that the law was carried out to the letter, but this should always be taken into account as respects the legislation we are now proposing; namely that those who will be permitted to come to Canada from China will be determined, not after their arrival here, but before their departure from China, and will be determined by an officer of the government itself in accordance with the regulations which the minister may think it wise to lay down.

With regard to merchants, I think it should be understood that only those who would come within the category I have mentioned, of persons carrying on business in a large way, the business of import and export as between Canada and China, should come within that definition. I think it would be wiser to leave it to the minister by regulation further precisely to define what comes within that broad definition, than that we should attempt, in the statute, to insert words which might occasion offence to the Chinese. Similarly in regard to students, where we reserve to ourselves the right to visé the passports of those who come, by an officer of our government stationed in China, who has to be statisfied as to the bona fides of the student being admitted. I think we ought to be prepared to allow a certain latitude to the minister as to whom to admit. The United States, Great Britain and other countries have all felt it to their advantage, not merely to admit these students, but to encourage them to come. After the Boxer uprising, the United States' government thought it was a wise thing to turn over for the purpose of encouraging Chinese students to come to the United States, all the money which came to it by way of indemnity. These Chinese students have come, have studied in the universites and have gone back, and they have been missionaries, not merely of the gospel, many of them, but also missionaries of trade, so far as the United States is concerned. I remember having a few years ago the privilege of travelling in China, and seeing something of the country, and how great was my surprise to see the extent to which the supplies in the trains were American merchandise,—the glassware, the cutlery, stoves, clocks, many different kinds of manufacture. Wherever one went in one's travels, in the hotels, and elsewhere one found traces of American manufacture. That applies also to canned fruit, vegetables and the like. Why should Canada not share in that great trade, as well as the American people? We cannot share in it if we are going to shut everybody out and adopt a system of complete exclusion.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How did the Americans get that trade? They exclude Chinese.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member has not listened to what I have just been saying in regard to the American government encouraging the students to come. They have gone by hundreds to the universities in the states. What is the sense of talking of American exclusion? They are being encouraged at this very time to come.

Mr. CLARK: What have the students to do with the trade of the country?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Surely the hon. member has intelligence enough to see the bearing of a matter of that kind.

Mr. CLARK: I asked a question and I thought I might get a courteous answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thought I was giving a courteous answer. If the hon. member wants me to explain in A. B. C. fashion I can do so.

Mr. CLARK: I was asking the question without any reflection on the minister's intelligence, and I thought I might get an answer without any reflection on my intelligence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg pardon if I have reflected upon the hon. member's intelligence. I did not intend so to do. If the hon. member were to spend three or four years in China as a student, coming in touch with the commercial, industrial and social life of China, when he returned to this country, let us assume as a professor, a teacher of economics or any other subject in one of the universities, he would be the very first to tell his pupils and to tell those with whom he came in contact, of the products, manufactures and other commodities which China was in a position to send to Canada. He would be in a very short time, unless I mistake altogether his character in that regard, a missionary in respect to many of the questions which affect relations between China

and ourselves. The extent to which the Chinese students have studied in American universities is vitally affecting the relations between the United States and China to-day. They go back to China educated men, the men who control the press of their country, who find their way into parliament, who become the diplomats of their country. They are the ones who are in the position to control, in a very large way, the whole question of trade relations between the countries. I think we have already suffered a great deal in this country through not having given a like encouragement.

Mr. STEVENS: If I may be allowed to interrupt, I wish to say that we admitted students, but where the hon. gentleman is in error both in regard to students and merchants is this: We are not objecting to the bona fide student as described here, in a Canadian institute of higher education at all, but the Chinese themselves deliberately evaded the regulations and brought in hundreds, indeed thousands, of Chinese who never went to any institute of learning. They were admitted on that understanding; but while they, perhaps, attend one of our public schools for a few days or a short time, they are afterwards found here and there in ordinary labour.

The evasion in the case of merchants is of a similar character, and the difficulty is this: The Chinese put an altogether different interpretation on the prefession of merchant from what we do. For instance, a dozen Chinament will form a little company to run a store, and every one of them individually is a merchant. We would say that there was one merchant there and eleven clerks. They say that there are a dozen merchants, and in this way they evade and have evaded the regulations. I pointed out a moment ago that we used to have only two or three merchants coming in a month, whereas the number suddenly leaped to 400 a month, showing that there was a deliberate conspiracy to evade the regulation. Therefore, if the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will catch our complaint, it is not against merchants or students, if we can pin down the correct interpretation. In this regard I think students are correctly defined, but merchants are not. That is the point that I tried to raise a moment ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am absolutely at one with the hon. member in what he says about preventing evasions and the like. I would not countenance for a moment any evasion of the law by either student or merchant. I am pointing out to him that this legislation differs from anything in the nature of regulations we have heretofore had, in that under its provisions we contemplate placing in China an officer of our own government who will himself have to visé every passport. He will be under the direction of the minister, and, if so desired he can be in communication with the minister, by cable day by day. If he finds that merchants are making application to him in too large numbers, he can take his time to find out the standing of the men who are coming, and if the minister's regulations are not broad enough to cover what we all understand and what we want to have understood as coming within the provisions of the law, the minister will have an opportunity of amending his regulations accordingly. What I am asking the committee to consider at the moment is the international aspect of the language we use in the statutes. These enactments are read in China as well as in this country. If we can by regulation meet effectively the object that we in Canada are all aiming at, and avoid what is invidious and what makes for international illwill, surely it is to the interest of all classes in this country that we do so. I cannot think of anyone who will take exception to that point of view. The government has adopted an effective method of restriction by undertaking to see that passports are viséd in China before the persons to whom the passports are given leave that country. If we can agree upon the status of the man, for example, who is to be included within the merchant class, we ought to treat him in a generous way, and we ought also to take a broad and liberal attitude as regards students.

When I was interrupted, I was about to say that I know General Sir Arthur Currie of McGill and Sir Robert Falconer of Toronto both feel very strongly on this subject. They have represented to the government that they would be glad to see Chinese students coming to their respective universities. We must go this much further. If we are to expect students to attend our universities, we must give them the privilege of attending some preparatory college for a short time before they are admitted to the universities. All of that need be only a matter of regulation; it need not lend itself to evasion unless a government wished to lend itself to that, and I do not think any government would do so. The point I wish to make at the moment is the wisdom of recognizing the dual aspect of the legislation we are discussing, the economic and the international aspects, the care that must be taken in discussing international questions, while dealing with matters

which on this side are primarily of economic concern.

Mr. TOLMIE: British Columbians as a whole are anxious to maintain international relations and also to maintain our high standard as a Christian community; but we do not want to do that at the expense of giving up our country to the Asiatics. I will just read this telegram from the Retail Merchants' Association of Victoria:

> Retail Merchants of Victoria strongly opposed to Bill 45 feeling that the word "merchant" is much too vague. Oriental question in British Columbia has become alarming.
>
> H. O. KIRKHAM,
> President.

We might glance just for a moment at the result of past legislation. In 1885, we had a head tax passed of $50 a head on Chinese. In 1901, this was increased to $100; in 1904, to $500, and in 1919, an order in council was passed keeping out skilled and unskilled labour. Then certain privileges were extended to students, and as has already been pointed out by one of the representatives from British Columbia, the Chinese abused that privilege. After a "student" came in he would attend a school for a short time, and then he would be found peeling potatoes in some hotel kitchen. He was not a student at all, but simply a labourer. We extended certain privileges to merchants, and in one year, 1921, no less than 1,145 "merchants" came in under that heading. In 1904, the Chinese population of Canada was only 14,000. It is now 58,000 and 38,000 of those are located in British Columbia. This indicates that our past legislation has been totally inadequate to meet the situation. I feel, like some hon. gentlemen who have spoken already, that if we do not have total exclusion, we must have something as close to that as possible, if we are going to get along and attain the ends we desire.

In the present bill before the House, the clause dealing with merchants leaves the question pretty wide open. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Prime Minister, and I must say that if this inspector whom he is going to send over to the other side is to keep out Chinese merchants or to have them come in only under the proper head, strict regulations will have to be made and carried out to the letter. This is of the utmost importance to us in British Columbia. I have lived in British Columbia all my life, and I can remember when in Victoria there was only one Chinese merchant; now we have thousands of them located there, and there are thousands of them in Vancouver. We have them controlling several lines of agricultural work; we have them controlling practically, or very nearly, the whole of the fishing business and gaining on us every year, and they are becoming more powerful now that they have money as they did not have before. If the white people of British Columbia are going to be able to compete with these Chinese, they must lower their standard of living, live under cheaper conditions and in cheaper houses, wear cheaper clothes and eat less food. The Chinese do not and never will assimilate with our people, as has been proved to be the case in every country in which they have settled. We quite understand that the application of regulations that will be necessary will bring hardship on some people; but we must meet the situation courageously and apply those regulations in an effective manner. The whole aim of our immigration regulations and laws is to keep out the bad and undesirable people, and to let in those that are good.

I might refer for a moment to conditions existing across the Pacific, the tremendous populations there. In China alone there is a population of 400,000,000, many of whom have been kept on the edge of starvation owing to the heavily populated condition of the country, with the result that it has been found in all countries where they have settled, they are able to put up a class of work more cheaply and under rougher conditions than any other labour that is to be found in the world.

Let us consider what might happen in the case of a little laxity in our immigration laws. In the United States at the end of the Civil War, there was a coloured population of only 400,000. This has increased until at the present time there are over 10,000,000. Surely that is enough to make Canadians sit up and take notice of this Asiatic question. We cannot be too particular in allowing immigration to come to this country, for the reason that the very same men whom we are allowing in now, and their offspring, will in the future play an important part in building up the national life of this country, and the standard of our national life should be jealously guarded in every possible way.

I quite agree that we should like to have oriental trade, but if we are going to permit any laxity in connection with Chinese immigration or make too many concessions in order to get this trade, we shall find in all probability that we shall secure this trade at the expense of many of the industries of the country. My experience of Asiatics, and particularly the Chinese, has been in the past that they will buy where they can get goods cheapest. If we have goods to sell at prices that appeal to the Chinese, the 400,000,000 on

the other side will not spend much time arguing about the privileges extended to the 50,000 or 60,000 Chinese here. One of our principal troubles in the past has been I think the inability of the people east of the Rocky mountains to grasp the Asiatic situation in its full significance. Many persons in the professions have contended that we should allow more Chinese to come into the country. I can quite understand that, because there are no Chinamen in this country engaged in these professions; and the professional people have taken good care to preclude Chinese competition against themselves, having fenced their professions around with various regulations to render such competition impossible. But the farmers, the labourers, the laundry people, the restaurant people, the tailors, and now even the merchants of the country are feeling this competition. In British Columbia we have passed year after year certain legislation asking the federal government to put into effect a proper exclusion of Asiatics. This matter has been urged principally by the business organizations who have passed resoiutions and forwarded them to Ottawa. The business people have fallen into line behind these resolutions but with no definite results, for we find to-day that the Chinese are still coming in across the Pacific and locating in our country in large numbers, in spite of such regulations as have been enforced; which proves that our laws have been inadequate in the past to meet this situation. The Chinese question has now assumed very serious proportions, so that we have to-day a difficult oriental problem to solve. I think that the people of Canada must wake up to the danger from this Asiatic invasion from across the Pacific. If we hope to preserve this country to the white man, our legislators and the members of this House should realize the great responsibility that rests on their shoulders not only for the protection of those people who are now in this country, but in the interests of the generations to come. I must oppose the bill in its present form and hope the minister will have a suitable amendment to offer.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think it goes without saying that the experience of the past has taught us that regulations and even statutes do not always accomplish what they are intended to do; and in discussing this matter with the law officers who drafted the bill I thought it would be preferable that the definition of the word "merchant" be left to regulation rather than embodied in the statute. I take it that the object to be attained is not to interefere with trade but as far as possible to restrict the permanent immigration of Chinese nationals into Canada. There can be no objection to the student body, nor do I hear anyone voicing any such objection. Rather, there is a feeling that we should encourage Chinese students to come to Canada to take advantage of our educational institutions in order that they might go back and be emissaries to assist in the development of trade. But I can hardly agree with some of the views expressed opposite that if we go practically to the point of total exclusion there will not be a falling off of trade between Canada and China, which is beginning to be an important factor. However, I am not stressing that point; I merely say that we are agreed about one class at all events, namely, the students who will go into the universities.. It has been pointed out to us since the bill was drafted that the qualification of the young men or young women passing out of the high schools of China is not sufficiently high to permit the immediate entry of Chinese students into our universities, and we shall have in some way to provide for their attendance at a school for a period of six months or more to qualify them for the university. This is necessary; but I wish to assure the committee that care will be taken that no students coming to Canada to enter the university shall be allowed, as the hon. member (Mr. Tolmie) pointed out, to alter their purpose as they have done in the past and enter some occupation after five or six months. It is the intention of the department to follow up by registration each national of China resident in Canada. Whether he is a British subject or not, the Chinese resident in Canada will have to register. I have been endeavouring to keep in mind the objection raised, particularly in British Columbia, and indeed it applies to other parts of Canada, that the Chinese are entering into active competition with the citizens of this country in practically every mercantile pursuit. Having that in mind I thought it fair to the committee that I should intimate the kind of regulation which would be forwarded to the official in China whose duty it will be to visé passports before Chinese may be allowed to come to Canada. This regulation is to define as nearly as possible the sort of person we propose to allow to enter this country. The following gives an idea of what we intend to provide in this respect:

It is contemplated making an agreement with China to limit the number per annum of Chinese merchants to be admitted to Canada, and in such an event the government of China would be asked to issue passports to none but bona fide merchants who devote their undivided attention to mercantile pursuits, who have

at least $2,500 invested in business in China and are prepared to invest a like amount in Canada in a business dealing exclusively in goods grown, produced or manufactured in China.

Hon. gentlemen will see that a merchant according to this definition would be a man who had been engaged in mercantile pursuits in China previous to making application for passport from the Chinese government; and having that passport visé by the Canadian officer he would require to have been in business in China and had $2,500 invested therein. In addition, when he came to Canada he could engage only in business dealing in goods grown, manufactured or produced in China.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Have you any control over him?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Absolutely. The act provides also that if he fails in any respect in carrying out the provisions under which he entered Canada—and my hon. friend will realize that not very many will qualify under that provision—he shall be subject to deportation.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If he engages in any other occupation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. Once he departs from the provisions surrounding his entry into Canada, in other words, if he engages in any other business than that described, the provision of deportation shall apply.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What section has the minister quoted?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): What I have read is not in the bill; I am giving the regulation which we intend putting into effect to define the word "merchant."

Mr. McQUARRIE: But the deportation clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend will find it in section 27, if I remember correctly.

Mr. NEILL: I understood the minister to say that he proposes to make an arrangement with the Chinese government to limit the number of immigrants coming in per annum. What is the limit?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was quoting from the memorandum dealing with the definition of a merchant, namely, an individual engaged in mercantile pursuits. He might be engaged in any mercantile pursuit in China, but whatever line he was engaged in he had to have $2,500 invested in his business.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. NEILL: The minister began by saying; It is proposed to make an arrangement with China to limit the number. Will he look at that memorandum again and tell us what is to be the limited number?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend will have to treat that in the larger sense. Of course, there is a very great limitation of numbers in regard to Chinese immigration bcause it is confined now to merchants, students and members of the diplomatic corps.

Mr. NEILL: Clearly the minister proposes to make an arrangement to limit the number of Chinese merchants that are to come in in any year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, my hon. friend has taken the wrong interpretation.

Mr. NEILL: Will he read it again?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Certainly; but it does not deal definitely with the word "merchant". There is a definition of the word " merchant " by regulation. This is a restriction all around.

Mr. NEILL: Will the hon. minister read the first few lines of that regulation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know perfectly well what my hon. friend has in mind The reference to numbers means numbers of merchants.

Mr. NEILL: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): But that is not our intention.

Mr. McBRIDE: The right hon. Prime Minister stated that he would allow merchants to bring in their wives and families. I understand there are very few Chinese merchants in Canada that have not two or three wives. Would the Prime Minister admit to Canada only the children of the merchant by one wife, or would he let in the whole of them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would allow him one wife and any children by that wife.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Which wife?

Mr. CLARK: Did I understand the minister to say in introducing this section that this bill is merely intended to enact regulations which are already in existence?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. The old act provides for the entry of Chinese on payment of head tax; there was no restriction on the number of immigrants so long as they each paid the stipulated head tax. Within

recent months we have refused admission of Chinese immigrants under a general regulation. Now we are by this bill naming the individuals who may come to Canada.

Mr. CLARK: The effect of the regulation and the bill is the same?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend does not see that the general regulation can be used the other way at any moment. At the present time the general regulation is taken advantage of to exclude labourers. The government has taken that step within the last three months; but another government might take an entirely opposite line under that general regulation. The purpose of this bill is to do away with the possibility of letting in any number of Chinese labourers regardless of regulations.

Mr. CLARK: This particular section is objectionable in that it gives full power to the minister or a representative of the department to say what class of merchants are to be admitted. The minister has given us a regulation which he proposes to bring into force. It does seem to me that there should be no doubt in the minds of anyone here as to the meaning of the term "Chinese merchant." I think that should be clearly defined. I am not sure whether the minister's definition goes far enough or not, but I think we should define what a Chinese merchant is, and if the definition does not work in practice next year we can amend it. But it will have this result, we will all know what the effect of this measure is. If the minister is allowed to make regulations he may change them from time to time, or another government might disapprove of the spirit of this bill and by changing the regulations change the whole law. It really comes down to order in council government. It savours of autocracy—the very thing my hon. friend has taken exception to in the past.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I listened with much interest to the remarks of the Prime Minister and particularly what he said respecting students. I feel that we are all agreed on the advisability of allowing students to come into this country under proper safeguards, providing they are bona fide students who are attending our universities. Even in the resolution which I had the honour to move last session asking for the exclusion of orientals it was distinctly stipulated, if not in the resolution itself, in the discussion which took place upon it, that we were not at all opposed to the entry of students. But we all know that there has been a great deal of illegal entry under this head in years past, and I am afraid that the same kind of thing has kept up. I have in my hand a telegram from the secretary of the Retail Merchants' Association of New Westminster dated March 24th of this year, reading as follows:

> On Thursday March 22nd Chinese employees at Rainbow Shingle Mills Port Coquitlam struck work owing to a white man having got a job on a saw cutting twenty-four inch shingles, which saw one of their nationality was removed from and put to another machine to cut shingles of smaller size. Mills meantime closed down but expected to resume Monday with white crew working. At United Shingle Mills here as packer Chinese boy who entered country as a student one month ago. Association desire you be acquainted of these facts in view of present bill before parliament.

What does that show? It shows that a Chinese boy admitted as a student was found one month later working in a shingle mill at Port Coquitlam, and not only was he working there, but he was the cause of a strike in that mill because of the fact that his employer had the hardihood to change him from a saw at which orientals had been previously employed and put a white man in his place. That shows that we must be very careful in admitting students. I am sure the minister realizes that to the full and that the proper precautions will be taken. I took occasion to draw this telegram to his attention, and he has I think made some investigation. He has asked me to get him further particulars, for which I have sent, and, I am sure that when this Chinese is located the minister will take steps to have him deported.

As has already been stated, we have a large number of Chinese merchants in British Columbia. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre has told us about conditions in the city of Vancouver. I might add that since the figures which he quoted were compiled it appears that the orientals have been invading still further the business life of Vancouver, and at the present time there are something like two thousand trade licenses issued to orientals in that city alone. The same condition applies to other cities and towns in British Columbia, except, of course, that the other places being smaller have fewer oriental merchants, but the proportion keeps up. I know that in the city of New Westminster we have a great many oriental merchants. They are engaged in various lines of business and in almost every trade, and seem to be acquiring a very strong foothold.

I have tried to approach this subject from a non-political standpoint; I think we have all done that. We are not trying to make political capital out of it. On various occasions I have even gone to the extent of making excuses for the Minister of Immigration by pointing out that he had a very difficult duty to perform. I have also on many occasions stated my belief that he was approaching this question in a conscientious way and was trying to do his very best to keep the orientals out of this country. Perhaps I went too far in that direction. Possibly I have been blamed to a certain extent for the want of initiative on the part of the minister, but I still believe that he is really trying to do something in this important matter.

I have in my hand a telegram from the secretary of the Retail Merchants' association of New Westminster dealing with this particular bill. It is dated April 24 of this year and is addressed to myself:

Being advised from Ottawa that the government will not eliminate or change the word "merchant" in bill No. 45 we the Retail Merchants Association of New Westminster notwithstanding your assurance of the fair-mindedness of the Minister of Immigration—

I would draw the minister's attention to that statement and remind him of my previous remark, that I have always endeavoured to point out that he was fair-minded on this question and was trying to do his best:

—cannot but feel that Department of Immigration in proposing to allow Chinese merchants to enter into this country do so as a direct reproof to the great body of retail merchants of Canada for their concerted action last year on the oriental question, and as free Canadian citizens we resent and protest with all our power this aggression on the part of the government. However we still hope and pray that the government will see fit to change this act so that the menace to the retailer and to the people of Canada of an ever increasing army of Chinese merchants will be eliminated. Feeling very intense here. We feel every effort should be exerted now. Wire us our expense if there is anything further we can do we have also wired Premier and the Minister of Immigration as follows:

"We the Retail Merchants Association of New Westminster with a membership of 102 employing upward of 900 wage earners as a class resent the action of the government in drafting a Chinese immigration bill that will allow Chinese merchants to enter Canada to open up business in direct competition with Canadian merchants and we respectfully implore that the word 'merchant' be changed to the wording submitted by the Retail Merchants Association of Canada".

I have here that proposed amendment and I intend to suggest this amendment to the committee:

That section 5 be amended by striking out subsection (c) (1) and substituting therefor the following:

(c) (1) Trade representatives—

It replaces "merchants" by "trade representatives"—

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

Trade representatives shall include sales agents and purchasing agents while representing bona fide Chinese exporters and importers carrying on international trade between Canada and China, buying from or selling to persons, firms, or corporations in Canada. No trade representative shall conduct any retail, wholesale, or jobbing warehouse or shop in Canada.

I suppose we are all agreed that trade between the countries should be encouraged, but the objection which I have is this: If the bill goes through in its present form we will have a further influx of Chinese merchants. They will not come for the purpose of doing business with their own people because there are enough Chinese merchants in the country now to attend to the wants of the Chinese who are here, and as we are not going to allow any more Chinese to come into Canada we cannot expect that there will be an additional growth of business for Chinese merchants. So that there is really no necessity for that class of merchants in this country. If the Chinese merchants are confined to international trade then, of course, it will be quite in order to allow them to enter Canada.

In this same connection I have a statement which was made by the late Theodore Roosevelt dealing more particularly with the Japanese, because the Chinese have been excluded from the United States for a great many years. To-day they have no Chinese question there. They have a Japanese problem which is very serious, particularly in the Pacific states of Washington, Oregon and California. That situation was brought about by the restriction of Japanese immigration as against the exclusion of the Chinese, and it is a very clear and convincing demonstration of the utility of the two methods. Now, Theodore Roosevelt was a friend of the Japanese. He was a student and was one of the greatest Americans of the present generation. In a letter written on the 11th of February, 1909, he expressed himself in a very fair-minded manner when he declared himself as follows:

Let the arrangement between Japan and the United States be entirely reciprocal. Let the Japanese and Americans visit one another's countries with entire freedom as tourists, scholars, professors, sojourners for study or pleasure, or for puposes of international business—

That is what my amendment suggests, for the purposes of international business.

—but keep out labourers, men who want to take up farms, men who want to go into the small trades—

I call particular attention to that.

—men who want to go into the small trades, or even in professions where the work is of a non-international character; that is, keep out of Japan those Americans who wish to settle and become part of the resident

working population, and keep out of America those Japanese who wish to adopt a similar attitude. This is the only wise and proper policy.

It is merely a recognition of the fact that, in the present stages of social advancement of the two peoples, whatever may be the case in the future, it is not only undesirable, but impossible that there should be intermingling on a large scale, and the effort is sure to bring disaster. Let each country also behave with scrupulous courtesy, fairness and consideration to the other.

It seems to me that we can adopt exactly the same attitude in this country without in any way expressing any antagonism towards the Chinese; and I may say that I appreciate the good qualities of the Chinese in many ways, particularly in a business sense. The Chinaman is a good business man, he is a fair business man, and when he sells you an article you get what he represents it to be. He is thoroughly honest and in every way is a good business man. I have every respect for the industry of the Chinaman, and as far as it goes in their own country, the Chinese no doubt are very estimable people. The great difficulty is that in this country they cannot be assimilated and therefore they always exist as a foreign element in our midst. It is a bad thing for us to encourage Chinese merchants to come to this country because they do not help to build up Canada. What money they make here, or a great proportion of the money they make here, goes back to China. The same thing applies to a great extent to the Japanese. If inquiry were made at the post offices in British Columbia cities or towns we would be surprised at the large sums that are sent out weekly and monthly by the Japanese and Chinese. In the case particularly of the latter, the money that they make here goes back in great part to China. As far as the Chinese are concerned their great ambition is to return to their native land after they have made a fortune in this country. They live in an altogether different way to what we do. In a great many cases the Chinese, and the Japanese also, live in their own stores. A Chinaman can make a success of his business on such a small margin of profit that a white man cannot compete with him; that has been demonstrated very clearly out in British Columbia. I would say to the minister "Let us encourage trade with China as far as we can do so, but do not let us sacrifice this country simply for the purpose of endeavouring to pander to the Chinese."

I would say that if this amendment is adopted it will strengthen the hands of the government. It would be better and less embarrassing for the government to have a provision of this kind in the act itself rather than in the regulation. I am opposed to the principle of putting such an important enactment in a regulation rather than in the act itself. It seems to me it would be more satisfactory for the government to be able to point to an act rather than to have to say "Here is a regulation which provides certain things." Because the answer is always ready "Well, a regulation can be changed by order in council. Why not pass an order in council amending your regulation so as to give us the conditions as we desire them?" I would strongly impress upon the minister the advisability of clearing this thing up. I think it would be a great mistake to allow the bill to go through in its present form. It would be embarrassing to him, and I am sure it would bring about a condition of affairs which later on would be very disturbing. We have enough Chinese merchants in the country now, certainly in British Columbia and I think from our experience you should know that the Chinese, and the Japanese for that reason, are not going to be kept out of this eastern country merely because of the climate. I think you will find, if this thing goes on, that later on you will have here a great many Chinese merchants. You are getting them now. You have them in Ottawa, you have them in Toronto, you have them in Montreal. They are getting into all the large cities, and if you allow more of these Chinese merchants to enter the country you are going to be in very bad shape in a few years.

There is another thing that appeals to me and that is, that after a man comes here as a merchant, you have a great deal of difficulty in keeping tab on him. If a man cannot make a success as a merchant, what are you going to do with him? Are you going to send him back to China? I think you will find a great deal of difficulty in doing that. You are finding it very difficult now to deport drug addicts. Objections of all kinds are raised, and, as far as my information goes, you have been unsuccessful in deporting drug addicts. When you get them into the country you have practically no control over them, and if a man is allowed to come into Canada as a merchant you have no guarantee that, in a very few years, or a very few months for that matter, he may not be engaged in some other business. I think the proper thing to do would be to insert some kind of an amendment. If this amendment proposed is not satisfactory to the minister, possibly he can word the amendment in some other way, but

the result to be desired is that we shall not allow Chinese to come here as merchants, to compete with our own people. It is too dangerous.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I merely desire to place on record a communication received from the Retail Merchants' Association of my town, similar in purport to that read by other members from British Columbia this afternoon. It reads:

Re Bill 45. We view with alarm government proposal permitting Chinese merchants entry to Canada. Feel confident you will strenuously urge elimination of term "merchants" or request amendment clearly defining status of merchants entering Canada for temporary or permanent residence.

In view of what has been disclosed by the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), and the member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie), regarding the rapidity with which the retail business of Vancouver and the other coast cities has been gobbled by orientals during the past few years, it is not surprising that the retail merchants of British Columbia towns view this bill with a great deal of well-grounded suspicion. Indeed, in my own city of Vernon, they have an added reason for feeling dubious as to the results, because they have an object lesson before their eyes in the manner in which the vegetable productions of the Okanagan country have been practically taken control of during the past few years by the Chinese and Japanese population.

I feel diffident and hesitant about speaking on this subject again this session. I have already spoken on two occasions regarding oriental immigration since this session opened, and I will restrict my remarks to a very small area, indeed. I merely desire to say that all past efforts in the way of restrictive measures have proved almost futile, that the wily oriental has found some means or subterfuge to circumvent any regulations that may have been imposed upon him, and he certainly will find in this word "merchant" in this act a loop-hole which will enable orientals to come, in increasing numbers, to British Columbia, unless his status is more definitely defined than in the statute. We feel that the minister and the members from the East can hardly realize the situation, and while we feel perfectly confident that it is the duty of the minister and of the departments of government to encourage trade and commerce with other nations, we also realize that you can purchase commerce at too dear a price, and the fact remains, and is staring us in the face in British Columbia, that if oriental immigration is to be allowed to continue, with the present spread and growth of the population already there by natural increase in a very short time indeed there will be very few white people in British Columbia with whom any oriental nation can carry on trade.

I do not know exactly whether the amendment proposed by the hon. member for New Westminister is the remedy that should be applied in this case, but I feef certain the minister will discover that, when he sends the administrator of this act to China, he will find that that gentleman, no matter what his qualifications may be, no matter how strong a character he may have, or how he may endeavour to fulfil his obligations, will be subjected to very great pressure indeed and will be offered all kinds of inducements to relax the restrictions. I regard that as altogether an unsafe way to carry on business. I should like very much to see the regulations which the minister proposes, and which seem reasonable in one respect, at least, to be embodied in this bill. I believe it is infinitely preferable to have a large tax imposed rather than to deal with the matter by means of regulations. The public men will know exactly what they have to depend upon, and I have little apprenhension—in fact I have none—as to any danger of offending the pride of any foreign nation by restrictive measures as to immigration. Surely, it is conceded that any country is privileged to impose such restrictive measures as it deems fair to itself, and no exception can be reasonably taken to any method to keep in our own hands the control of immigration into this country.

I am not going to labour the question any further. I merely rose to enter upon and record the protest received from the Retail Merchants' Association of my town, and to say that I am thoroughly of the opinion that it is far better to strain the act to the utmost in the way of restrictions than to leave any loop-hole, such as is permitted in this bill under consideration.

Mr. NEILL: I was under the impression when this bill was introduced that it was one to restrict Chinese immigration, but listening to the speeches this afternoon and evening I was beginning to wonder if, at least in British Columbia, or in some parts of British Columbia, there is not an impression that it is intended to increase Chinese immigration. We were told this afternoon, not from one, but from three or four sources, how the Retail Merchants' Association of this place or that place is all "het up" on this subject. One hon. member's wire said that they were "strongly opposed to the whole of Bill No. 45," and another member tells us they view the bill and its provisions with alarm. The

retail merchants associations of British Columbia are to a certain extent, or to a considerable extent, very strongly affiliated with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and we all know the scope, the policy and the politics of that particular body. I do not think we should give the impression from British Columbia that any strong body of the people there are opposed to this bill. Far from it. There are minor faults or minor flaws in the bill which I hope the government will see their way to remedy. That is what the committee is for. I would suppose, having introduced the bill and admitted the principle of it, the government will be consistent enough to see that it is made workable.

But apart from the minor faults, which I will briefly refer to later, I will say that the only fault I have to find is that the minister did not insert the words "Asiatic origin" instead of the words "Chinese origin" which would make it apply to Japanese. If he had taken that step how he would have immortalized himself in western Canada! We would have been hanging halos around his hallowed brow for all time to come. But apart from that feature, I think it must be admitted that this bill is a sincere attempt to carry out the assurances given last year by the Prime Minister, and it will meet with a certain measure of support in British Columbia so far, at least, as it goes. Just last week I picked up a British Columbia paper. You know they carry a column headed "Twenty Years Ago," and in that column it mentioned that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had moved in the House—this is about three weeks ago now—a motion to increase the Chinese head tax from $100 to $500. Of course the paper at that time applauded the increase. That, so far as I know, has been the only genuine attempt to deal with that question from that day to this, and twenty years have come and gone since then. It is only twenty years after that occasion that we again find a Liberal government taking hold of the situation.

There are one or two clauses that, I wish to point out, could be improved. Paragraph (b) of clause 5 says:

> The children born in Canada of parents of Chinese race or descent, who have left Canada for educational or other purposes, on substantiating their identity to the satisfaction of the controller at the port or place where they seek to enter on their return;

I think that should be made more definite. Only to ask them to substantiate their identity when they return is not sufficient. They ought to substantiate it before they go. Until recently, at all events, if we went home to Great Britain, which might be our native country, we had to have passports and to go through considerable red tape to get them. Surely it is not too much to ask Chinese children, who go to China intending to return to Canada, to substantiate their identity before they go, so that possibility of evasion when they return might be made less easy.

Paragraph (c) of clause 5 is the one that deals with merchants and students. That has been badly printed. By a mistake in the way it is printed, the intention is materially changed. The word "degrees" at the top of page 4 should be the end of a line, and then it should begin "who shall," in such a way that the words "who shall substantiate" would apply to both merchants and students. As it reads now, it gives the impression, which I have heard repeatedly commented upon, that the word "merchant" in subclause (1) has absolutely no restriction on it whatever, and that is the meaning of it as the paragraph is now printed. It goes on to say "students. . who shall substantiate" but for lack of precision in printing and its being printed in the way that I have mentioned, a wrong impression is given—it is really intended to say that both classes, merchants and students, shall substantiate their status. The way the paragraph is printed, it applies only to the one word "student," and this has given rise to the impression that the merchant is going to have a very wide-open door.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that it was decided to determine who should be considered as merchants or students before they left China, and the drift of his remarks was that their status would be ascertained, if not decided, in China. As regards that clause, I was glad to hear that explanation; but the clause says only that the passports shall be endorsed or vised by a Canadian immigration officer at the place where the Chinamen leave. But it also says that the final decision shall be at the port of entry, because there the Chinamen shall substantiate their status to the satisfaction of the controller, subject to the approval of the minister. We have there a sort of dual control. Certainly it would appear to me that the first officer in China had little or nothing to do except to put his imprimatur on the passport. If it was intended that he should be the deciding official, his powers in that regard should be better defined. As two men are involved, this matter of putting the visé on the passport will drift into a mere formality. He will do what is formally known as visé-ing a passport; he will simply put his name on it. I think the bill could be improved a great deal in that respect.

As regards students the clause says that students coming to Canada properly endorsed, and so on, shall be allowed in free. The provision should be made not only to ensure that they continue to be students while in Canada, but that they leave Canada at the end of their period of education. As the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) pointed out, there was a case quite recently where a student, not long after coming into Canada turned out to be labouring in a mill. Under conditions as outlined, there is no real check.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Under clause 27, the moment a man ceases to belong to any of the exempt classes, he is liable to deportation.

Mr. NEILL: He is liable under clause 27 to be picked up in the street if he is found to be in Canada without any right, so to speak. But who is to find him and who is to pick him up? I would make this suggestion: Supposing 200 students come into Canada and they enter a college for a fixed period. If they are really genuinely going to be educated, the Chinese comptroller in Vancouver should have knowledge of those boys, of where they are and to what schools they are going. He could once a year or so check the records of the school or university in order to find out if they are still students. Let him keep in touch with the schools or universities and if so many graduate say this year, he will expect to see so many educated Chinese boys leave the country. The way the situation is at present, they come in and as my hon. friend for New Westminster says, they drift away, they sneak away, and if they do put in a perfunctory education for a few months, they leave then. There is no possible means under clause 27 of keeping in touch with these students. A Chinaman may get into court for some offence and you can ask him where his papers are and so on; but it would be more satisfactory, easier and cheaper, to check him up in the college from time to time than to chase him all over the province, in the hope of finding him in some odd corner.

The definition of "merchant" should have been in clause 2, amongst the other definitions. I can not say that I altogether agree with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for New Westminster. I think it is desirable that we should encourage our trade with the orient. We all admit that and I do not think the suggestion of the hon. member for New Westminster quite covers that, because he restricts the definition to a man acting practically as a commision agent. There would be no objection to a man acting as a wholesaler of Chinese or oriental imports in Canada, provided that there was no evasion.

I think the regulations mentioned by the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) this afternoon, although I could not get him to read them the second time and I only heard them read once, seemed to be quite appropriate and sufficient to check fraudulent entry of merchants. He should, however, put that regulation, which he says is in existence, into the bill, and it would meet the whole situation. The worst of a regulation is this: that it is liable to be abrogated at the whim of one man. This minister might be all right; but the next one might not, or his deputy might not and it is not wise to have the whole substance of a piece of legislation depend upon the whim of one man in the department. If the definition is sufficient to effect the purpose aimed at, and it can be put in a regulation, surely it can be put into the bill, and in that case there will be no trouble about the matter. I would also suggest that the number entering in one year should be restricted by joint agreement, so that not more than so many shall be allowed to enter in any one year.

The minister might well consider the idea of holding over this clause until the next time the bill comes down and having printed his amendment and that of the hon. member for New Westminster so that we could study them to better advantage. There are several other small things in this bill that need re-adjustment, but we can deal with them as we come to them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With most of the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Neill), I for one agree. He clearly draws a distinction between an evasion of the law through the endeavour of some Chinese coming into the country to act in a fraudulent manner, and an effort on the part of the administration to permit those who, in the interest of the country, should be allowed to come in, to enter in a way which will be thoroughly honourable and in accordance with recognized procedure. The various communications that have been read have, for the most part, come from Retail Merchants' Associations, and evidently it is the retailers who are afraid of Chinese competition in their trade. If that is the case, might I suggest to my hon. friends from British Columbia that, perhaps, if the word "merchant" were changed to read "merchants engaged in import and export trade," that would remove any of the serious or justifiable alarm which retail merchants have

and at the same time permit international trade of a character which it is eminently desirable to foster between the two countries? I would not object to the greater part of the amendment my hon. friend has suggested, were he to couple it with the words I have used, so that the section would read:

Merchants engaged in import and export trade, including sales agents and purchasing agents while representing bona fide Chinese exporters and importers carrying on international trade between Canada and China, buying from or selling to persons, firms or corporations in Canada.

If these two sentences were incorporated in the act they would pretty effectively cover what the committee is aiming at and at the same time they would not be invidious in any way to persons who might be sensitive on matters of this kind. In proposing this I would draw the attention of the committee to the last part of section 3 which has not yet been enacted but which will undoubtedly pass substantially as it is later on. It gives to the Governor in Council, in other words, the minister, power to make regulations providing for the payment of fees for the furnishing of substantial certificates, endorsing passports, "and other administrative work in connection with the carrying out of this act." Under that power the minister, with this definition of merchant before him, would be in a position to supplement the definition by whatever regulations appear to be demanded by the necessities of the case. My hon. friend in referring to the students has mentioned the desirability of keeping track of this class of immigrants as they come into the country. I can hardly imagine a minister who would not make regulations which would contemplate that course being followed. I believe however that it is preferable to leave to the minister the making of such regulations rather than to have the act itself declare that every Chinese student, regardless of who he may be or of the home from which he comes should be kept track of from day to day and year by year, by some system of registration, from the moment he comes to the country to the moment he leaves it. I think that regulation can effect all that is necessary in this regard. If this broader definition would meet the situation, the government would be agreeable to incorporating the words I have cited in the act itself. I hope that this meets with my hon. friend's approval.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would not the Prime Minister and the Acting Minister of Immigration be willing to leave this matter over as suggested by the member for Comox-Alberni so that we might study the proposed amendment?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I merely wished to present it to the committee with that end in view. I think it would be well to leave it over and proceed to the other sections.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If hon. gentlemen have any suggestions to make regarding students I should be glad to have them now, because if I have any amendments to make I desire to have all the views of hon. members before me.

Mr. STEVENS: I would call the attention of the minister to the last three or four lines of the section which refers to a passport:

Issued in and by the government of China and endorsed by a Canadian immigration officer.

If I am correctly informed, the government of China with headquarters at Peking is not functioning in the Canton district from which practically all immigrants to Canada come. There is a de facto government at Canton, a rebel government one might call it, I suppose, which controls the district, a very large area comprising two or three of the southern provinces; and I understand that the Peking government is not in control of that part of the country at all. Under these circumstances how could you get the endorsation of the Chinese government in respect of matters affecting immigrants from Canton?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of course, the act is looking more or less to stable government in China. The first provision is that the passport shall be issued by the government; that is the first requirement that the student must comply with. I doubt myself that this would be practicable at the moment, with existing difficulties in China. As a matter of fact there are two governments there at the moment, and I presume that either government issuing a passport would have to be recognized.

Mr. STEVENS: I am afraid my hon. friend would find himself in serious difficulty. How can the Canadian government recognise a government which is at enmity with that government which is represented by the Consul-General from China in this country? The Consul-General with whom my hon. friend has been negotiating is the representative of the government that has its headquarters at Peking; and if my hon. friend were to recognize passports issued by the so-called rebel government of the south, from which district alone practically this immigration comes, I anticipate trouble. Frankly, I really apprehend serious difficulty when my hon. friend comes to place his officer over

there. We had a great deal of difficulty in years gone by and I am very sceptical about the success of this movement with an officer of the Canadian government in that country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not share my hon. friend's apprehension concerning these difficulties. I think he will notice that the final test in this case, as indeed it is with regard to all other nationals entering Canada, is at the port of Vancouver. That is where the final disposition of any national of China will take place; and as a matter of fact the port of landing in this country is the place of final disposition of the national of any other country coming to Canada. At the moment the British government is doing business with China and passports are being issued by that government that are recognised so far as China is concerned. I admit, of course, that there is a serious difficulty, but the act is looking to a settled condition of affairs in China. If conditions do not become settled there the result may be that we shall receive few people from that country, which I suppose would satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, absolutely. But this act is intended to repeal the present statute which does away with the $500 head tax, and there is a danger that in the hiatus between now and the time when there are settled conditions in China the courts may declare that it is possible for those immigrants to come in. We know from experience that unless legislation is very carefully drawn, applications will be made to the courts and my hon. friend's hands will be tied, as his predecessors' have been time and again. At the present moment the minister finds it impossible to deport some couple of hundreds of people convicted under the Drug Act, and this through no fault of his particularly—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We had nothing to do with it.

Mr. STEVENS:—but because of the fact that the act has been so interpreted by the courts as to prevent the minister's acting. That is what I am afraid of here. I fear that the minister may find himself faced with a difficulty of that kind, and we might have thousands of Chinese landed here and experience another riot such as occurred in 1908.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The provisions of the act are being very much restricted; they apply practically to two classes of citizens of China.

Mr. STEVENS: I quite understand all that. I am merely calling attention to this matter and if the minister is satisfied I want to tell him that I am not, and we will cry quits so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does not my hon. friend know that the existing act is not repealed until this act comes into force? The moment this act comes into force the class of Chinese admitted to come in under the head tax will be excluded. So that the hiatus my hon. friend talks about is a pure figment of the imagination.

Mr. STEVENS: I hope it is, but probably I shall have the pleasure of recalling this conversation to the attention of the government at some future date.

Mr. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I have not very much to add to what has already been said on this subject. A number of telegrams have been read with respect to Chinese immigration; I have four along the same lines, but I shall refrain from putting them on Hansard. Expression has been given here to the opinion that it is quite satisfactory to the people of British Columbia to allow the entry of Chinese students. Well, I cannot see the matter in that light. Why should British Columbia educate the people of the Orient? Why cannot the orientals build schools in their own countries and get European teachers to come out and teach them English and French if they want to learn those languages? These orientals make very strong objections unless their children are allowed to be educated in our schools and colleges with our own boys and girls. I do not think it is right that oriental students should be allowed to mix with our young people. In Victoria last summer the orientals refused pointblank to be segregated from Canadian school children. To give the committee some idea of what the people of the East think on this question I will read a few extracts translated from an article which was published in an oriental paper. It stated:

> There is danger ahead. Discrimination has been shown in the school question and in the fishing question. This question is a life and death struggle to us Japanese, and we should determine our objective.

This is rather strong languege from people who come into our country although they know we do not want them here. The orientals must know that they are not wanted in British Columbia. And what is their object in coming into this country if they are putting up a "life and death struggle" as they call it? In my opinion their object is to get control of the Pacific coast, including all British Columbia.

I do not think orientals should be allowed into this country under any conditions. We do not have to bring people into our own houses simply because we do business with them and there is no reason why these orientals should come here and occupy our country simply because they want to do business with us. I see the South African authorities are talking of giving the orientals there a bonus to return home. I think this government could well afford to give back to every Chinaman here what we got from him—the $500 he paid to enter the Dominion—on condition he would leave, and thus rid the country of a whole lot of Chinamen and do ourselves a good turn.

In South Africa the people are talking of segregating the Chinese; that may have to be done yet in British Columbia, for the two races should not be brought together. It seems to me that if the good Lord had intended orientals and white people to live in the same country he would not have put the Pacific ocean between them. I think the people of the East should remain in their own countries. I do not see why we should admit them here and educate them in our own schools and colleges. I could cite a number of cases where the mingling of oriental children with our children in British Columbia has been a great detriment to the latter. The eastern ideals of morality and citizenship are entirely different to ours, and I do not see why our children's ideals should be lowered by their contact with the children of orientals. In China and Japan the men can have as many wives as they want, and there is no question but that this and similar views are drilled into our children where they are educated with the children of orientals. We do not want such ideas to be propagated here. Therefore I take very strong exception to allowing oriental students to come into this country to be educated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I should like to remove a misapprehension under which my hon friend is apparently labouring. He seems to think that it is the intention to have such students educated in British Columbia. As a matter of fact the clause in the bill relating to students has reference to universities conferring degrees. Undoubtedly if any university hesitates to take Chinese students they will not be admitted there. For instance, if the University of British Columbia thinks well not to admit Chinese students, why certainly these students will not go to that university. But Toronto, Kingston and Montreal universities are willing and anxious to take Chinese students. It seems to me it would be a mistake on the part of our people if we prevented educated young men and women from China getting the benefits of higher education here and then returning home to do what they can to acquaint the Orient with what my hon. friend has spoken of as the higher standards of living on this continent. I think we ought to be prepared, if we have it, to spread the light of our civilization in the Orient, and so far as I can see it our universities afford one of the best means to that end.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—At Vancouver and Victoria only, with several exceptions:

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the idea of this?

Mr. HUMPHREY: What is the idea of specifying Vancouver and Victoria?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are the principal ports at which most of the nationals of China will make application for entry. It is the intention of the government to keep a staff of officials at these ports to conduct proper examinations. It would be a very expensive proposition, for example, if we had to keep similar staffs at St. John, Halifax, Quebec and other ports.

Mr. STEVENS: We would be delighted if the minister would substitute St. John and Halifax for Vancouver and Victoria—or what might be better still, Montreal and Toronto. If that suggestion is acceptable to the minister I shall be very glad indeed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think it will be admitted that the two ports mentioned are the natural ports through which most of the nationals of China do enter Canada.

Mr. HUMPHREY: It is my opinion that if the government would incorporate in this bill one or two of the eastern ports the people of British Columbia would take it upon themselves to exclude the Chinese from entering their province from the east.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Prohibited classes:

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the need of such prolixity in this clause? Are not these classes just the same as those prohibited from all countries?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does not the clause simply read:

Classes prohibited under section so-and-so of the Immigration Act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not being a lawyer I cannot answer my hon. friend, except to say that you have within the bounds of the one act all the prohibited classes named without having to refer to the general Immigration Act.

Mr. STEVENS: There are no exemptions from the regular act?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It seems to me the better method of legislation would be to have one immigration act and then have, if there is going to be a distinction between China and other countries, parts applicable to
9 p.m. China or to any other country as to which special legislation applies. It would be a much more compact and comprehensive way of getting legislation on our books.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): To some extent I agree with my hon. friend, but he will notice there are provisions under the Chinese Immigration Act which do not appear in the other act. I can see no other reason for going to the trouble of inserting the prohibited classes of the general act, except that it saves the trouble of consulting the latter act in so far as Chinese immigration is concerned. It will also be noted that practically all the clauses of this bill apply peculiarly to Chinese immigration, and to it alone.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the government contemplate further legislation on Japanese immigration?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not further legislation at present, but I will have an announcement to make later with regard to Japanese immigration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will there be further legislation following that announcement?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might perhaps state to my right hon. friend that as I mentioned here some little time ago, negotiations have been carried on between this government and the Japanese government, and as a result of those negotiations the Japanese government themselves have offered to place a greater restriction on the classes of labour coming to Canada than has hitherto existed. They have expressed the hope that it will not be found necessary for the parliament of Canada to legislate in a manner which might create serious embarrassment to the government of Japan in Japan itself and they would hope that such restriction as they are prepared to place on the classes of labour to which we object will in the eyes of our government prove sufficient to prevent the necessity of introducing any invidious legislation. The government is prepared, at least for a time, to give the Japanese government the opportunity of revealing its intentions and good faith in this matter. If it should appear from the figures themselves, which probably will prove more eloquent than any words, that the restriction which the Japanese government itself is contemplating is not sufficient to meet the needs of the situation, then legislation may be necessary at a later stage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not very familiar with the legislative history of the matter. Is there special Japanese immigration legislation now?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Japanese just come in under the general Immigration Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is an agreement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subject to the mysterious agreement. Perhaps while I am on my feet I might make a few remarks as to the general principles that I think should underlie this character of legislation—in fact, the one principle; I do not think there is more than one. There has been some discussion as to how far we should go and how far we ought not to go in restricting immigration. It has not been carried on with a view to making any contrast of party history except on the part of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and there is no need for such contrast at all. There have been progressive restrictions all through the last three score years. The last restrictive enactment on Chinese immigration was in the year 1921, when substantial effective restrictions were put on, not effective enough I know. There were other restrictions in 1917. These were under the late government.

Now I want to lay down this principle which I think is sound, which I think other countries have followed, and which our country must follow; that we should determine our immigration law not out of animosity to any country or to any race, not out of prejudice to any country or to any race, nor on the other hand out of a fear of the sensitiveness of any country or of any race, but solely out of consideration for our own internal domestic

necessities. We have done that; we have done it all along, and we ought to continue to do it. Other countries have done it. Other countries have gone much farther than we.

How could it be said, for example, that in the legislation we have here consideration is shown for the sensibilities of China, that we have taken care not to offend the Chinese Empire, that there is no invidious distinction? Why, the whole bill is invidious, if you can have anything invidious in immigration legislation. I do not complain of it on that account. As long as the bill is founded on the just needs of our country from its domestic internal standpoint that is all that is required. But to argue that a bill excluding merchants would offend China but that this bill is all right and will not offend China, because under it merchants are admitted though it keeps out farmers, labourers, clerks, salesmen, professional men, laundrymen, all sorts and conditions of men, seems to me to verge on nonsense.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think that can be said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, if there is any offence in the world the offence comes from distinctions between China and any other country. But we have to do it, and we have to do it on the basis of our own needs, and if it meets our own needs better to keep merchants out. then we ought to do it, and China would have no just cause of offence. China has an equal right so far as we are concerned to do the same thing. I believe—I will not say I believe, but I would not be very much surprised if in the course of time public opinion which is built upon and which grows out of public necessities, will demand more and more restrictions than any that are called for by hon. gentlemen behind me. It does not so demand to-day. Public opinion to-day is prepared in view of other things to be gained thereby to admit students, to admit trade representatives, not merchants, but trade representatives, for the sake as respects the first of making Canadian learning known throughout the world, for the sake as respects the second of developing the trade of our country. If other considerations later on weigh more heavily than those two, then public opinion will demand the exclusion of both. But the reason we exclude now until we get right up to trade representatives and up to students is simply because we have to do so for our protection in this country. That is the only principle that really governs us, and do not let us pretend that any other does; I do not think any other ever has. Just as soon as you select a country or a race and you place around it barriers and restraints that you do not apply to immigration in general, then as respects that country or race there is something invidious. But because it does exist it does not mean that it arises out of any feeling of unfriendliness, any feeling of international animosity or anything of that kind. It arises out of conditions peculiar to ourselves which we have to take care of in the interests of ourselves and of the world. I hope I have made myself clear.

I would define "merchant" if I were the minister. I am glad the government has consented at last to do so. It is simply foolish to argue that the Chinese are quite satisfied if merchants are defined by regulation, but that they would be offended if they are defined in the bill. We cannot stand on a foundation of that sort. I would define "merchant" if I were the minister, and I would define it most specifically so that there can be no dispute, for I say this to the minister: You are going to find your representative in China clothed with remarkable, extensive and very perilous powers, very perilous powers indeed, and you may find yourself in serious trouble for that reason. Do not have those powers any wider than you can possibly avoid. Let this parliament speak as to what a merchant should be. It really is intended to be defined for according to the statement of the minister himself, according to the proposal the Prime Minister later suggested to the committee, what is really intended is, not a merchant but a trade representative, a merchant, if you may so describe him, in the international sense as between two countries and two alone, China and Canada. Consequently I would define "merchant," and I would have some other definitions that we will arrive at before we reach the end of the bill. It would have been better if we had not passed clause 2 because it is clause 2 that will need to be amended. There must be something left to regulation, I admit, but the minimum should always be left, and if ever there was a bill where the least should be left to regulation it is such a bill as this.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Minister may authorize admission for specified period:

Mr. STEVENS: I think I correctly interpret the minister's intention when I say that the purpose of this clause is to reserve a right to admit persons under special request such as, clergy or the wives of some merchants, and

so forth, who may be excluded by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not think it is the intention of clause 9 to permit the permanent admission of any persons.

Mr. STEVENS: I was just coming to that. I would like, however, to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that this clause does permit of the admission of indentured labour. Now it does not so state, and it may not be in his mind to do so, but the clause as it stands would permit the entry of indentured labour. I am looking forward and this clause, perhaps, is one that will not be invoked very frequently and may become, for the time being a dead letter; but at some time, under pressure of some, perhaps by reason of ordinary circumstances, an application may be made to the Minister of Immigration who may be tempted to admit some indentured labour under this clause. To that I am most bitterly opposed; I do not believe in indentured labour under any circumstance. We had the experience many years ago of Chinese indentured labour and we want no repetition of that experience. Does the minister really consider this clause necessary?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would like to say to my hon. friend that I have steadily stood out against representations made to widen the classes of people who would be admissible under clause 5—that is merchants and students virtually and the diplomatic corps; but there is one contention, and there seems to be good reason for it, that missionaries and teachers of Chinese origin might very well be admitted. Therefore, I think, under clause 9, for a restricted period, the minister might have that authority. Then again there is the case of tourists who wish to come and visit the country; they might be admitted under a permit. If my hon. friend sees an opportunity, at some future time, for some corporation, perhaps, to come to the minister and say "We want 100, or 150, or 200 labourers temporarily" that might be provided for in the bill if it is thought the power is too wide but I do think that clause 9 will be necessary and will be needed for legitimate purposes, although I may say frankly I would not for a moment consider that indentured labour should come in under its provisions.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will admit that it could; the power is there. I know that it is not in his mind, but we have had the witness to-day of the transfer of one minister, a very excellent gentleman, from one department to another. My hon. friend may be Minister of Agriculture next session; we can never tell.

An hon. MEMBER: Minister of Justice.

Mr. STEVENS: No he would hardly be Minister of Justice because I do not think he has—shall I say?—the technique for that portfolio. But we might have a minister here who was prejudiced against the ideas of this bill; such a thing might possibly happen. So I would like to see that provided against, if it were possible. I am not prepared with an amendment offhand. The clause reads:

> The minister may authorize the admission to Canada of any person of Chinese origin or descent without being subject to the provision of this act—

It is a very broad clause, it ought to be restricted in some manner.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no notion the power would be used for any other purposes than those I have named; and really the object of the clause is to avoid specifying in the bill any classes of people who might come into the country temporarily. However, it could be used for the purpose which my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. STEVENS: We might add the words:

> Provided however that this section shall not apply to the admission of labourers or artisans.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Labourers are excluded as the bill stands.

Mr. STEVENS: No, if the Prime Minister will look at this he will realize my point. Under this clause all other provisions of the act can be ignored. Let me repeat: I am not suggesting that that is the idea in the minister's mind at the present time because I know very well it is not; but the time might come in the future when perhaps some emergency, or imagined emergency, might arise and such an application might be made to bring in 50 or 100 Chinamen, something of that character, and it would just be the opening of the way for the abuse of the very idea that forms the basis of this legislation. I frankly feel that this clause should be restricted very considerably.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is there not in the knowledge of the strong feeling that there is on the part of the country against the admission of any number of orientals a very good guarantee that the minister will not use his powers unduly? I think that constitutes a guarantee that the minister will not go too far in the matter. Cases might come up—unforeseen cases—where it might conceivably be in the interests even of British Columbia that

a few Chinese might be permitted to come in for some emergency purpose. I do not assume that the clause will ever be used in that way; there are, however, individual cases which come to the attention of the department —such, for example, as clergymen or tourists coming through on some special mission. I should think some latitude ought to be given to the minister to admit a few persons of that class, and it is better to give the general authority rather than to be too detailed and specific in the classes that are mentioned.

Mr. NEILL: Could not that be done by order in council in specific cases?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It virtually comes to that; the minister has to give his sanction. I do not, however, think we had better add to the number of orders in council which it is necessary to pass.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister will remember, of course, that he cannot deputize this responsibility; he cannot authorize anybody else to act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are doing this purposely. We got into trouble under the general act over this matter, and I think this power should be confined to the minister. This particular case is one in which the minister should act.

Section agreed to.

On section 12—Appeal to minister:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the Immigration Act section is it not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is clause 11—no appeal in certain cases—the Immigration Act section also, and if it is not why is there a distinction made?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): (Reading).

> There shall be no appeal from the decision of the controller, as to the rejection or deportation of any immigrant, passenger or other person found to be of Chinese origin or descent seeking to enter or land in Canada when such decision is based upon a certificate of the examining medical officer to the effect that such immigrant, passenger or other person of Chinese origin or descent is afflicted with any loathsome disease—

In that particular case it is concluded that the evidence is sufficient to bar the entry into Canada of the Chinese immigrant. I may say there has been some criticism of this from the Chinese themselves. I think it should stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do you mean that clause 11 should stand?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No; I think the provision should remain.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—Identification and registration of Chinese immigrants.—Certificates to be delivered to immigrants permitted to land:

Mr. BAXTER: Does the minister propose to use the finger print identification system?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. BAXTER: Is anything else trustworthy in the case of Asiatics?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Identification is difficult, I admit, but after considering the matter I came to the conclusion, from representations made, that it was going a bit too far, because, as my hon. friend knows, it is only used in cases of criminals.

Mr. BAXTER: Quite so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): And we do not want to have the oriental people classed as criminals.

Mr. STEVENS: This clause says—

> And such certificate shall be prima facie evidence that the person presenting it has complied with the requirements of this act.

Now, what the minister will have to face, without question, is the system of transferring those certificates. There is no question in my mind that if a Chinaman dies, or if, as has been going on for years, he is smuggled across into the United States, or into some other country, the certificate will be passed on. We have been passing a steady stream through this country, without the knowledge of the government of Canada. They will get these certificates, will pass them on and they will be held and used, just as sure as we are sitting in this House to-night, for illegal purposes. Experience teaches us that and I think that these Chinese should be compelled to carry the certificates or an identification card on their persons.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They have to carry their certificates with them.

Mr. STEVENS: And check up occasionally. I had a reference, which for the moment I have lost, which I wished to refer to in connection with this matter. I am very much afraid that there will be a continued evasion of this clause. Has the minister any definnite idea in mind as to how this could be prevented?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend will recognize the difficulty of pre-

venting exchange of certificates, owing to the similarity of the appearance of the Chinese. If a man is in possession of a certificate, it is a most difficult thing, unless you have some other evidence, to detect fraud. We discussed the matter of taking finger prints, but afterwards dropped it. The mere fact of making the Chinaman produce the certificate on demand is not evidence that the individual holding the certificate is the one who entered under it.

Mr. STEVENS: There is no penalty for forgery or transfer?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh yes, I think there is a very severe penalty for the transference of a certificate. I quite appreciate the difficulty of proving that the man presenting the certificate is the man who really owns it.

Mr. BAXTER: Section 32 provides the penalty.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One year after the act goes into force there is to be a general registration, and each individual in Canada will have to show his certificate. If he goes out of Canada, and some one comes in and uses that certificate in place of him, I confess it will be a very difficult thing to prove.

Mr. GRAHAM: What about the photograph?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know the photographs are there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not expect any of them to die. I am told they never die. Those who have British citizenship to-day are endowed with immortality. The certificate always passes to some one else who looks exactly like the original party. I fancy you will meet with that difficulty. There will be no emigration from that part of the country. All the certificates will remain, and those who died will have their counterparts in possession of the certificates.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I cannot see why there should be any objection to the finger print system. The idea in taking the finger print is that we should have some positive means of identification. We have had the experience in British Columbia in regard to naturalization papers. I have a return here, No. 187, which I got the other day, containing certain correspondence in regard to naturalization in Vancouver between the Under Secretary of State and one of the county court judges there, his honour, Judge Grant. It appears from that correspondence that in some cases naturalization certificates had been granted to Japanese who had never left Japan at all. Some friend had got the naturalization papers for them.

In regard to fishing licenses, we had a great deal of trouble, and it was admitted before our British Columbia Fisheries Commission last year that there had been many cases of abuse of this kind. There were many instances of naturalization papers being transferred, for the purpose of enabling the holders for the time being to obtain fishing licenses. A photograph is of no material assistance. The photographs that will be attached to the registration certificates under the section we are considering, will be so similar that it will be almost impossible for any one to determine whether the holder for the time being of the certificate is the person who is legally entitled to that certificate or not. I cannot for the life of me see why there should be any greater indignity to a man by requiring him to allow records to be taken of his finger prints than by requiring his photograph. I think where there is this method of obtaining positive proof of identity, it should be made use of. Certainly the finger print system seems to be one that no person, not even an oriental, can beat.

Mr. NEILL: I would like to endorse the stand taken by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). I think we should provide that the Chinaman should carry his certificate on his person and produce it on demand. The minister says truly enough that the production of it will not be any evidence that he has not obtained it by fraudulent means. That is true, but there is another phase of the matter. It is at least a certificate that he has one license, let him get it where he likes. It has this advantage: If you have a Chinese prisoner, and you ask him where his certificate is and he says it is at home and you let him go and get it, he will be sure to produce a certificate. But if you arrest him, you ask him to produce his certificate and he does not have it on him, that is evidence that he does not have one. If you let him go home where there are a couple of hundred Chinamen, he will certainly get a certificate, and there will be no way of discovering whether he did not simply borrow it. During the war every white man in Canada had to have a registration card and to produce it on request. No injustice was done and there was very little inconvenience. If provision were made in this legislation that a Chinaman must have his certificate on his person—and I certainly think such provision

should be made—that would be a means of detecting a great deal of this illicit work of shuffling around certificates, because a Chinaman might lend a man a certificate when he was going to court, but he would not give it to him if he himself had to carry it permanently on his person, as he himself might be caught without it and deported. I think such a provision should be inserted in the bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might point out to my hon. friend that if this legislation were admitting any large number of Chinese, probably there would be some force in what he has just said. But the bill contemplates the admission of only the classes mentioned, and they will be very limited classes. They will be either of the student or the merchant class, and in all probability a very complete record will be kept of those individuals. There will, therefore, not be the same need for possession of a certificate on the person of an individual entering Canada under those classes as there would be if the persons being admitted were, for example, coolie labourers.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—Chinese to register within twelve months of date of the act:

Mr. NEILL: I should like in this connection to remind the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart), or more properly the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that this would be a suitable occasion, when this registration is taking place, to give effect to the recommendation of the Duff Fisheries Commission of British Columbia last year that, as we had found so many cases of fraudulent naturalization papers, an opportunity should be taken to recall all those in British Columbia and revise them. The inference was that where it was found they were patently fraudulently obtained, for instance, if a man who was, say, twenty years old, had a certificate describing him as being fifty-five or sixty years of age, his certificate would be revoked. This would be a good occasion, when the registration by Chinamen is being made general, to have these papers revised as regards both Chinamen and Japanese. The recommendation of the Fisheries Commission in this regard was accepted by the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All right.

Section agreed to.

On Section 19—Number of immigrants to be carried on each ship limited:

Mr. STEVENS: Is there any need of this clause? What is the idea of retaining it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is merely one other restriction on the number who can enter Canada..

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this an old clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In the former act the tonnage was fifty. It is now increased to two hundred and fifty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is built on the old section. Really, this seems a very absurd way of going at the subject. You might as well say that the number of immigrants must be regulated by the number of hairs on the captain's head.

Section agreed to.

On Section 20—Chinese persons not to leave ship without permit:

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the explanation of this clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This clause prohibits officers of any ship carrying Chinese to Canada permitting Chinese to leave the ship before all the formalities of the regulations have been observed. We have had some difficulty in connection with this in the past. This is to prevent Chinese sailors deserting at a Canadian port, and dishonest captains from permitting stowaways and others to leave the ship, and, in this way, obtain surreptitious or illegal entry into Canada.

Section agreed to.

On Section 21—Conductor to furnish list of Chinese persons carried:

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the explanation of this clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is to prevent conductors of railway trains allowing Chinese to obtain surreptitious entry into Canada by such trains.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are the provisions of clauses 20 and 21 in the general Immigration Act?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not in such enlarged form. This is a much stiffer provision as regards both captains and railway conductors.

Section agreed to.

On Section 24—Re-entry:

Mr. STEVENS: As I read this clause, it constitutes really a further extension of this permission to return. If the minister will refer to sub-clause (3), there was a period about 1914 when conditions were pretty bad on the Pacific coast and permission was given

to a large number of Chinese to return again to Canada within one or two years. That permission was extended by P.C. 697. If I recall the situation corectly, P.C. 697 has virtually expired but by this clause we are permitting return to Canada for the further period of a year from the coming into force of this legislation. I really do not think that should be done, and I will tell the minister once again why. What I have said before very largely applies to this. I doubt whether many who have not yet returned will return but substitutes will come who never were in the country before. I want to assure the minister that we are not overstating the case in constantly referring to this ability on the part of the Chinese to substitute one for another in these various matters. I am certain that this will mean the entry into Canada of a considerable number of Chinese. A man will make a competency and go back without any intention of returning, but he will return in the person of another Chinaman; or he may go back and die, and there is always someone else to fill the gap. These are the things we are so bitterly opposed to. I see no reason whatever for this added permission and I would ask the minister, if it were not inconsistent with the legislation, and I do not think it is, to strike out subsection 3.

Mr. STEWART: Subsection 3 provides for the return of Chinese who registered out between April first, 1914, and March 31st, 1919, and who, under the provisions of an order in council, P.C., 697, passed under the authority of the War Measures Act, were accorded the privilege of prolonging their return to Canada until one year after a proclamation had been published in the Canada Gazette declaring that a state of war no longer existed. No such proclamation has yet appeared in the Canada Gazette and it is possible it may never appear. There were at Vancouver registrations covering 572 Chinese who left during the period I have stated and who are still absent from Canada. The present section is to provide that they shall return within one year from the date of the coming into force of this act. They have under the order in council the extended time of one year after the publication in the Canada Gazette that a state of war no longer exists, but in view of the fact that such a declaration may not be published we are limiting the time of return to one year after the passing of this act.

Mr. STEVENS: What form did the termination of the war take? Our signing of the Peace Treaty ended the war, but I suppose that when this terminology was used in the order in council it was prior to the conclusion of the war. I take it therefore that it was assumed that the publication of a declaration in the Canada Gazette would be the method of declaring the war at an end. Undoubtedly the intention of the order was to end the privilege with the termination of the war. What we are really doing by this legislation is extending the period for another year, and I think we ought to cancel now absolutely the privilege to any that have not returned to Canada because certainly they know perfectly well that they should have returned before now, and they are only taking advantage of a very strained interpretation of the order in council.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We will let this stand so that I may make further inquiry.

Section stands.

On section 25—Chinese sailors on Canadian vessels:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does this section admit Chinese as sailors?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, it provides for the outward registration of Chinese sailors employed on Canadian vessels operating between Canada and the United States. The Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia have ships operating between Vancouver and Seattle, making a round trip daily, and under the present act a Chinese sailor employed on such a ship must register daily. The cost of registration being a dollar it is proposed to change this and provide for the issuance of a certificate for a period of two years at a fee of $2.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would that apply to Chinese immigrants?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, merely to men sailing between ports.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could not a Chinese immigrant come in and instead of landing on shore land in a boat and become a sailor and thereby become entitled to registration under this section?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would not be possible for him to do that because he would of necessity first need to be in possession of a passport before he could make application for the certificate.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—Arrest and deportation of any Chinese who has illegally entered or remained in Canada:

Mr. NEILL: Instead of "officer" in this section I think it should be "police officer". It is no use in the wilds of British Columbia to send two hundred miles to get a Chinese immigration officer; a police constable should be allowed to act under this section. The definition of officer in the interpretation clause is simply an immigration officer and such an officer would be found only in Vancouver, Victoria and possibly Nelson.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend mean that any police officer might demand the production of a certificate from a Chinese in Canada?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will have to pardon me for referring to our experiences so often, but we learn by experience. Only a few years ago quite a number of Chinese or Japanese, I forgot which, landed on the west coast near my hon. friend's home. They did not touch a port of entry at all; they landed off the west coast of Vancouver Island, or Queen Charlotte Islands. There are constantly vessels running back and forth on the fishing grounds between different points, and as we are by this act restricting the ports of entry to Vancouver and Victoria, the only possible way of apprehending such people would be for a local officer to have some definite powers. If he were in the Queen Charlotte Islands it would take him in winter from two to three weeks to communicate with Vancouver.

Mr. NEILL: Or Prince Rupert.

Mr. STEVENS: There would be no Chinese immigration agent there. It would be hopeless for any person to apprehend immigrants or control immigration of that kind under this clause.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Would provincial police officers be satisfactory?

Mr. STEVENS: I think so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I see a difficulty in keeping up a force of immigration officers.

Mr. STEVENS: Either provincial, municipal or Dominion police officers would do. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he keep an immigration officer at Prince Rupert.

Mr. NEILL: This section would not give the policeman any drastic power because he can only arrest. Further down it is provided that the officer may detain an arrested person in custody and bring him before the nearest controller for examination. So that the man's rights are absolutely protected, and if a police constable cannot be trusted to do this much he is not fit for the position.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not taking exception to the suggestion. I see the impossibility of patrolling a large area like British Columbia with immigration officials whose duty it would be to arrest people who obtain illegal entry.

Mr. STEVENS: I would suggest the words "police officer."

Section stands.

On section 27—Arrest and deportation of Chinese who ceases to belong to exempt or admissible classes:

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Some exception has been taken to this section, and I do think that it is somewhat drastic.

> Any person admitted as exempt from the tax under the provisions of the Chinese Immigration Act or any amendment thereto or under this act,—

It embodies the whole of it.

> —and who at any time after admission ceases to belong to any of the exempt classes as defined by the Chinese Immigration Act or any amendment thereof or by this act,—

It seems to me this goes so far that if a Chinese merchant after being here for twenty years failed in his business and was obliged to become a labourer he would be subject to deportation.

Mr. STEVENS: That would be a very good thing.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I hardly think that is just.

Mr. STEVENS: There are thousands who have been admitted by the officers of this government as merchants, who have deliberately abandoned that calling and are to-day labourers and never intend to be anything else. So there would be no hardship; my hon. friend need not waste any sympathy on them whatever.

Mr. NEILL: I would also point out, Mr. Chairman, that this is the section the hon. minister referred me to early in the afternoon when I asked him what means he had of checking up those who were admitted as students, he said section 27.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This will apply to the person who enters as a student.

Mr. NEILL: It will not apply if you alter it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was not thinking of altering it as applying to those

entering under the provisions of this act, but I thought some hardship might be imposed upon individuals who had been in Canada for, say, ten years.

Mr. STEVENS: It will not apply, for this reason: you are not going to register these people under the calling upon which they enter the country. I wish it were so, but it is not. They will simply be registered as students. So the fact that they have changed their calling will not penalize them in any sense under this clause. My hon. friend need not lose a particle of sleep over any Chinese that are in the country.

Mr. NEILL: In line 6, page 12, I think the word "the" before "controller" should be changed to "a," or else there is likely to be confusion. I would also point out that the word "officer" occurs there, and if the minister changes the previous section and makes it read "peace officer" the same amendment ought to be made in this section.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that line 6 page 12, section 27, be amended by striking out "the" before controller and substituting "a"?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend (Mr. Neill) suggests "peace officer." I think that ought to be included.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will look into the amendment suggested by my hon. friend to section 26 as well as to this section. It is usually well to exercise a little care. I have no objection to this standing for the purpose if need be.

Mr. STEVENS: The point may already be covered if the Immigration Act provides for "officer" including peace officer.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is where it should go.

Mr. STEVENS: There is no objection to its being carried with that understanding.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 27 stands.

On section 30—Liability of transportation companies:

Mr. STEVENS: This is the same as in the old act, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 31—Liability of railway companies:

Mr. STEVENS: Is this the same as in the old act too?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think the increased penalty is the only change.

Section agreed to.

On section 32—Chinese landing in violation of act, etc.:

Mr. STEVENS: I would suggest that we might strengthen the latter part of subclause (b) "and shall also be liable to deportation when so ordered by the controller," and make it obligatory that the party so offending should be deported. Anyone who deliberately violates the provisions of this act ought to be deported without any consideration.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We might strike out the words, "when so ordered by the controller."

Mr. STEVENS: I have more objection to the qualifying words, "shall be liable." Why not make it read, "and shall be deported." Make it a positive statement—obligatory. If not my hon. friend will find himself deluged with all manner of appeals for clemency. There is no minimum either; it is a fine not exceeding $1,000. The fine might be only $1. The wording of the clause is to lean towards clemency. What we want in these penalties is something drastic and definite, because that is the only way in which we are going to get effective restriction under this act. We invite the odium of the criticism referred to by the Prime Minister, and yet we do not obtain the full effects that we are seeking.

10 p.m.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It does not matter who the national is, if he wilfully misrepresents—

Mr. STEVENS: No. This section begins, "Every person of Chinese origin or descent who—"

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, but I am making reference to the fact that any national who obtains entry under a fraudulent certificate or who wilfully misrepresents himself should be punished. I have no particular desire to shield such an offender.

Mr. STEVENS: I would point out to the minister that the two clauses of this section are inconsistent one with the other on the basis of his own suggestion. For instance, the first clause refers to every person of Chinese origin, and that includes liability to deportation. The second clause refers to persons who aid and abet, having in mind, no doubt, persons who are not of Chinese origin, and there is no question of deportation there. That shows a distinction between the two. Of course, that person might be a citizen of

this country or he might be a foreigner, an alien of another race. So to carry out the minister's argument of a moment ago deportation ought to be included in the second clause as well.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You could not deport a Canadian citizen.

Mr. STEVENS: No, an alien, a Swede, a German or a Frenchman.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You would have a double-barrelled clause, one for the Canadian citizen who aids and abets and one for the foreigner?

Mr. STEVENS: It is double-barrelled now. You do not deport a Canadian citizen anyway. You only deport an alien.

Mr. BLACK: You might cover it by saying that if of foreign origin he shall be liable to deportation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Perhaps it would be better to alter that section making deportation obligatory.

Section stands.

On section 35—Organizing, etc. unlawful courts as to offences by Chinese:

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister give us a brief explanation of this clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is in our present act, and is to prevent unlawful organizations of Chinese in Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: This deals with the tong war question, war between the different tongs of Chinese; it is very necessary. I would again draw the minister's attention to the fine. It may be only one dollar. There is no minimum fine provided. I think that in both these sections there should be a minimum and a maximum fine if possible.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This section is hardly in the same category with section 32. I have no compunction about section 32. I am prepared to put the maximum there.

Mr. STEVENS: For instance, you might fine a man one dollar only and he is penalized under this section. There is no minimum as regards either imprisonment or fine. I grant you this section is not as important as the other one, but in redrafting perhaps the minister will keep this point in mind.

Section agreed to.

On section 37—Violation of act, order or regulation:

Mr. STEVENS: We have the same wording again here: "Every person who violates any provision of this act or any order or regulation made thereunder for which no special punishment is herein provided, is guilty of an offence, and liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months." There is no minimum in either case. Is there any particular reason for that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Again I think my hon. friend will admit that this is not in the same category with section 32. There is a vast difference between infractions of these two kinds, and some latitude will have to be allowed the court in this case. That is the way it appeals to me. There might be a case in which ten dollars would be a sufficient punishment, but in a serious case a fine of a thousand dollars or imprisonment might be necessary.

Section agreed to.

On section 38—Jurisdiction of courts in cases of rejection and deportation restricted:

Mr. HANSON: There might be a case where the minister or the controller acted wholly without jurisdiction notwithstanding the provisions of this section. I would submit that the court of record would have the right to have the King's writ run. For instance, habeas corpus might lie. Is it the intention to deprive the accused of the right of habeas corpus. If so, it ought to say so in express language.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): A great deal of difficulty has been experienced in connection with this matter. The minister's decision I think should be final. It perhaps looks like a hardship to say that a man must be bundled out of the country on the order of the minister, but the very same thing applies here as in the case of the head tax. The head tax has been abused and been made the means of a sort of slavery among the Chinese who are in Canada, and the same applies here. It is being repeatedly abused. If my hon. friend was in my office for twenty-four hours he would see just how much it is being abused daily. I am not anxious to have the power conferred here, but I think it would be very much to the advantage of the nationals of China themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY: In connection with this clause I should like to place on record a resolution I received a few days ago. It may not

have a direct bearing on this particular clause but it concerns the bill generally, and shows the very strong feeling of the people of British Columbia upon this question. It is under date of April 7, 1923, and is a resolution that was adopted at a public meeting at Silverton, British Columbia, which was held to discuss the immigration of orientals into Canada. It reads as follows:

Whereas many orientals make an easy living trafficking in drugs, liquors and vice, and,

Whereas such creatures, having no citizenship in this country, no reputation to lose and no position in the community to maintain, easily lend themselves to the profit of a few disreputable citizens who are thus less subject to detection, and,

Whereas such tolerance is demoralizing to the community and the rising generations.

Therefore, be it resolved that we request the Federal authorities to enact such legislation as will permit local magistrates to order the deportation of such orientals as are known to be a menace to the community.

It is signed by the secretary of the meeting.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not like this thought of placing any one official in such a position that the public generally have no opportunity of taking active steps or appealing against his decision. It seems to me that the action of any minister ought to be subject to review by a court, or by some other body in this country. I do not like this kind of legislation that we seem to be passing in one or two instances this year, placing the minister in a position of absolute arbitrary authority.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

DUKE AND DUCHESS OF YORK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that in conformity with instructions given the Speaker on April 26th, I caused the following cablegram to be sent to the Right Hon. Bonar Law, Prime Minister, London:

The Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada presents his duties to Their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of York, and begs to forward the following resolution which has been unanimously adopted by the House of Commons of Canada:

That this House extends its congratulations to Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York on the occasion of their marriage, and that the expression of the wishes of the Canadian Commons be communicated to Their Royal Highnesses by His Honour the Speaker."

To-day I received the following answer by cablegram:

[Mr. Humphrey.]

Speaker,

House of Commons, Ottawa,

Please convey to the members of the House of Commons of Canada our warm thanks for the resolution of kind congratulations and good wishes which are greatly appreciated.

ALBERT and ELIZABETH.

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide that the time within which the various provinces of Canada may earn and be paid the sums allotted to the said provinces under the provisions of The Canada Highways Act, chapter fifty-four of the statutes of 1919 be extended for a further period of two years.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister kindly give the reasons for this legislation, also a statement as to what has been expended and how much the various provinces have taken up of their respective quotas?

Mr. GRAHAM: In 1919 an act was passed by the federal House providing for the payment to the various provinces of $20,000,000 to aid in the construction of roads. The grant was for a period of five years, which term expires in 1924. It will be necessary, however, for the provinces that are dependent on federal aid to know at this session what aid they can expect in arranging their plans for the years succeeding 1924. Several of the provinces have used up, or will have used up by the end of 1924, the various amounts to which they were entitled under the legislation of 1919. On the other hand, a number of them will not have expended the amounts to which they were entitled. The bill to be based on this resolution will extend the act of 1919 for two years to give those provinces that will not have used up the amount to which they were entitled by the end of 1924 an opportunity, during the next two years, to earn that amount. The amounts practically appropriated for the various provinces under the act of 1919 were as follows:

Province—	Amount
Alberta	$1,477,810
British Columbia	1,251,955
Manitoba	1,602,265
Nova Scotia	1,468,720
New Brunswick	1,163,845
Ontario	5,877,275
Prince Edward Island	603,455
Quebec	4,748,420
Saskatchewan	1,806,255

Mr. MEIGHEN: The total will be $25,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, $20,000,000. The amount earned by each province up to the end of 1922 stands as follows:

Province—	Amount
Alberta	Nil
British Columbia	$1,116,383 87
Manitoba	525,964 27
Nova Scotia	1,357,633 57
New Brunswick	1,107,479 36
Ontario	5,841,577 88
Prince Edward Island	254,871 53
Quebec	2,452,477 62
Saskatchewan	766,343 79

The amounts paid to the various provinces up to the end of 1922 total $9,788,404.98. The situation in regard to the amounts it is estimated the provinces will not have earned from the apportionment of their grants stands as follows: Alberta has not been able to undertake any great work as yet. Manitoba still needs $500,000 to complete its apportionment. In the case of the other provinces the amounts are:

Prince Edward Island	$125,000
Quebec	800,000
Saskatchewan	700,000

At the end of 1924 British Columbia, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario will have drawn their full apportionment. The object of this act is to allow the provinces which, at the end of 1924, will not have been able to earn their entire appropriation, to have two years in which to earn it.

Mr. HANSON: This seems to be an appropriate occasion to ask the government what decision has been reached with reference to the request of the provinces, made here within the last few weeks, to extend the principle of this legislation. I understand a very large delegation came before the government since the Easter vacation, which delegation asked for the modest sum of $40,000,000. I do not know what encouragement they got from the government, as I was not present, but I think the country should know if the government reached a conclusion, and this would be an appropriate time to make the statement.

Mr. GRAHAM: To put it briefly, this resolution is the answer of the government. After full deliberation considering the vast obligations of the Dominion it was thought advisable, and quite just and fair that this act should not be extended further than to allow those provinces which will not have been able to earn their apportionment by the expiration of 1924 to have ample opportunity to earn that portion of the appropriation. The deputation to which my hon. friend refers, I think, went away without any mistaken view as to what the attitude of the government was. The reply to their request was made by the Prime Minister, who pointed out the fact, as I have stated, that our federal obligations were so great that the government thought it was time the provinces should look after the further development of good roads, and that the federal authorities should devote their attention and their expenditures to those things which necessarily come under federal authority. It was further pointed out that, while the war affected all parts of Canada, directly the expenses of the war fell upon the federal authorities, and the burden of taxation had risen to a point where the government believed it would not be justified at the present time in giving further aid to those things which are essentially provincial. That is the attitude of the government, as I stated before. We thought it would not be just to the provinces who had begun to develop a plan for good roads, believing they would have the entire amount of this appropriation at their disposal, to cut them off before they had their plans developed. This resolution is based on that principle, and it is proposed to extend the time so as to place all the provinces on an equal footing in regard to their ability and time to earn the amount of this appropriation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whatever may be said for the government's decision, it cannot be said that it contributes to the relief of the tax-payer of this country.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does not add any more to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There might be economies effected by the government that would, but anything effected by simply reducing what assistance has been given to the provinces merely adds to the tax burdens the provinces have to impose. It is a change in the tax-collecting agency, and that is all. A far better form of curtailment would be in those things that are federal, those things that have to do with the machinery and upkeep of government. This is merely a shifting of the instrument of collection.

Mr. GRAHAM: To the place where it belongs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: From the federal authority to the provincial. Constitutionally the obligation of roadmaking and upkeep of roads is of course provincial, that cannot be disputed, but of course the Dominion has very frequently assisted the provinces in more than one of the functions the provinces carry on. For instance, we are making grants for agricultural education. We are conducting agricultural services. These are fundamentally provincial. But that is not the point I rose to

emphasize, which was that this proposition may take a burden off the government, but it does not take any burden off the people. It may make the estimates of this government that much less, but it is not by economizing that the government brings it about. It is merely by shifting to the provinces the load that, for general purposes and in the public interests, the federal government assumed in 1919.

This policy has resulted undoubtedly in a stimulus being given to road building in this country. We were very far behind the United States, and I do not doubt for a moment but that this country is suffering now, in comparison with the United States, in the retention of its population, in the attraction of new population, in business activities, from many reasons, one of which is the superiority of transit on the roads in that country. In Canada we are far behind them indeed, and the object of the legislation was to give such an impetus to them, and to have such a momentum aroused, that the provinces would go on and continue the work of roadmaking on a permanent interprovincial and lasting basis. It has had that effect to a degree. It has had it to a very considerable degree. I apprehend that the breaking of it off will result in the patch-work character of roads in Canada. I knew the time would likely come sooner or later when the matter would be again left to the provinces, but I fear the high cost of roadmaking of recent years—that is the extent to which that high cost was unexpected and was unprovided for—will all be reflected in a broken patch-work system of roads. We shall find the country with pieces of road here and pieces there, but nothing linked up. That will likely be one of the results; but whether or not it is justified, I want only to emphasize that it is not brought about by any economy of administration, it is simply shoving back on the provinces a load that in other days we undertook to carry.

Mr. FORKE: It seems to me, on this question of road building, after all the people pay. It does not matter whether it is the Dominion government or the provincial government, the money comes from the people. In connection with municipal affairs, I have had some little experience in bulding roads, and I do not know that government aid is just the best thing in some circumstances. I believe Manitoba would to-day be in a better position if it had a good many roads yet to build that it has already built, and built at a time when wages were high and expenses of every kind enormous. With the fillip that it got from advances from the Dominion government and advances from the provincial government, the idea was: Go on and build the roads; go after all those grants, and, of course, in that way the province ran into pretty large expenses and debts. I am a believer in good roads. The measure of a country's civilization is known by the way in which it goes about road building. At the same time I want to point out the fact that nearly all the big road building that has been done in the Dominion of Canada has been done at the most expensive time when it could possibly have been done, when help was scarce and when it cost an enormous amount of money to get the work done. In the municipality in which I was interested, we used to get the work done for 20 to 25 cents a yard; whereas during the time the great bulk of the road building was done, this cost 40 to 45 cents a yard. This shows the enormous cost of carrying on road building. The government in this case is neither to be praised nor to be blamed. I think about the right thing to do is to drop this policy in the meantime.

Mr. McMASTER: I think the government is to be congratulated on bringing to an end on fair terms a system whereby one power supplies the money and another power spends it. That system is essentially unwise. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) seems in a half-hearted sort of way to blame the government for its declared intention of bringing this system to an end. In this country we have more or less gone transportation mad. We have applied to transportation systems, whether railway, canal or otherwise, far more of the public revenue than it was wise to do. I am thoroughly of opinion that we shall put the finances of this country on a sound basis if we adhere, more largely in the future than we have done in the past, to the principle which forces the government that is spending the money to the unpleasant task of raising the money. I cannot help congratulating the government on its declared intention, as I understand it, of bringing this system to an end. This legislation of 1919 may have had a good effect. It may, however, have had the effect of encouraging provinces to embark in schemes of expenditure which they did not want, and which it was unwise for them to embark upon. The question of roads is, in its primary aspect, the question of a good road to market, to church and to the station, and a great deal of our expenditure on great trunk highways which serve largely as plea-

sure roads for pleasure travel is in my humble opinion, an extravagance of which a country in our financial condition should make the most sparing use.

Mr. BAXTER: How much remains to be drawn for New Brunswick?

Mr. GRAHAM: About $300,000. It is estimated that it will be expended fully by the end of 1924.

Mr. FORTIER: I see by the statement of the minister that in Quebec there is still a balance of about $2,500,000 unexpended. Has the minister approved any plans for the construction of any new highways, especially those highways that have been already mentioned, betwen Montreal and Mont Laurier, and between Hull and Montreal on the north shore of the Ottawa river? I would be glad if special attention be given to those highways, because for the last ten or twelve years the construction of those roads has been advocated by the citizens of the Ottawa valley. They are most important, and I trust the department will assist the provincial government in the construction of those highways. As a matter of principle, I approve this resolution of the government. I think it is in the interest of the rural districts of my province, and I am glad that this policy is continued.

Mr. GRAHAM: The method adopted is for the province to outline its plans for roads for that section, and after that has been done, they either have been or will be approved if they are within the amount yet to be drawn by the province.

Mr. HANSON: Is any discretion exercised by the department as to approving what roads will be called trunk roads?

Mr. GRAHAM: An arrangement is come to between the provincial and the federal authorities; but the province is the real authority to say where the road shall be established, although approval has to be given by the federal authority. It is the standard of road and the amount of expenditure to be made that comes more intimately within the purview of the federal authority.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is the position of British Columbia?

Mr. GRAHAM: The amount due to British Columbia under the federal agreement was $1,251,955. British Columbia has earned $1,116,383.87. It has been paid $1,116,383.87. It is anticipated that by the expiration of 1924, British Columbia will have earned all its appropriation.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is it proposed to give Brtiish Columbia any further assistance in road building?

Mr. GRAHAM: The government's proposal as outlined in the resolution is to extend to those provinces that have not earned the amount of their appropriation, a period of two years in which to earn it. No further grant is proposed to provinces which will have earned their proportion of the appropriation of $20,000,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I do not agree with the stand taken by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and other hon. gentlemen, that the Dominion should not do anything further to assist in building good roads. In British Columbia particularly there are reasons why we should receive assistance. The country there is of such a nature that road-building is very difficult and very expensive. I do not know that there have been any allegations as to the misapplication of funds or the throwing away of money in connection with the building of roads in the province. If there has been anything wrong in that connection, then of course the Liberal government must be responsible for it, because we have had a Liberal government there all that time. But I suggest that the money which has been spent, although it may have been spent in an extravagant way, has possibly been spent to advantage; that is to say, we have received benefits from the work which has been done. In British Columbia some very good roads have been built which are not in all respects of a provincial character. For instance, the Pacific highway which connects with a road from Vancouver to San Diego in southern California, a distance of some two thousand miles, is one of such roads. I think the construction of that road is going to be a good thing for British Columbia and consequently for Canada. It is going to bring in a great many motorists who are all going to spend money and some of whom will undoubtedly remain in the country. The construction of that road I believe was a splendid thing for Canada.

Another road is required and that is across British Columbia from the east to the west. In my opinion the rest of Canada is interested in that road to a certain extent. Certainly the mountainous scenery of British Columbia is unsurpassed in the world and is a great asset to Canada as a whole. It seems to me a matter for regret that in order to get from British Columbia to the province of Alberta it is necessary for us to go through the United States if we wish to travel by motor. It would be a good thing if a road

could be built across British Columbia, and I think that the Dominion should do something to assist in the construction of such a road. The same principle would apply to other provinces. I am firmly convinced that money spent either by the Dominion or by the provinces in the construction of good roads is as well expended as any money can be. In this country we are not as far advanced in this respect as they are in other places, and this government should consider extending the programme of assistance federally to the provinces for the building of roads.

Mr. GARDINER: Has Alberta taken advantage of the Dominion grant?

Mr. GRAHAM: The province of Alberta has not to any extent earned any of her appropriation. The bill which will be founded on this resolution extends the time for two years within which that province can take advantage of the act of 1919.

Mr. HANSON: In view of the principle which has been laid down by the minister and supported by the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) I would ask what principle is to be adopted with respect to the building of international bridges between the various provinces and adjacent states of the union. For long distances on the border between New Brunswick and the state of Maine the St. John river is the boundary, and at another stage the St. Croix river is the boundary line. In days gone by the Dominion government had paid one-half of the expense of building new bridges across the boundary line where a river divides the two countries. One has just been completed at Edmundston, New Brunswick, and it is a fine bridge indeed. Another one was required across the St. Croix river between McAdam and Vanceboro in the state of Maine. I have been endeavouring to get the Minister of Public Works to include a small appropriation of $17,500 to pay one-half of the cost of that bridge, our neighbours in Maine having already voted their share.

Mr. GRAHAM: The state of Maine?

Mr. HANSON: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: And why not New Brunswick?

Mr. HANSON: New Brunswick absolutely refuses to shoulder any part of the burden, I presume because they consider this an international matter and because of the example which they have in precedent of former years. I would press upon the government the necessity of meeting our Maine neighbours halfway.

The CHAIRMAN: This can hardly be considered altogether relevant to the subject matter of the resolution.

Mr. HANSON: I am asking the minister to lay down a principle and if he does not object I do not think the chairman should.

The CHAIRMAN: There are several hon. members who might object.

Mr. HANSON: No one has objected yet.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. HANSON: Then I would ask the minister a question. Would he lay down a principle to-night so that we may know hereafter whether any federal aid will be extended towards the building of international bridges?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not been discussing international bridges, but I do not think that any principle I have laid down would prevent any government dealing with a case as it arose.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Has the minister had any communication from the authorities of British Columbia in regard to what is known as the Hope-Princeton highway there asking for an extension?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no recollection of any such correspondence; possibly it may be in the department.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that the province of Alberta has not taken advantage to any great extent so far of this federal scheme for assisting in the building of highways. We in the province of Alberta have a peculiar situation with regard to the building of roads. No doubt hon. members will realise that in the matter of railway facilities we are perhaps worse off than any of the other two western provinces, and we have found it necessary to use our funds for the building of roads for the purpose of constructing market roads for the farmers. Under these circumstances we have not been able to take advantage of this particular scheme to any great extent. We contend that in our province the farmers, who produce the wealth, should receive first consideration, and we have had to spend money providing them with roads because of the lack of transportation facilities by rail. I would suggest the possibility of extending this federal aid scheme in the western provinces to assist in the building of main

market roads so that the farmers can haul their produce to the nearest delivery points. I repeat, we have fewer transportation facilities in that province than there are in other provinces, and consequently have had to spend our money to a large extent in the construction of market roads. Under these conditions therefore some consideration should be given the province of Alberta to assist in the building of roads.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Graham thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 151, to extend the period of the Canada Highways Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. JAMES A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the third reading of Bill No. 24 to amend The Copyright Act 1921.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): Mr. Speaker, before this bill is read a third time perhaps the House will bear with me while I make a short statement in an endeavour to somewhat dissipate a conclusion that seems to have been reached as regards certain features of this bill and the act of 1921 which this measure is supposed to amend. It is not customary to present any remarks on the third reading of a bill, but I may be excused by the fact that I was prevented from being present when this bill was before Committee of the Whole for a reason well known to all hon. members—that at this stage of the session so many committees are sitting concurrently that even with the best will imaginable it is impossible to attend to all one's duties in this House.

I wish to state first that the main desire which, in my humble opinion, should inspire the House in regard to the question of copyright is to adopt and put in force this year a new copyright act. You know that at present our copyright law is the law embodied in the Revised Statutes of 1906, which is nothing but the embodiment of the law in the Revised Statutes of 1886, which in turn merely embody the original law of 1875. I need not stress the point that this indeed constitutes a very antiquated form of copyright which it is imperative for us to renovate and modernize. Efforts have been made session after session to put through this House a new copyright bill, but all these efforts have failed.

I do not propose to repeat the history of this law. It is well known to many members, but I wish to bring back the attention of the House to what took place in 1921, when the Hon. Mr. Doherty, then Minister of Justice, moved for leave to introduce a copyright bill. That bill was referred to a special committee of which I was a member, and we gave it quite a lot of study. Many new features were introduced in that bill, for the very reason that since 1875 so many new forms of reproducing the works of artists had arisen that it was necessary to provide for protection along new lines. For instance, there was nothing in the old copyright law covering the reproduction of musical compositions by talking machines, and so on. Finally we arrived at an agreement on every clause except what are known as the license clauses, Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 27, which are now under discussion.

The other night an hon. member in committee stated that all parties—printers and authors—had been agreed on those clauses, and that it was only later on that someone found out that they were in contravention of the Berne convention and should therefore be dispensed with. I may say that these are not the facts at all. The printers and authors presented their case before the committee, and we could not come to an agreement on the clauses, except to the extent that we decided we would not retain them in the bill if they were in contravention of the Berne convention. That is made very plain by the discussion that took place on that bill on the 25th May last, when, voicing the opinion of myself and the authors, I stated:

> I still think it wrong to pass the bill with the clauses to which we object, and I feel confident that the minister will find out they are in contravention of the Berne convention, and that he will have to do away with them if we wish to adhere to that convention.

To which Mr. Doherty replied:

> If I find I have to do that, I will. In saying it was a compromise I did not mean to suggest that it was a compromise reached by the authors and publishers after a conference. It was a compromise effected by the committee between the respective contentions.

The bill at the time was passed with the very clear understanding that these contentious clauses would be referred to the Berne office for interpretation. That was done in the meanwhile and Friday I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) produced the result of that submission. I have in my hand a copy of Le Droit D'Auteur of the 15th July, 1921, in which the bill of 1921 is studied and analyzed. The other day some suspicion was expressed as to the official character of this paper. I may say that it is the official organ of the International Bureau of Berne on Copyright. As

for the bureau itself, there cannot be any discussion as to its official status. It will be found in our bill of 1921 in the second schedule which reproduces the revised Berne convention with Articles 21, 22, 23 and 24, recognizing the official authority of the bureau. I will read Article 21:

> The international office established under the name of the "Office of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works" shall be maintained.
>
> 11 p.m. That office is placed under the high authority of the government of the Swiss Confederation, which regulates its organization and supervises its working.

Le Droit D'Auteur is the official organ of the International bureau. It has a correspondent in Ottawa. It was stated in committee that this correspondent was a mere civil servant and it was somewhat implied that we did not have to pay too much attention to his opinion. I do not believe that corresponds with the facts at all. The only duty of that correspondent who is the official correspondent of this paper is to supply the office with documents in order to enable them to pass judgment upon them or to express an opinion over them. Anyway I know for a fact that that is what took place, that the Canadian bill was sent to Berne, was analysed there, and this paper expressed its opinion as to these contentious clauses. It does not matter much, Mr. Speaker, who happened to write the article; so long as it was printed in this paper it has the full authority of the International bureau.

The opinion expressed by Le Droit D'Auteur very plainly was that the license clauses as they passed the House in 1921 came in contravention of the Berne convention. Perhaps I might explain in a word if I do not detain the House too long, what the license clauses are. They are for these purposes: If a Canadian writer chooses to publish his work in another country than Canada the Canadian printer may apply to the minister who has the Copyright branch under his jurisdiction to obtain permission through license to print that work in Canada, providing he gives the author due compensation for the work. That seems very fair at first sight, but the contention of the authors is that they are full masters of their work, that they alone must decide whether they publish in Canada or elsewhere, that they alone must keep the control of the work of their brains. The contention of the printers, on the other hand, is this, that by the authors publishing their work in another country than Canada they do not give to the printing business sufficient encouragement, and that a kind of protectionist measure by the government in this way would give a chance to the printers to have their share of the printing of Canadian works.

As far as our connection with the convention of Berne was concerned, we did not have to pass an opinion on the principle of the license clauses. I insist upon that point. All that we have had to do was to obtain an opinion from Berne as to whether we could adhere to the convention and at the same time retain these clauses in the bill of 1921. Last year and again this year I moved a resolution, after taking cognizance of this opinion expressed from Berne, that we should not delay further putting into force the bill of 1921, but that we should drop the license clauses and put the rest of the bill into force. This year a few weeks after that resolution was put on the order paper the Minister of Trade and Commerce brought down a bill to that very same effect, the bill that is now before us for third reading, in which bill there was a clause doing away with the license clauses, and another clause to the effect that the Copyright Bill would be put into force on the 1st day of July. But renewed opposition came from the other side of the House on the ground that no official authority at Berne had expressed an opinion on the matter, and that therefore there was no good reason for the government doing away with the license clauses. I have tried to show previously what the expression by that paper meant, and to what an extent it had an authority which should guide us. I must add that if I am not mistaken, that is the interpretation that has also been given by the Imperial authorities and by the officials of the government at Ottawa. But the minister in order to meet the situation moved an amendment on Friday, which is also in my opinion in full accordance with the requirements of the Berne convention, to the effect that instead of dropping the license clauses they be kept in the bill but should not apply to a British citizen who is not a Canadian or to a citizen of any other country which has adhered to the convention.

A great deal of speculation arose in the House as to the exact meaning of that amendment. As far as I am concerned I must admit myself that it is susceptible of two different interpretations. It may mean that when a Canadian author publishes a book in the United States for instance, that is in a country that has not adhered to the convention, these license clauses may apply; but if he publishes his book in a country which has adhered to the convention the license clauses would not apply. That is one interpretation. But a close

scrutiny of the amendment strikes me that it may go much closer and mean this, that we cannot in this country apply for a license to reprint a book published by a British citizen who is not a Canadian or by the subject of a foreign country that has adhered to the convention, but that as far as Canadian authors are concerned no matter where they publish their work the printers in this country may always apply for a license to reprint them. Now I am not to speak for the government, but I do not think they intended to go that far. I am afraid that as far as the Canadian authors are concerned this amendment leaves them exactly where they were in the bill of 1921. At the same time I wish to impress this on the mind of the House, and it is the very crux of the situation. As I have said, we are still under the effect of an old copyright law which goes as far back as 1875. We are all willing to adhere to the convention of Berne, and as far as that is concerned this amendment meets the requirements very fully. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, although I wish to make a strong reservation as to the meaning of this amendment if it can really be interpreted in the last sense I have just given, at the same time for the sake of the fifty clauses of the 1921 bill, for the sake of the rights that were granted by the 1921 bill to the song writers and to the musical publishers who had no protection at all, and who do not enjoy any protection at this moment, and because of a desire not to delay any more this legislation, I would suggest that this House pass this bill on its third reading without division with this in mind, that we must help with all our force to have a copyright bill assented to at the end of the session and put into force this year that shall have nothing in it that would prevent Canada from adhering to the convention of Berne. If I may be permitted to make that reservation, I hope that when the bill reaches the Upper House this amendment will be very carefully scrutinized and redrafted in such a way as to indicate clearly that the license clauses do not apply to the countries which have adhered to the Berne convention and that Canadian writers shall not be prejudicially affected in any way. I do not know whether I have made my meaning clear. What I mean is this: If the amendment merely deals with the relations of the Canadian writers—

Mr. McMASTER: Has the hon. member the terms of this amendment?

Mr. RINFRET: Yes, I have it here.

Mr. McMASTER: Read it.

Mr. RINFRET: It is as follows:

That clause 2 of the bill be struck out—

That clause is the clause which purported to repeal the license clauses—

—and the following substituted therefor:

2. Sections thirteen, fourteen, fifteen and twenty-seven of The Copyright Act, 1921, shall not apply to any work the author of which is a British subject, other than a Canadian citizen, or the subject or citizen of a country which has adhered to the convention and the additional protocol thereto set out in the second schedule to the said act.

I think that the only intended effect of this amendment was to deal with the American situation—to deal with the case of a Canadian writer publishing his book in the United States, and the case of the Canadian printer who is anxious to have that book printed in Canada. But I am afraid that it may mean much more, and that it would apply to the Canadian writer publishing a book in France, or in Belgium, or in England, or in Germany because this amendment says that the license clauses will not apply to any work the author of which is a British subject, other than a Canadian citizen. That, it seems to me, will apply to a Canadian citizen no matter whether he publishes his book in an adhering country or in a non-adhering country. Again I say I do not think it was the intention of the government to go that far. Therefore—and I can only speak for myself—I am so desirous that this bill be put into force, for other considerations that I have mentioned, that as long as this amendment assures our adherence to the Berne convention, and that there is nothing in it to prevent us from doing so, I am perfectly willing to approve of the third reading of the bill but with the reservation that in the Upper House this amendment will be carefully scrutinized and if necessary changed so as to restrict its meaning to what was the original purpose; that is to say, to deal with the case of the Canadian writer in regard to the United States. As soon as the United States adheres to the Berne convention that would do away with the necessity for the amendment, if I might use that term. If the United States do not adhere to the Berne convention then it would be necessary for this country to pass a special agreement with that country. As the amendment now reads it seems to me that there is danger that it may lead to more confusion. Personally, although I fully approve of the bill of 1921, as amended by the present bill, No. 24, yet I desire to make a strong reservation concerning the possible interpretation of the amendment in question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a subject that I have not had the privilege of following

closely through its somewhat long history in this House, and particularly through its recent course of the last few weeks. The hon member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) have made a study, in some degree, of it. It is unfortunate that owing to other engagements the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) was not able to be present at the last discussion, and that the other two hon. members to whom I referred are not able to be present tonight. It is quite clear that the hon. member who has just sat down has made a detailed study of the subject, and he certainly has made an able presentation of his case to-night. I do not like the idea though of passing a bill in the hope that the Upper House will, if we are wrong, save us from our folly, or in the expectation that later on in the same session another bill of a better character on the same subject will be introduced and adopted. It may be that I have not caught the latter reservation of the hon. gentleman correctly. It would appear to me though that under the circumstances the third reading might wait until to-morrow until the speech of the hon. member can be read by those here who take special interest in the subject of copyright, and that the minister will be well advised to let the third reading stand to that end.

Mr. ROBB: The government have no desire to rush this bill through. I may say for the information of my right hon friend (Mr. Meighen) that the former Minister of Finance, who was leading the House on Friday night was willing that the bill should get its third reading then—that was my understanding. The situation when the bill came before the House on Friday night was that my hon. friend for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made a strong plea on behalf of the printers while my hon. friend for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) made a plea on behalf of the authors. I have no knowledge whatever of the law on this subject, particularly the international law, but I am assured by the Commissioner of Copyright, who has had twenty-five years' experience in this department, and has made a close study of international copyright law, that the proposed amendment will enable Canada to join the Berne convention, and that the fear just expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Rinfret) as regards the rights of the Canadian author in countries other than those that adhere to the Berne convention, are unfounded, that as to the United States—we may as well be frank, it is the United States that we are particularly interested in—the authors will not be affected, that they will have their rights in all other countries, and that the license clauses will apply only to such countries as are not members of the Berne convention. As soon as the United States joins the Berne convention—and at the last session of their congress a bill for that purpose was introduced but was not pressed to conclusion because of the amount of legislation that required to be dealt with—then these licensing clauses all disappear. Of course, if my hon. friend insists upon it we will—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the Commissioner of Copyright?

Mr. ROBB: Mr. O'Halloran.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister had an opinion on the subject from the Department of Justice?

Mr. ROBB: My recollection is that Mr. O'Halloran told me that a copy of the bill had been referred to the Department of Justice and approved of by them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But has this feature, this amendment, been submitted to the Department of Justice for their opinion?

Mr. ROBB: Yes. My recollection is that Mr. O'Halloran assured me that it had been submitted to the Department of Justice and approved of by them, that it was their interpretation of it.

Mr. FORKE: It was a very unsatisfactory vote that was taken on the second reading of this bill. I think scarcely anyone in the House understood it, I know I did not; and listening very carefully to the explanation which has been so very well given by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) to-night I cannot say that I am very clear on the subject yet I have been interviewed by the printers and by the authors and still I do not understand the question. If an understanding was arrived at between the different parties as to the purpose of the bill, and that it was all right it would not take long to pass. However I think it would be better to let the motion for the third reading stand until the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who has some knowledge of the subject, is here. Then he and the hon. member for St. James can talk the matter over and if they assure the House that it is all right, and I suppose we can take their word for it, the bill can be passed without any further waste of time. I do not feel like letting it go through now, because I do not understand it.

Motion stands.

GRAND TRUNK GRATUITIES

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend asked me for a copy of the order in council appointing Mr. Congdon a commissioner to inquire into the Grand Trunk gratuities. I now lay a copy of the order in council on the Table.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

Tuesday, May 1, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 145 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mabel Gertrude Johnston.—Mr. Mewburn.

Bill No. 146, (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilfrid Charles Brown.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 147 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gertrude Andrews.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 148 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Henry Davidson.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 149 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Robert Webb.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 150 (from the Senate), for the relief of Katharine Bryans.—Mr. Church.

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): May I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance if he has fixed the date for the delivery of the budget?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): If my hon. friend will permit me, I hope during the week to fix a definite date. I would rather not do it to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will not be this week?

Mr. FIELDING: It will not be this week.

U.S. LABOUR DELEGATES DETAINED

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has the Acting Minister of Immigration any further information to give the House with respect to the Howat case?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization): I am awaiting further information. I expect that my decision will be given this afternoon.

FRENCH TREATY

BILL TO RATIFY CONVENTION READ THE THIRD TIME

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill No. 23, respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the French Republic.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—DISALLOWANCE OF NOVA SCOTIA STATUTE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Intimation was given that, following the third reading of the French treaty we would proceed to consider the Italian treaty to-day. That, however, has been laid aside. I move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I desire to avail myself of the opportunity afforded by this motion to move the following amendment:

> That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:
>
> "In the opinion of this House the disallowance of the statute enacted by the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia, being chapter 177 of the statutes enacted in the year 1921, was an abuse of the Dominion's powers of disallowance, such statutes being entirely intra vires of the province and not interfering with any matter the subject of Dominion policy or administration."

The consideration of this motion involves going, at some little length, into the question of the veto power and where we stand in connection with it. The veto power, as all members, I think, are very well aware, came into our constitutional system as part of the gradual process of granting by the sovereign of the right of government of constitutional assemblies. There has been a reservation here, there, and everywhere almost, in connection with this matter of veto and disallowance. In Canada we start the right of veto at the bottom and go on up to the top. We have the right of veto in the Dominion in so far as the provinces are concerned; the right of veto in the British authorities in so far as the Dominion is concerned; and the right of veto in the sovereign in so far as the Imperial parliament is concerned. The history of vetoing is an interesting one. It is very interesting, because, for example, the first two counts in the American Declaration of Independence against his Britannic Majesty were founded upon the use of this power of disallowance or veto. We have had the same thing in Canada ourselves—protests

against the exercise of the veto power in regard to matters entirely within the provincial jurisdiction. To this I shall refer later. I might also tell the House that, as a matter of law, the veto still rests in the Crown, as a matter of fact the last exercise of the power of veto by the Crown in England was in the year 1708. Nominally the power still exists, but constitutionally it is absolutely dead. So far as the Dominion is concerned, while there is that right of veto in the home government, in so far as we are concerned, it being recognized that we have sovereign powers in our own parliament, again constitutionally that legal right is also dead as Julius Caesar. The exact provisions as to veto in Canada are to be found in the British North America Act. Section 56 of that act deals with the vetoing of the legislation of this parliament by the Imperial parliament. By section 90 of the same act the provisions of section 56, mutatis mutandis, are made to apply, with changes of course as to the terms and the words, to the provinces. So that the jurisdiction under which the government here acts was as follows:

> Where the Governor General assents to a bill in the Queen's name, he shall by the first convenient opportunity send an authentic copy of the act to one of Her Majesty's principal secretaries of State, and if the Queen in council within two years after receipt thereof by the secretary of state thinks fit to disallow the act, such disallowance with a certificate of the secretary of state of the day on which the act was received by him being signified by the Governor General by speech or message to each of the Houses of parliament or by proclamation, shall annul the act from and after the day of such signification.

We have had a good deal of trouble in working out in Canada our jurisprudence, if we can term it, under this question of the veto. We have had two schools of thought. I am free to admit that at one time the school of thought which was more advanced and democratic was that advanced by my hon. friend's party sitting opposite to us. I suppose the late Sir Oliver Mowat did more than any other man to advance and make clear provincial rights in Canada, and we found him taking a very firm and insistent stand in connection with this question of veto. You had two schools of thought. You had on the one hand the Dominion administrator, whose idea was that he was a sort of wet nurse or judge extraordinary of the morals of the province, and you had on the other hand those who thought the province within the exercise of their own absolute jurisdiction was supreme—just as supreme as the Dominion was in the exercise of its jurisdiction—and that by no stretch of imagination could the Dominion cabinet be erected into a censor of morals of provincial legislation. We have had some disallowances which have gone a long way—much further than they should have. We have had disallowances that have been frankly termed ridiculous—held and shown to be ridiculous, as the result of subsequent litigation. On the other hand, we have had disallowances which were necessary and proper in connection with the functioning of the country as a whole. I think I am fair to my hon. friend when I say that in this case he makes for us a new precedent. I think I am fair when I say that this is the first case where the immorality and the injustice of the legislation is made the sole and only ground for disallowance. We have different cases which dealt with vested rights. I am going to refer to a few of them later on. We have had legislation which has stepped in between litigants and the courts. But to-day we have to consider a case where the injustice of the legislation—I think I am putting it fairly—as passed upon by my hon. friend, is such in his opinion that, irrespective of the constitutional right of the province, he may disallow it. Therefore, I think I am fair in saying that we to-day have a new idea, the idea that, untrammelled by any consideration—by considerations of Dominion policy, considerations of overlapping of different governmental activities, questions of Dominion legislation on the one hand and provincial administration on the other—on the mere question as to the good faith of the legislature, an act may be disallowed. As I say the United States, in their Declaration of Independence, made this the first and second counts in their indictment.

There was a great conference held in Quebec—my hon. friend will remember the year; I think it was in 1889—for the purpose of upholding provincial rights and of preventing encroachments by Dominion authority. At the time that conference was called in the city of Quebec by the then provincial premier, the Hon. Honoré Mercier, the first resolution passed and unanimously passed, was that the right to disallow provincial acts should be transferred from the Dominion to the Imperial government as was the case before confederation. The provinces at that time were impatient at Dominion action. Of course, the particular thing about which they were troubled at that time was the Streams Act, which had been disallowed once and then again. The disallowance was admittedly improper and the act was finally allowed to take its course. But the resentment against this encroachment upon provincial rights was so

great that the Quebec conference unanimously passed the resolution to which I have referred. In other words, the provincial idea was and is, as regards legislation which is entirely within the right of the province, that the right of a province to legislate is just as absolute as is the right of the Imperial parliament itself or the Dominion or any other sovereign body. I am free to admit that that right, of recent years, has been absolutely recognized by the Dominion, and I think I am correct in stating that this is the first illustration we have had for many years of any attempt being made to interefere with provincial authority and jurisdiction.

I now turn to the act which is the subject of discussion, and which is an act of the province of Nova Scotia, chapter 177 of the statutes of the year 1921. In the first instance, I want to make this point absolutely clear, I do not conceive myself charged with the duty of here discussing the question whether that act was properly passed or not, or whether it was a proper act or not. It is sufficient to show that it was an act which the local legislature, seized of local conditions, with knowledge of their properties, lands and citizens, thought they ought to pass. It would be just as presumptuous for me on the one hand to say that it was right, as it would be on the other to say that it was wrong. It was their business; it was their act. It is however, necessary to show just why that legislation came about.

Mr. McMASTER: Do I understand the hon. member to propose to lay before this House the idea that no matter how repugnant to sentiments of justice an act passed by a local legislature might be, that question should not be considered by us in a matter of this sort.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask my hon. friend—what constituted this House as keeper of the morals of another? What made this House the judge of the representatives chosen by the people of any province? Where is any proper appeal from the acts of any representative except to the sovereign people of the province that elected him? On the one hand you have the democratic idea of government by, for and of the people with responsibility to the people. On the other you have the idea of responsibility not to the people but to the Dominion cabinet. My view is that responsibility is to the people.

An action was brought in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia for the purpose of setting aside a transaction which arose apparently under the following circumstances. There was a firm or partnership in which a Mr. MacNeil was a partner; he bought a property which he described to be a farm, and as was said, he thought he was buying a farm. He entered into an agreement in November, 1910, for the acquisition of the property. The MacNeils assert that by a family arrangement of many years standing, that property was to go to Miss MacNeil for her care of her brothers, in looking after them when they were young, keeping the house and the like. The purchase price was $2,000. The deed was taken in April, 1911, and was taken as I say, in the name of Miss MacNeil. During the period of time which elapsed between the agreement and the deed, it is said that gypsum was discovered on the property in March, 1911, and that an option to sell this property had been given by the MacNeils for $35,000. The firm goes into liquidation and an action is brought against Miss MacNeil by the assignee of the firm, to have that transferred to her declared to be null and void as against the creditors. The case goes to trial and Miss MacNeil is successful at the trial. The case then goes to the court en banc of Nova Scotia and is heard by three judges. Two of them decide against Miss MacNeil, and one decides in her favour. The case then comes down to Ottawa and is heard by the Supreme Court of Canada, three out of five judges of the Supreme Court finding against her. Therefore, as regards judicial opinion on the subject, we have four judges saying one thing is right and five judges saying that thing is wrong. As I look at the record, one matter which was greatly stressed was the fact that MacNeil had secured, not a farm, but a very valuable property which he intended to exploit. A great deal was said, in the evidence at the trial, as to the value of the property. The point, of course, is made as to the ridiculousness of the consideration, and so on and so forth. It is rather interesting to see what is done by these people for whom my hon. friend takes this extraordinary action, as I conceive it to be. The assignee, upon getting hold of the property, turns around and sells it, for the sum of, not $35,000 or anything like that, but $2,500, to one of the chief witnesses against Miss MacNeil. And then after that the Plaster Quarries is incorporated with $300,000 worth of stock, a bond issue of $150,000, and a prospectus showing a value of property of $2,750,000. Well, matters stand in this shape when Mr. MacNeil, a brother, comes back from overseas, and the question is then taken up by the Great War Veterans Association who hold three separate examinations. Allegations are made that this

judgment was got at the expense of truth and justice, that it was got by evidence which did not disclose the fact that numerous witnesses who were called were never subjected to cross-examination, and that an absolute wrong had been done to the MacNeil family. And it is to the question of that alleged wrong that the legislature addressed itself. Now, if this act be so awful, if its immorality be so transparent, one would naturally suppose that a terrible lot of people must have had to do with its passage, which, of course, would be a dreadful thing. Before leading up to the act, however, I will go down the steps with a view to seeing just who had to do with this matter, what is their status, and whether they are gentlemen who have such a standing in that community that one would at least suppose that they would not try to do something which was immoral, wrong and against all public interest. The file shows one thing, first of all. It shows that Mr. Stewart, of the firm of Henry, Rogers, Harrison and Stewart, took this question up in the first instance. I think my hon. friends from Nova Scotia at any rate will agree with me that there is no more reputable practitioner in that province than Mr. Stewart, or a firm of better standing than that to which he belongs. He writes this letter of date May 9, 1921;

Mr. D. S. MacNeil is promoting a bill in the legislature which comes up before the Committee on Private and Local Bills at 10.30 to-morrow. Mr. MacNeil's family were badly done in an action concerning the title to lands at that time believed to be farm lands, but subsequently found to contain large deposits of gypsum. In the main, the circumstances are as follows: Mr. MacNeil's brother had agreed with his sister that if she would devote her time to supporting the younger members of the family he would purchase a farm for her which was ultimately to become the property of Mr. MacNeil, who is promoting the bill.

This is another MacNeil, the returned soldier.

This was done, but subsequently on the firm in which Mr. MacNeil was partner becoming insolvent through what appears to be the collusive action between the assignees in insolvency and MacNeil's partner, a case was made for declaring the property as having been purchased with partnership moneys. The case was very badly conducted, I think. In any event, although winning at the trial, the case was lost on appeal to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia and in the Supreme Court of Canada by a vote of three to one.

I think that is a mistake; in the report I saw it was three to two.

Since the action was determined sufficient facts have come to light to warrant the conclusion that the decision was a miscarriage of justice. I have gone through the facts very carefully and have satisfied myself that there has been a miscarriage of justice although I was not interested in the case before the courts. Mr. MacNeil asked me in February to look into the matter and to prepare a bill for him to submit to the legislature.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

What gentleman is that letter written to? What is his standing in the community? That letter is written to the gallant son of my hon. friend the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) who to-day wears his Majesty's decorations for distinguished conduct overseas. Now, Sir, that is the class of gentlemen who had to do with the matter before the legislature. There was another firm that was interested, a firm with which some others of my friends are fairly conversant and for which I make every claim to responsibility and respectability.

Mr. JACOBS: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I refer to the firm of Maclean, Burchell and Ralston. Mr. Ralston is the gentleman whom this government chose to act as chairman of its Commission on Pensions, a man whose probity, as it should be, is beyond question. He was acting in this case.

Mr. MARTELL: I know something of the matter, and I might observe that Colonel Ralston never appeared before any committee of the legislature of Nova Scotia in support of the bill. He was written to. Mr. Burchell did appear before one of the committees of which I was secretary, but Colonel Ralston never appeared before the legislature in behalf of the bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I had not finished my story; I was going to come to that in time. Colonel Ralston acted as counsel, not before the legislature, because so far as the committee work was concerned the matter was looked after by Mr. Burchell, the senior member of the firm. Is he not the senior member of that firm?

Mr. MARTELL: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which this business was conducted, if this case is as it is represented to be, would suggest one of two things: either, on the one hand, it reflects tremendous credit on these gentlemen in their ability to pull the wool over the eyes of a very ignorant body of legislators; or, on the other hand, it shows great merit in the MacNeil case; because this file shows that there was only one person opposing this legislation of all those who were concerned in it.

Mr. MARTELL: Where did the hon. member get that information?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not the information my hon. friend has; the information I have I gather from the file. There is an extraordinary letter on file in this case.

Mr. MARTELL: If my hon. friend will look up the proceedings in the Legislative Council he will find that three or four members voted against the bill, amongst them Mr. Chisholm, the chairman of the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend was there and he may have taken part in the matter; I do not know anything about that. I am simply going by the file, and as I say, there is an extraordinary letter to be found there.

Mr. SHAW: What file is the hon. member referring to?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am referring to the file brought down by the government in its return, and I am looking at the moment at a letter written by Mr. N. H. Meagher, who was a judge, and who has been very active in the work that is being carried on for the purpose of getting this bill disallowed. Whether the judge was right or wrong I do not know. Of course, the MacNeils' case always says he is wrong, but this is what he says:

> To the credit of the Hon. C. P. Chisholm, be it said, he did his best alone and unaided to prevent the passage of this unexampled legislation.

Ex-Judge Meagher may have been wrong; I do not know; but there is the letter. Well, the act then is passed, and what it does is to vest these lands in Mr. MacNeil. But the act does not stop with that vesting order. It does not say, as is said on the floor of this House, that the legislature has the right to take one man's property from him and give it to some other man without compensation or without this House having the slightest right to say a word in the matter, and without recourse to law, as has been said repeatedly and with great emphasis by a former Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth. Oh no, not at all. They say here: "Apparently there has been a miscarriage of justice. Evidence that ought to have been given has not been given Wrong conclusions appear to have been come to. Let the parties get at this all over again. Put Miss MacNeil back where she was and at the same time revive all the equities which anybody had against her." So that, in effect, the extent of the hardship which was placed upon these gentlemen who floated the company was that they had to submit their rights again to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. Here is the clause:

> The claims, rights and interests of all persons and bodies corporate in respect to the trusts and equities, if any, mentioned in section 1 of this act, shall be forever barred, unless an action, suit or other proceeding is brought in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia for the purpose of declaring, enforcing or establishing of such claim, right or interest within one year after the date of the coming into force of this act.

And the first section declared that Miss MacNeil held subject to those rights and equities.

The next thing done after that is the application to disallow. That application in the first instance is met by a request from the department here to the local legislature that the act should be repealed. The local government or somebody caused to be introduced a bill for the purpose of repealing the act. The Nova Scotia legislature apparently was still unrepentant and still thought it had done the right thing—the bill did not pass.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was it discussed in the House?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will read to my hon. friend everything the file says. My personal information is confined to the file.

> A bill was introduced on the 28th ultimo, and a copy of it is enclosed herewith. The bill passed first and second readings and got before the committee on law amendments, but I regret to say the legislature closed before the bill was reported to the House.

This is what is then said about it:

> I quite appreciate that in an ordinary case disallowance of a provincial act upon the ground of its conflict with the principles of justice would introduce a principle of action with respect to provincial legislation which it might afterwards be found difficult to restrict within due limits, and which no doubt would be resented by the provinces; but in the present case I am directed to state that the government in Nova Scotia will not oppose the disallowance of the act if the case is regarded as an exceptional one and not as a precedent.

What an extraordinary suggestion that is, Mr. Speaker—worse even than my hon. friend's so far as the Nova Scotia authorities are concerned. They say: "As a matter of right there is no Dominion jurisdiction. Once you step into this field who is there to say where you shall stop? Don't do it." On the other hand, the suggestion is: "Well, just do it this once. We don't mind. It is all wrong, but so long as you don't hold it against us, and promise never to do it again, why, do it this once."

Mr. HUGHES: Has Nova Scotia still the right to repeal?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everything is gone now so far as that act is concerned it has been killed by the Dominion authorities. Now, on the question of right it is significant to notice the following:

> I may add that if the bill had been reported by the committee it is, to say the least, very doubtful that a majority of the House of Assembly or of the Legisla-

tive Council would have supported it, as many of the members were imbued with the feeling that a grave injustice had been done to J. E. MacNeil because they thought her case had not been properly presented to the court.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to refer to some authorities to show just what the course of action has been in connection with this right which has been so much disputed and which we thought had been settled in the interests of local autonomy and public rights. I am not going to cite many of these authorities because we have some cases which deal so fully with the matter that I do not think it is necessary to burden the House with very many references. First of all I am going to refer to the report of the Hon. Sir Allen Aylesworth, when Minister of Justice, in the Cobalt Lake and Kerr Lake Mining Case Act. I am quoting from Provincial Legislation, volume 2, at page 81, where the issue is shortly stated as follows:

The case upon which the petitioning company relies is therefore briefly that the company having under the provisions of the general mining law of Ontario acquired the right to this mining property through discovery by Green and the assignment of Green's interest, the Ontario government proceeded to sell the property to the Cobalt Lake Mining Company, disregarding the rights of the petitioning company, and that upon these being asserted in the courts the statute in question was passed, the effect of which really is to transfer the petitioning company's title to the Cobalt Lake Mining Company and to preclude the petitioners from any redress notwithstanding their claim to be the true owners of the property.

There we have a case where the courts are absolutely shut out, where the title is taken away from one and given to the other. That is the issue as stated by Sir Allen Aylesworth in reporting it to this House, that is the issue which he conceives he is considering, and that is the important point to remember in going through his report. The date of his report is April 21, 1908. A little history is given by the writer at page 82, where he states:

The Honourable David Mills, when Minister of Justice, had occasion to report upon an Ontario statute, 1 Edward VII, chapter 21, as to which a petition had been submitted seeking disallowance for the reason, among others, that the act impaired or interfered with an existing contract. The minister stated: "The undersigned conceives that Your Excellency's government is not concerned with the policy of this measure."

Hon. gentlemen will see that that stand was taken as far back as 1897 if my memory is correct.

"It is no doubt intra vires of the legislature, and if it be unfair or unjust or contrary to the principles which ought to govern in dealing with private rights the constitutional recourse is to the legislature, and the acts of the legislature may be ultimately judged by the people."

The undersigned does not consider, therefore, that Your Excellency ought to exercise the power of disallowance in such cases.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) will note that Hon. Mr. David Mills, in precise language, answers the very question he put to me at the opening of this debate. Then again, the same Minister of Justice, in his report of 1901, says:

The undersigned bases his refusal to recommend disallowance upon the fact that the application proceeds upon grounds affecting the substance of the act in regard to matters undoubtedly within the legislative authority of the province and not affecting any matter of dominion policy.

Certainly every word of that applies to this case.

It is alleged that the statute affects pending litigation, and rights existing under previous legislation and grants from the province.

It will be seen that the case here is on all fours with the one mentioned in this report, where the act affected rights existing under previous legislation and grants from the province.

The undersigned considers that such legislation is objectionable in principle, and not justified, unless in very exceptionable circumstances, but Your Excellency's government is not in anywise responsible for the principle of the legislation, and, as has been already stated in this report, with regard to an Ontario statute, the proper remedy in such cases lies with the legislature or its constitutional judges.

Then the next Minister of Justice, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, entirely approves of that course of action. He says:

It appears that litigation was pending between the government and the petitioners at the time of the passing of the act with regard to the petitioners' liability to pay these royalties, and no doubt a very strong case is made out by the petitioners in support of the view that the legislature should have allowed the existing law to operate, and should not have undertaken to legislate so as to diminish or affect existing rights. The undersigned cannot help expressing his disapprobation of measures of this character, but there is a difficulty about Your Excellency in Council giving relief in such cases without affirming a policy which requires Your Excellency's government to put itself to a large extent in the place of the legislature and judge of the propriety of its acts relating to matters committed by the constitution to the exclusive legislative authority of the province.

And the report goes on just in the same way. It shows clearly that no matter how vicious the legislation may be, no matter how wrong it is, the jurisdiction of the province is absolute in connection with the matter which has been placed so entirely in their hands.

There is another case I am going to trouble the House with, and that is the report of Sir Allen Aylesworth in connection with the hydro-electric legislation. In that report, which is dated March 29, 1910, he takes the same stand; in fact, he goes further than he did before; he felt the case was, perhaps, a more extreme one. He refers to two deci-

sions of the Privy Council dealing with the question of the British North America Act, and I just want to read one or two references in that connection. Lord Watson, in the case of the Maritime Bank vs. the Receiver General of New Brunswick, says:

The object of the act was neither to weld the provinces into one nor to subordinate provincial governments to a central authority—

That is what my hon. friend's action here has done.

—but to create a federal government in which they should all be represented, entrusted with the exclusive administration of affairs in which they had a common interest, each province retaining its independence and autonomy. That object was accomplished by distributing between the Dominion and the provinces all powers, executive and legislative, and all public property and revenues which had previously belonged to the provinces, so that the Dominion government should be vested with such of these powers, property and revenues as were necessary for the due performance of its constitutional functions.

And so on. Then he continues:

But, in so far as regards those matters which, by section 92, are specially reserved for provincial legislation—

It is not necessary for me to point out that property and civil rights are by that section specially reserved to the provinces, and that is the only matter that is touched upon at all by this act that has been disallowed.

—the legislation of each province continues to be free from the control of the Dominion and as supreme as it was before the passing of the act.

That is what the House of Lords thinks. Then again, Sir Barnes Peacock, in the case of Hodge vs. The Queen, says:

When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a legislature for Ontario, and that its legislative assembly should have exclusive authority to make laws for the province and for provincial purposes in relation to the matters enumerated in section 92, it conferred powers not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial parliament, but authority as plenary and as ample within the limits prescribed by Section 92 as the Imperial parliament in the plenitude of its powers possessed and could bestow. Within these limits of subject and area, the local legislature is supreme, and has the same authority as the Imperial parliament or the parliament of the Dominion.

My hon. friend says it is not supreme; that he can at any time interfere and say, "This bill which you have passed dealing with property and civil rights is in my opinion immoral; it is not a far bill and because I do not think it is a fair bill I disallow it." Again, Lord Herschell, in the case of Brophy vs. the Attorney General of Manitoba, says:

In relation to the subjects specified in section 92 of the British North America Act and not falling within those set forth in section 91, the exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures may be said to be absolute.

My hon. friend takes issue with that statement. In the Fisheries case the same learned lord said:

The suggestion that the power might be abused so as to amount to a practical confiscation of property, does not warrant the imposition by the courts of any limit upon the absolute power of legislation conferred. The supreme legislative power in relation to any subject matter is always capable of abuse, but it is not to be assumed that it will be improperly used; if it is, the only remedy is an appeal to those by whom the legislature is elected.

That is a very cogent paragraph, and it shows how dangerous this sort of thing is. Why, Mr. Speaker, if it be right for the Dominion to say to this province or that province, "Your legislation is immoral, therefore we will disallow it," under the same statute and the very same terms you are in effect saying that the British parliament has exactly the same right to oversee, catechise or disallow every thing we do, if they want to. The cases are exactly the same; there is no difference. The terms of the bond are the same; every word and every comma is the same; the only change is in the name. My hon. friend says to Nova Scotia: "It is quite true, you have full and ample jurisdiction to deal with these matters, and you are supposed to do the right thing, but I do not think you are doing the right thing so I am going to disallow this legislation." Well, in doing that my hon. friend is inviting for the government exactly the same oversight on the part of the Imperial authorities.

4 p.m.

There ought to be some finality and the finality ought to be such as to assure the right of the people concerned. Sir Allen points out:

—that it is impossible to suppose that previously to the union of the provinces Her Majesty's government would under the corresponding powers of section 38 of the act on the union of the two provinces of Canada, have disallowed a provincial act for reasons such as those now urged for disallowance of the Ontario Power Commission Amendment Act 1909, and the undersigned is not aware of any reason why the power of disallowance should, in present circumstances be exercised more liberally or upon grounds which would not have previously availed.

This view is not confined to the more recent cases. In the case of Severn vs. the Queen, heard in the Supreme Court in 1878 and reported in volume 2 of the Supreme Court reports, page 96, the judgment of the Chief Justice reads:

Under our system of government the disallowing of statutes passed by a local legislature after due deliberation, asserting a right to exercise powers which they claim to possess under the British North America Act, will always be considered a harsh exercise of power unless in case of a great and manifest necessity and where the act is so clearly beyond the powers of the local legislature that the propriety of interfering would at once be recognized.

In another judgment in the same court, to be found at page 131 of the reports, Mr. Justice Fournier declares with reference to the power of veto:

> No doubt this extraordinary prerogative exists and could even be applied to a law over which the provincial legislature had complete jurisdiction. But it is precisely on account of its extraordinary and exceptional character that the exercise of this prerogative will always be a delicate matter. It will always be very difficult for the federal government to substitute its opinion instead of that of the legislative assemblies, in regard to matters within their province, without exposing themeselves to be reproached with threatening the independence of the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course the Minister of Justice can point to the fact that the right of disallowance has been exercised in other cases, but I do not think that he can do that with respect to one case that is identical in character with the present during the last twenty-five years. We have been growing, we have been changing, the public rights are daily becoming more confirmed, the right of the provincial legislature to enact laws within its own sphere has become more and more recognized; my hon. friend cannot find within the last twenty-five years any disallowance which at all resembles the disallowance in this case; indeed, I do not think he can find any such instance since Confederation. Previous to that there had been disallowances such as brought about the indignant protests which were voiced at the Quebec conference and resulted in the passing of resolutions on the subject. The minister can, however, point to acts which were disallowed because there was a conflict between Dominion policy and provincial policies, between a Dominion administration and a provincial administration; to cases where there was a conflict of Dominion interest as against provincial interest. He can refer to the railroad cases in Manitoba and a good many like cases. Hon. Mr. Doherty, Minister of Justice in the former administration, looked with a little more favouring eye on disallowance and doubtless the present Minister of Justice will refer to some reports on disallowance drawn up by him. He may, perhaps, in the case of the late minister cite dicta suggesting something of the nature of the grounds which are relied upon to justify action in the present case. But he will find only one case at all resembling the present one where an act was disallowed. That was an act of the province of British Columbia, enacted, I think, in 1917, and disallowed in 1918 by the federal authority simply because there was a conflict between a Dominion contract and a provincial statute. It was the case of the Railway belt. Where the rates arising under a Dominion contract, were in dispute and therefore the right of disallowance was exercised.

There is one peculiar thing which goes to show how hard it really is to keep these matters just where they ought to be unless they are left within their proper channels and proper jurisdiction. Why, before the present Minister of Justice was here, and when Mr. Doherty was minister, MacNeil came down to see the minister. And when the Great War Veterans found out how badly this case had gone and how badly MacNeil had been treated they came down and interviewed Mr. Doherty and he told them he could not do anything for them. He refused to interfere; he said it was impossible. He told them to go down to Nova Scotia, that it was a matter in which the local people should act. Well, after all, it does not matter very much what is said by this or that minister; we are dealing with a matter of very much greater importance than anything which can be established by the statement of any hon. gentleman. We are dealing with a question to-day which, if this course of action be proceeded with, can be the most formidable challenge to the proper continuance of our Dominion Confederation. If this practice be followed out we are dealing with a question which would enable the central authority to interfere with the deliberations of provincial legislatures, with a question which if it proceeds along these lines, invades the rights of justice possessed by a province and interferes with its legislation. We are dealing with a question to-day which, as I said in opening, was made the subject of the first two counts by the thirteen American colonies when they rose in rebellion; a question which led to the passage of resolutions at the Quebec conference when the provinces were endeavouring to get away from what they felt were improper attempts at interference, those attempts being far less serious than the attempt we have here. The provinces desired to have this power taken away from the Dominion minister—who might well be interested in politics—if it was to be so used as to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the province, and placed in the hands of the Imperial authorities. I hope my hon. friend on consideration will see that this is a very grave question, and that everyone in the House may take the attitude that the Nova Scotia legislature is a supreme and sovereign body within its own powers, just the same as any other legislature in this country, and has the right to pass its own laws, under the sections of the act establishing the legislative rights of the provinces.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): My hon. friend has asked that the House should declare that the government has been guilty of abuse of the Dominion powers by disallowing chapter 177 of the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia of the year 1921, because such statute is entirely intra vires of the province and does not interfere with the Dominion policy of administration. He declares that this statute, referring to civil rights, was strictly within the jurisdiction of the province, and that there is no power of disallowance in this country which could interfere with such legislation. He has given us the history of the case and has put before the House the facts which gave rise to this statute. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will give my version of the facts, and there may be some little difference between my hon. friend's version and mine.

In 1911 F. W. Sparrow and Francis MacNeil were doing business in Montreal as general contractors. They had been in business for some years. MacNeil was a native of Sydney Mines, Nova Scotia. For some time he had been speaking to his partner, trying to induce him to purchase a certain gypsum property situated in the province of Nova Scotia, for which he had an option. He was urging the purchase of that property for $2,000, stating that they could sell it at a very much increased price and be in a position to meet their liabilities. Sparrow finally accepted the proposition of his partner. They had no money. They went to the Molsons Bank in Montreal and asked for an advance of $2,000. The manager of the Molsons Bank, on their representation, consented to give them $2,000, with the understanding that the money would be used for the purchase of that property.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If these are the facts will he give us his authority for them? Will my hon. friend give us the evidence and tell us whether that evidence was contradicted or uncontradicted on the records?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I will give the judgment of the trial judge, who decided in favour of the MacNeil family. I refer to the 47th volume of the Nova Scotia law report, page 408, where I find the judge said:

> I find on the evidence that the gypsum property was bought with the money of Sparrow & MacNeil and not with the individual money of the defendant, Francis J. MacNeil. On this point I discredit the evidence of the defendant, Francis J. MacNeil, and I may add that his manner and demeanour on the witness stand were unsatisfactory and very far from convincing. The $2,000 cheque with the proceeds of which the gypsum property was purchased was a cheque of the firm signed by Sparrow and counter-signed by MacNeil in accordance with their practice in regard to firm cheques. Speaking of this cheque Mr. Johnson, the Manager of the Molsons Bank at Montreal, says: "That cheque was got to buy a gypsum property on Little Bras d'Or Lake, N.S. MacNeil did not see me on the occasion of this cheque, it was asked for by Sparrow and MacNeil; then the firm asked for an advance of $2,000, to complete the payment on this property on which Mr. MacNeil had an option. I gave the firm that advance understanding that it was to be for the benefit of the firm, and that the property when bought would be the property of Sparrow & MacNeil. MacNeil & Sparrow both asked for the advance for the purpose of buying the gypsum property. I understood from them that this gypsum property was to be the property of the firm; otherwise would not have made the advance." Sparrow's evidence is to the same effect.

This is to show, Mr. Speaker, that the money was advanced to the firm. At that time in April it was perfectly well known that there was some gypsum on that property, and the firm was trying to buy the property because there was gypsum on it. After MacNeil got the $2,000 he went down to Nova Scotia, met the proprietor of that gypsum property, a man named MacLeod. He purchased the property from him, had it conveyed to his sister, Jane MacNeil, and he paid the price agreed upon, $2,000, being the same amount that he had received from the firm of Sparrow and MacNeil. This was on the 18th April 1911. On the 10th May MacNeil gave an option to a man named Fletcher for the sum of $25,000 or $30,000, the option being signed by his partner Sparrow as a witness. This was one month after the conveyance of the same lot to Jane MacNeil. They received on account $1,000, which was forfeited, because Fletcher did not complete his agreement. On the 27th June, a month later, Francis MacNeil deeded to the defendant, Jane MacNeil, certain lands which he had at North Sydney. On the 12th July the firm went into liquidation. On April 12th, at the request of the creditors, the curator Sharpe took action against Francis MacNeil and his sister Jane MacNeil to set aside the two conveyances that I have mentioned. The defendant Jane MacNeil pleaded a general denial. She pretended that she had purchased the property herself, paid for it out of her own money, and that she had acted in good faith. She did not prove any of these lines of defence. At the trial she first tried to establish that she had paid out her own money, but on cross-examination she had to admit that the price was paid by the cheque of Sparrow and MacNeil.

As to the Sydney property, the trial judge declared that that property had been deeded to Jane MacNeil without any consideration;

that the transaction was carried out fraudulently by Francis MacNeil; that Jane MacNeil had no title to such property, and the action was maintained as to that property. As to the gypsum lot, the trial judge accepted another plea of Jane MacNeil to the effect that some years before, her brother Francis MacNeil had promised her that, on account of the fact that she had taken care of the younger brothers and sisters of the family, he would give her a farm. In giving her evidence, she contended that she had spent in that connection some $1,500, and the judge declared that, while Francis MacNeil had acted fraudulently towards his partner Sparrow, while he had paid the price of that purchase with the money of the firm, Jane MacNeil was in good faith; she was not a party to the fraudulent dealing of her brother; she did not know anything of his fraudulent conduct, and consequently the judge accepted her contention that she was entitled to the property. Jane MacNeil, who was by that judgment losing the North Sydney land, about which the judge declared that there was fraud, accepted that judgment. As to the gypsum property, the curator brought the case to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and the majority of the judges reversed the first judgment. I will cite to hon. members an appreciation by Mr. Justice Meagher of the evidence given by Francis MacNeil. Mr. Justice Meagher, in the name of the Nova Scotia full bentch, said:

I shall for brevity refer to MacNeil as the defendant who in breach of that understanding with him and his co-partner and in fraud of the latter, and of their creditors, misapplied such money paid for the property with it and caused it to be conveyed to his sister Jennie the other defendant.

He further said:

The appropriation of the money in question to pay an individual debt of the defendant (assuming there was a debt) was at best a gift from the firm to him, and it did not reach so high, because Sparrow was no party to it in any sense. It was an act of the defendant alone, and therefore as to him it was perilously near a theft. He came to Nova Scotia with the money practically in his hands to buy the property for his firm and then misappropriated it.

As to Jane MacNeil, this is what the judge says:

It cannot be said, having regard to her, (Jane MacNeil's) story, take whatever side or version of it you please, that she was a purchaser for value in good faith. It was not her money that paid for it, neither was it money to which she was entitled in any sense, nor has she any claim aginst her brother which she could enforce by legal proceedings. It is a fact pregnant with suggestions that she has not said one word in support of the good faith. I mean in regard to the source whence the money was derived, and the solvency in her belief of the firm out of whose pockets it came. She remained discreetly silent. The defendant knew the firm was utterly insolvent, so much so that its suspension could be, in his belief, a matter of a very few weeks at the most. He knew before he came down with this money he would have to turn to something else, and with the formation of plans for the future in his mind, it would be strange indeed if he would not discuss them with his sister and other members of the family and thus disclose the reason for such change. A word of inquiry on her part would have disclosed the situation. She knew the defendant did not owe her any such sum and therefore an inquiry would have been quite natural. She knew her brother's liability with respect to the Mackenzie debt, so called. She knew it was not paid and had been outstanding for years, and therefore she could not have felt assured that the $2,000 came from him or that he was solvent.

Later in the judgement it is said:

The pleaded defence consists of a general denial and averment that she bought this property and paid for it with her own money and in good faith. She did not prove either at the trial, and did not even attempt it. The farm theory and the support theory are kept out of sight in the pleaded defence and in the answers to the interrogatories as well. A false story is set up in the latter.

Appeal was taken by Miss MacNeil to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the judgment of the Supreme Court rendered in 1915 maintained the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. Mr. Justice Idington, in rendering the judgment of the majority, declared that the transaction in question was either a gift or simulated to cover fraud. This judgment was duly registered in the registry office of the county of Victoria in August, 1915. The curator in July, 1915, sold that property to Gordon Fletcher for the sum of $2,500. Fletcher in turn sold it to the Plaster Quarries Company, and in June, 1916, that company went to the Eastern Trust Company and secured a bond issue of some $150,000, of which $27,500 worth was sold at par and is still in public hands.

Mr MEIGHEN: Who is Fletcher?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not know who he is

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He was one of the witnesses.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is no crime to be a witness. The younger brother Stanley MacNeil, had been absent from the country during the war, serving as a soldier at the front. On his return to Canada he pretended that he had discovered that a miscarriage of justice had taken place in the case of Sharp and his sister Jane. He started a campaign and induced a member of the Nova Scotia legislature to introduce in that legislature a bill to vest that gypsum property in his sister. This was done at the end of the session of 1921, without any notice to any of the interested parties.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought two members of the government were directors of the Eastern Trust Company

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That I did not know. It makes no difference. No notice was given to the Plaster Company as I am informed. No notice was given to Fletcher, or to Curator Sharp, or to the creditors of Sparrow and MacNeil in Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. HANSON: Was there not the usual statutory notice given under the rules of the legislature of Nova Scotia?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I am informed that there was no such rule.

Mr. KYTE: The rules of the legislatue of Nova Scotia do not call for notice.

Mr. HANSON: They should.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: On that occasion all sorts of representations were made in order to establish that as a matter of fact there was a miscarriage of justice. Some of the interested parties, some of the petitioners, or some of their friends, went to the extent of declaring that the judges who had decided against them in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia regretted their action and that if they had to adjudge again the same case they would render a judgment in favour of the MacNeil family. It was on that occasion that one of the judges, Mr. Justice Meagher, wrote an open letter in which he says among other things:

> If the legislature commits itself to the policy it adopted in this instance of reversing decisions reached after hearing both parties to the litigation fully, upon ex parte statements of the defeated party and without notice or inquiry, there is not much use in parties invoking the aid of the courts and incurring heavy expenses to redress a wrong or determine a right, if, after it has been decided by the highest courts of the land the legislature annuls the decisions and destroys all rights acquired by them.

Further on he states what my hon. friend has quoted:

> To the credit of the Hon. C. P. Chisholm be it said he did his best alone and unaided to prevent the passage of this unexampled legislation. I am persuaded it is impossible to produce another instance like it in any British country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did Mr. Justice Meagher write that public letter to the press while still occupying a seat on the bench?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was retired.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The legislature passed the act six years after the judgment had been rendered, and in the meantime Judge Meagher had retired.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Chief Justice Townshend is represented as favouring that legislation. Here is what he wrote on the 17th of June, 1922:

> I never dreamed that any legislature of a civilised country could be guilty of such an outrage as to pass an act setting aside the solemn judgment of a court, as I learn has been done in this case, and I do sincerely trust that you will succeed in having such a gross violation of constitutional right disallowed by the Dominion government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is right.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The statute declares that the land in question is vested in Miss MacNeil in fee simple nowithstanding any proceedings or judgment, legal or otherwise, in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, or on appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. In other words, the statute is intended to operate directly and entirely against any judgments rendered by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia or the Supreme Court of Canada. This statute, at the request of the petitioners, was carefully considered. We heard Stanley MacNeil, the young brother, who now claims that he has a title to the property. We heard the petitioners, I say; and after a full consideration of the whole case we came to the conclusion that it constituted such an extraordinary piece of legislative injustice that it could be regarded as amongst those conceivable cases which, according to all ministers of justice who have occupied the position I now hold in the government, would justify the exercise of the power of disallowance. My hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) has based the whole of his argument on the contention that since the report made by Sir Allen Aylesworth in the Cobalt case, no power of disallowance has existed, or that the power of disallowance was denied by most of the ministers of justice and should not be exercised. He quoted in the last part of his remarks two judgments of the Supreme Court, and in reply to an hon. member who asked whether he did not think that such legislation was so repugnant as to justify the federal government in exercising the power of disallowance, he suggested that there was no such power. Well, in these very same judgments which were read by my hon. friend we find that the judges say that there are such circumstances as to render that power applicable, and all the ministers who have had to consider this legislation have held the same view. The hon. member quoted the report of Sir Allen Aylesworth and also the report of the Hon. Mr. Mills and tried to convince the House that the latter gentleman was of the opinion he had expressed. If we refer to what

the Hon. Mr. Mills said in relation to the British Columbia statute, Edward VII, page 45, we shall find the following:

It is alleged that the statute affects pending litigation and rights existing under previous legislation, and grants from the province. The undersigned considers that such legislation is objectionable in principle and not justified unless in very exceptional circumstances.

In other words, the Hon. Mr. Mills admitted that there were cases in which the exercise of the power of disallowance was justifiable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the hon. gentleman see, if he will read the sentence through, that the exceptional circumstances are not because of grossness of injustice but because of the infringing of other lines of policy?

Sir LOMER GOUIN (reading):

It is alleged that the statute affects pending litigation and rights existing under previous legislation and grants from the province. The undersigned considers that such legislation is objectionable in principle and not justified unless in very exceptional circumstances.

This was because the legislation was not of such an extraordinary character as to justify disallowance. Even Sir Oliver Mowat, who worked so heartily in this country as a political man to have the rights of the provinces recognised and respected, declared, as Minister of Justice in this House, that the power of disallowance might under special circumstances be exercised. I would refer the House to the very volume quoted by my hon. friend at page 402. Here is what Sir Oliver Mowat said at page 402:

There can be no doubt that the legislation complained of is exclusively within provincial authority either as matter of property and civil rights or private and local matters within the province, and although the provision is somewhat of an unusual one by which the city is compelled to submit to arbitration a claim of upwards of thirty years' standing upon conditions upon which the arbitrators are to decide apparently not upon legal grounds, but upon grounds of order and conscience, yet the undersigned does not consider the injustice complained of is such or so apparent as would justify Your Excellency in interfering to exercise the power of disallowance with a matter which is otherwise entirely under provincial authority.

We had the same view given by our courts, and I find that Chief Justice Draper in a case of Goodhue decided in Ontario, a decision which will be found in Grant's Chancery 19, page 384, where Judge Draper ruled:

Such bills are still subject to the consideration of the Governor General, who as the representative of the sovereign is entrusted with authority, to which a corresponding duty attaches, to disallow any law contrary to reason or to natural justice and equity.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would not my hon. friend think that was entirely overruled by the later decisions of the House of Lords and also of our own Supreme Court? That would be much nearer in point.

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is no decision I know of which ever reversed that doctrine. Even my immediate predecessor in office, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, clearly said that the power of disallowance was still in existence. Here are his words:

The undersigned entertains no doubt, however, that the power is constitutionally capable of exercise and may on occasions be properly invoked for the purpose of preventing, not inconsistently with the public interest, irreparable injustice or undue interference with private rights or property through the operation of local statutes intra vires of the legislatures.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What case was that?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The Alberta case, January, 1912.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was any action taken on it?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No special action was ever taken, but we have his views on that very important question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite right, you have his obiter to the extent it goes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I should like to give to the House, Mr. Speaker, the opinion of Lord Hobhouse, expressed in the case of the Bank of Toronto vs. Lambe, which we find in Volume 12, Appeal Cases, at page 587. His Lordship said:

An act of parliament which makes an elaborate distribution of the whole field of legislative authority (is to be found in the British North America Act. It gives the authority) between the two legislative bodies, and at the same time provides for the federated provinces a carefully balanced constitution, under which no one of the parts can pass laws for itself except under the control of the whole acting through the Governor General.

Now, my hon. friend was telling us a few moments ago that since confederation we could not cite a case where the power of disallowance had been exercised in matters where the legislation dealt with civil rights exclusively. Well, on referring to the MacLaren case, dealing with rivers and streams, we find that under Sir John A. Macdonald's government, when Mr. James Macdonald—afterwards Chief Justice of Nova Scotia—was acting as Minister of Justice, a statute was disallowed, for the reasons which I find in the report, namely:

I think the power of the local legislature to take away the rights of one man and invest them in another, as is done in this act, is exceedingly doubtful, but assuming that such right does in strictness exist, I think it devolves upon this government to see that such power is not exercised if flagrant violation of private rights and natural justice, especially as in this case, interfere with private rights overrides a decision of

a court of competent jurisdiction by declaring retrospectively that the law always was and is different from that laid down by the court.

In that case the judgment was dependent, we might say, on a question of law. In the present case it was the finding of facts which were declared to be fraudulent, and it is because of such fraud that the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia and the Supreme Court of Canada gave their judgments.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is not that citation the case which in the first instance gave rise to the Quebec conference? And is it not also true that while that position was at first taken by the Dominion, the precise bill was again passed and was allowed to become law?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This was one of the reasons why the conference was called at Quebec. There were many other questions considered at that very important conference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly, but it was a reason.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I admit that the very same statute was passed three times by the Ontario legislature. Twice it was disallowed, but when the Privy Council reversed that judgment of the Chancery Court of Ontario the government said: "There is no longer any legislative injustice because the Privy Council has decided that the judgment should be reversed." In this case the position is the contrary. We had parties fighting before the courts in Nova Scotia and before the Supreme Court of Canada. Judgment was rendered and five years after, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, without any notice to the interested party, one of the parties goes to the legislature of Nova Scotia and secures the passing of such legislation. My hon. friend was speaking of finality in litigation and legislation. Will there ever be any such finality in this country if we are to say that such a statute as the one now under consideration is to be assented to by this parliament?

There is something else which the hon. member did mention but which he did not insist upon. This legislation is extraordinary in its character; it is extreme to the limit in its injustice. It was so found by the judges who tried the case and by the public generally. When we had to consider the merits of that statute we wrote to the Attorney General of Nova Scotia and the reply was to the effect that the government of that province was satisfied that the statute should be disallowed. My hon. friend has been referring to the dicta of certain ministers of justice, which are not binding on himself, on his party, or on this parliament. But I would like to point out that before the present government was charged with the administration of the affairs of this country the minister of justice of that day had already notified the government of Nova Scotia that that legislation would have to be repealed or that it would be disallowed. My hon. friend will find in the records which he has had in his hands for a long time a letter from Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, written to the Attorney General of Nova Scotia in November 8, 1921, as follows:

> The minister desires that I should draw your attention to a recent act of the legislature of Nova Scotia, chapter 177, of 1921, an act to vest certain lands in Victoria county in Jane E. MacNeil. It is represented to the department that this statute in effect reverses the judgments of the courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada, in which it was ultimately decided that the defendant, Jane E. MacNeil, had acquired the title fraudulently, held the lands in trust and should convey them to the curator for the benefit of creditors. It would be the duty of the Minister of Justice, as you will perceive, to consider the propriety of recommending disallowance of this statute, and he would be glad, in considering the matter, to have before him any explanation or representation which your government would desire to submit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say that committed the previous Minister of Justice to recommending disallowance?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is what I infer from that letter. I believe that if the minister of Justice of that day had been in charge of affairs in the month of August, when we did disallow that statute, he would have recommended that disallowance and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition would have voted for it.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Who was the Minister of Finance at the time?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Mr. Speaker, we found in this statute such gross injustice that we thought it our duty to give to the parties hurt by the legislation a remedy which they could not get in any other way. We disallowed it because, having asked the advice of the government of Nova Scotia, we were told by the attorney general, speaking for the whole executive, that they had no objection to such disallowance. But there is more than that. Reference has been made by my hon. friend to the report of Sir Allen Aylesworth in the Cobalt case, and he pretends that that expression of opinion with regard to the right of disallowance should be accepted by this government for ever, and that in no case should disallowance be exercised when the legislation in question relates strictly to matters within the exclusive jurisdiction of the province. But Sir

Allen Aylesworth qualified his expression of opinion in that respect; he declared that his observations did not apply to cases where the act was of a merely domestic or local character or did not affect any matter of Dominion interest. Another of the ministers of Justice, the predecessor of Sir Allen Aylesworth, Mr. Mills, has already expressed his views on the very same point in a Prince Edward Island case. He declared:

> The power of disallowance has, however, been vested in Your Excellency, not only for maintaining the constitutional lines of legislative authority, but also for preventing the provincial legislatures from interfering with Dominion policy in matters in which it is competent under the constitution to the Dominion government to have a policy. There may be provincial legislation which can have effect until superseded by parliament and as to such the undersigned may be properly exercised if the legislation be, in the opinion of Your Excellency's government, prejudicial to Dominion interests.

What made this legislation most unacceptable to the people of this country was the fact that it was passed five years after a judgment in the matter had been rendered by the Supreme Court of Canada, and that it deprived a subject of his property for the benefit of another subject without compensation of any kind, declaring that the only title which could be claimed by Miss Jane MacNeil was a title which had been declared fraudulent by the highest court of the land.

I have given the main grounds upon which the disallowance of this statute was based. I wish to add this—and I speak, perhaps, more personally than as minister—that if a province can by legislation nullify a judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada on the ground that it deals with civil rights which are under the control of the province; if that principle is accepted in one case, why should it not be accepted in respect to all the judgments rendered in the past by the Supreme Court of Canada? Why should it not be accepted for all the cases now pending before the Supreme Court, and why should all the provinces not be permitted to legislate to the effect that in the future no judgment of the Supreme Court affecting civil rights would be accepted in those provinces? Mr. Speaker, when I read that comment of my predecessor, Mr. Mills, that the Governor General in Council may intervene and exercise the right of disallowance when there is matter in the provincial legislation affecting Dominion policy, and when I look at this Supreme Court of ours which was created under the provisions of clause 101 of the British North America Act; when I recall that parliament provided for such a court and, by implied interpretation, provided at the same time that its judgments should not be affected by provincial legislation; when I recall that we have before us a statute, the declared purpose of which is not only to stay the judgment of the supreme court but to say that the law is the contrary of that which was adjudicated by the supreme court of Canada; when I recall these facts I ask—Is the parliament of Canada disposed to declare that in such extraordinary cases as the one we have been discussing this afternoon we should never exercise the power of disallowance. I may have been in error but I did recommend such disallowance because I thought it was as much in the interest of the provinces to do so as it was in the interest of the Dominion.

I have listened with great interest to the remarks made by my hon. friend He has spoken with eloquence of provincial rights. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this House more decided partisan than myself as to the rights of the provinces. By reason of life-long political affiliations, by tradition and by instinct—I may add, and as a result of having occupied the position of premier of one of the large provinces of Canada for over fifteen years—I have become and I remain a provincial autonomist. But having the experience that I have acquired while administering the affairs of that province, I do realize and understand the importance—in the interest of the provinces and of the country as a whole—of our aiding the provincial governments in certain cases to curb and redress abuses of legislative powers. When we had before us what we considered a request from the government of Nova Scotia, a letter in which it was said that they had tried, that they had introduced a bill for the purpose, to repeal that legislation of 1921 and that the only reason why the bill did not pass, or at any rate one of the reasons, was that the session was closed too soon; and when we had the clear declaration from the Attorney General of the province to the effect that the provincial government offered no opposition, no objection of any kind, to our disallowing such legislation, we understood that this was practically a request to disallow and it was for that reason we did so. Mr. Speaker, we hope that the House will ratify our decision which has been rendered, as I repeat, for the good of the provinces and for the good of the country as a whole.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, one cannot withhold congratulations to both the mover of the amendment and to the preceding speaker for the very able and very clear way in which not only the facts

but also the law governing the matter have been placed before the House. It is an important matter. In my humble judgment it is an essential and vital matter, if the fabric of this Dominion is to be preserved, that we should have a clear definition and a clear understanding of provincial rights and that the Dominion authority should never invade the provincial sphere except for the very gravest and soundest reasons. I suggest, that when one clears away much of the underbrush which surrounds this matter it largely resolves itself into a question of provincial rights. The simple facts in connection with this matter have been amply narrated but let me summarize them in a moment. The Supreme Court of Canada, the highest forum in this land, held that Miss MacNeil held certain lands as a trustee for the curator of an insolvent partnership in which her brother was interested. As a result of that judgment the property, the so-called gypsum property, became vested in the name of this curator. He subsequently sold and disposed of the property. The Nova Scotia legislature, for reasons which we must presume were adequate, passed an act the effect of which was to vest the property once more in the name of Miss MacNeil, passing it, however, subject to the right of any complainants to bring action to establish their rights within a limited time.

The question which appeals to me is this: Can there be any question whatsoever that this legislation of the province of Nova Scotia was intra vires of that legislature? I do not believe it for a single moment. The Minister of Justice would not deny that. The legislature of Nova Scotia can legislate within its own special fields if it does not encroach upon the powers of the Dominion under the British North America Act. That, I think, is clear. Then next we have letters written by the Deputy Minister of Justice—who I am informed was himself professionally interested in the litigation—to the Deputy Attorney General of Nova Scotia suggesting that this was very bad legislation and urging—as he had a perfect right to do and I think he adopted a proper course in so doing—urging the Nova Scotia legislature to repeal the act which it had formerly placed on its statute book. The Nova Scotia legislature, for reasons which to it also must have been sufficient, decided that it would not repeal the legislation in question. The bill introduced for that purpose failed of passage and subsequently the act was disallowed by the Minister of Justice.

Now, the Minister of Justice has stated that he received representations from the government of Nova Scotia urging him to disallow this statute. I have had an opportunity of seeing some of the papers and apparently what the provincial government said was in effect, "We have no objection to your disallowing this act but please remember that it is without prejudice to our rights: also understand that it is not to be taken as a precedent under any circumstance." Nova Scotia closed the door, so far as the action of the Minister of Justice is concerned to ever having that case used against it as a precedent. But I ask the Minister of Justice "What about the position of the province from which I come?" Their rights have not been preserved. The government of Nova Scotia has no right and did not presume to exercise any right to ask the Minister of Justice to consider this case as without precedent so far as Alberta or any other province in the Dominion was concerned. So that as the situation stands to-day, the action of the Minister of Justice constitutes, if I am correct, a precedent which can be invoked at any time against legislation passed by any province in the Dominion of Canada with the exception of the province of Nova Scotia. That seems to be the situation.

Now if we are going to maintain our federation we must see to it that there is no infringement, so far as this government is concerned, of the proper rights of any provincial government, and even if that provincial government abuses its powers. Of course we have the right of disallowance if the provincial government acts in excess of that power. There can be no question about that. If it infringes the field of Dominion legislation, then quite properly the Minister of Justice should intervene, but if it is only an abuse of the powers of that government, then I suggest that the Minister of Justice should never intervene, but he should leave that legislature to the determination by the highest judgment which they have, the judgment of the electors of the province to whom they are responsible. An amusing incident in connection with this debate to my mind is the fact that the hon. mover of the amendment places his case and relies upon the judgment of a former Liberal Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth, while the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) on the other hand quotes with approval the view of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. It is an indication that, as parties are invested with responsibilities, perhaps their views change on particular matters. Now I have had an

opportunity of perusing many of these decisions, and I want to say frankly at the outset that it seems to me that the view entertained by Sir Allen Aylesworth is the only solid foundation on which the security of provincial rights can be maintained. I want to read, in connection with the case already mentioned, the Florence mining case, somewhat more in detail the views which he expressed. In discussing the matter he wrote as follows:

> It is not intended by the British North America Act that the power of disallowance shall be exercised for the purpose of annulling provincial legislation even though your Excellency's ministers consider the legislation unjust or oppressive or in conflict with recognized legal principles, so long as such legislation is within the power of the provincial legislature to enact it.

Subsequently, on March 1, 1909, Sir Allen amplified his views before this parliament, and I commend the attention of the House to the views which he then expressed. He said:

> And in what I have to say upon the subject to-day I want, as far as possible, to discover the point of view which should be taken, I think, by anyone occupying the position I have the honour to hold. The large question of principle which was presented for consideration was simply whether or not the provincial legislature has the power, without control, to take one man's property and give it to another and to take away from the person injured any right or redress in the courts. I entertain in all honesty and sincerity the view that it is of vital consequence to the well-being of this Dominion that the rights of the provinces to legislate within the scope of their authority should not be interefered with, and that every provincial legislature, within the limits prescribed for it by the terms of the British North America Act, is and ought to be supreme. I believe that this is a principle of greater importance to the welfare of this Dominion as a whole than even the sacredness of private rights or of public ownership. I am willing to go thus far in the enunciation of the views I am stating to this House, that a provincial legislature, having, as is given to it by the terms of the British North America Act, full and absolute control over property and civil rights within the province, might, if it saw fit to do so, repeal Magna Charta itself. I know no difference between that most sacred bulwark of liberty and of property to every British subject and any piece of legislation. I take it that no one would dispute the power of a provincial legislature to repeal the Habeas Corpus Act, or any other charter of liberty which Englishmen possess and in precisely the same view I take the ground that rights of property are subject only to the control of provincial legislatures within Canada. Having that view, it seemed to me, in considering this legislation that I was not, as advising His Excellency in Council, called upon to think at all of the injustice, of the outrageous character it might be, of the legislation, but that my one inquiry ought to be whether or not there was anything in the legislation itself which went beyond the power of the provincial legislature to pass a law referring alone to property and civil rights within the province. In that view I had the help of opinions which had been expressed by my immediate predecessors in office, the Hon. David Mills, and Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.

And after quoting these references, already referred to, he said:

> I share these views. I believed, as I still believe, that this is the true spirit of our constitution. These are considerations entirely for the provincial legislature. It represents the people of the province; its members are elected by the same electors who send us to this House, and I certainly seek to put every provincial legislature, within the scope of its jurisdiction, as laid down in the British North America Act, upon an absolutely level footing with the parliament of Canada itself so far as its legislation is concerned. I know no difference and can sese no distinction to be drawn from the true reading of the language used in the British North America Act."

I think Sir Allen Aylesworth in that statement has indicated the true principles, and if perchance the legislation by the legislature of Nova Scotia is an abuse of its rights—and I am not going to argue that question—then the Nova Scotia legislature should be left to the consideration of the electors of that province. May I conclude by just referring to a statement in one of the letters written by the Deputy Minister of Justice, which I think puts the situation very shortly? He says:

> Disallowance of this sort of statute, which is I suppose intra vires upon the ground of its conflict with the principle of justice, would introduce a principle of action here with respect to provincial legislation which it might afterwards be found difficult to restrict within due limits.

Who will place a restriction upon the Minister of Justice? Who may appeal from the action of the Minister of Justice? Is there any appeal available which one may take, if parliament is to approve of interference in this particular case? I suggest that there is none. I suggest that in a case such as this where there is no appeal against disallowance, that the provinces only, if acting in excess of their powers, should feel the full measure of the disallowing power in the hands of the Minister of Justice, but if only abusing that power, should be left to the proper forum the electors of their own province.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): There seems to be quite a difference of opinion between the views expressed by the Minister of Justice and those expressed by my hon friend who has just spoken. If we accept the view of the Minister of Justice, I think we must say goodbye to the provincial authority. If we accept the view of the member for Calgary (Mr. Shaw) as he quotes Sir Allen Aylesworth, I think no opportunity whatever would be left for federal interference. The line lies somewhere between the two views which have been expressed to us, and I am still willing to accept Sir Allen Aylesworth as the authority because I think when fully quoted he has provided a solution. In the first place, it seems futile to say that the introduction of the power of disallowance into the British North America Act meant that the federal government was only to disallow

legislation that was beyond the power of the provinces to enact. There would be no need of reserving the power of disallowance when the disallowance itself would be absolutely futile because the legislation would be set aside by the courts.

On the other hand, while we recognize that we are governed by a written constitution, we must bear in mind that this written constitution is, at least, supplemented by the preservation of those constitutional principles which we inherit from Great Britain, and that we are developing an unwritten constitution side by side with the written letter. It is that development that we trace in the series of opinions given by ministers of justice which have moved all the way from absolute, arbitrary interference down to the latest standpoint that has been taken, in which Sir Allen Aylesworth declared that we ought not to interfere with the legislative action of any province, provided it was within the ambit of its powers, unless—and here is what I think the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Shaw) omitted—the result of the action of the province is such as practically to imperil the external relations of Canada. It is possible by provincial legislation to hold Canada out as a country repudiating her obligations. For instance, if we had such an extraordinary occurrence as a solemn repudiation by a province of its provincial debt, that would so affect the credit of Canada as a whole that interference would be absolutely necessary. But aside from and clear of all that extraordinary line of cases, which we think can never occur, it must be patent that if we are to preserve provincial autonomy, we must have the right of seeing things differently from the people outside of our own province, of acting differently from the way in which they would act under those circumstances. Unless we preserve that right, the whole scheme of the Canadian constitution falls to the ground; we shall have erected a superior legislature called the federal, and we shall have put the provincial legislature into the position of an inferior, bound to obey the dictates of the superior. That is not the scheme of confederation, nor the interpretation of confederation by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

In a case some years ago of the liquidator of the Maritime Bank against the Receiver General, a case that came from my province and that a gentleman who occupied a very distinguished position in this House at one time—I refer to the late Doctor Stockton—carried to the Privy Council and finally won, a most important constitutional principle was laid down. It is this, that there is neither inferiority nor superiority, but simply a division. The whole executive and legislative field might properly be described by a circle. You do not cut through the circle at a diameter and say half lies on one side and half on the other. But you cut a segment out of that circle, and you say that, within that segment, within that ambit of power, the province is just as sovereign as the Dominion. The Dominion cannot infringe upon the powers of the little sovereignty; the little sovereignty must not cross over the line and interfere with the larger one. But the two are sitting on the same plane, and the lieutenant governor of a province represents his Majesty just as fully, directly and completely within the ambit of provincial power as the Governor General represents the sovereign within the ambit of federal power.

The Minister of Justice says that this was such a case as to call for interference. I should like to examine that for a moment. I sympathize with him in being met as he was by the absolutely pusillanimous attitude of the government of Nova Scotia. I do not think the government of Nova Scotia is entitled to take any credit for standing up for constitutional rights. I do not think the other provinces need thank Nova Scotia, and I do not think Nova Scotia need look upon her letter in this respect with anything but shame. It was a cowardly act. It threw the responsibility upon the Minister of Justice. It meant simply one of two things: Either "we believed that this legislation was right and we abandoned it as a set of cowards;" or "we sat by in the legislature as a government and supinely allowed something to be enacted into law that we knew and believed was wrong and that to-day we abandon." The government of Nova Scotia must take one side or the other, and there is no credit and no pride to them in any possible position they have taken in that letter. But when the Minister of Justice receives it, it is a way out for him. It is the only excuse he has. He has neither tradition nor authority back of him in the action he has taken, and his sounder ground is to rely upon the cowards of the government of Nova Scotia.

My hon. friend has spoken with great respect, as we all do, of the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada. But it is possible, without fault in the Supreme Court of Canada, without fault in the Privy Council of the Empire, that error may creep into judgment. You cannot stop witnesses from lying; you cannot stop counsel from overlooking points of

importance; you cannot prevent evidence failing to be discovered that may be very vital for a decision, according to justice, on any matter. Supposing something of the kind happens. I cannot and I will not discuss the details of this particular matter—other members of the House are more familiar with them than I am —but let me suppose an instance that the legislature of Nova Scotia was convinced that, by a horrible error, injustice had been done, even if that injustice had been perpetrated through the action of the highest court within the realm, the Privy Council itself. Will hon. members tell me that a legislature, that a parliament in any part of the British Empire, has yet ceased to be a court, the high court of the realm, to which any subject may bring his plaint and get the justice given to him by the common sense of his fellow men.

There are in the Empire higher courts than any courts of law. I agree that we should never, except upon the most extraordinary of cases, substitute our will as legislators for the decision of a court; but a case can arise, great enough, important enough, to demand that interference, and the legislature would be cowardly which did not interfere when the proper case arose. That, in regard to property and civil rights in any province, is a matter for the legislature of that province, and it is not a matter for the decision of the Minister of Justice or his colleagues in the cabinet. If you say it is, then I ask you—where are you going to draw the line? What particular bit of legislation will be sacred from federal attack? ,I cannot imagine any. You can say that any particular bit of legislation does injustice to someone. Take the particular case that we are considering. To whom was real injustice done? As I understand this legislation, while the title was vested in a certain person by the legislation, yet litigation could be recommended. This was simply an opportunity to reopen the case, so that with all the facts that had come to light, with all the additional skill that could be brought to bear, there was reasonable hope that justice would, at least, be effected through the agency of a legal tribunal. Is that wrong? The Minister of Justice has to resort to that himself in the supreme question of life and death, because by an amendment to our Criminal Code it has been provided—and I have seen this done—that after the highest court in Canada has decided that a man shall be hanged, the Minister of Justice may step in and say that the case must be tried over again.

Mr. JACOBS: That is a matter of clemency.

[Mr. Baxter.]

Mr. BAXTER: No, that is not clemency; that is justice. That is what this parliament has said that the Minister of Justice can do. It is not reprieving the man; it is not pardoning the man. Pardoning is clemency; reprieving may be clemency; but this is neither the one nor the other. This is simply saying, we have a doubt as to the way in which your courts have functioned and we will give that man a new trial. This high court of parliament changed the law so that it would be possible to do justice in that particular way, and the Minister of Jusice of the present day overrules the legislature of Nova Scotia which has done with regard to civil rights, within the ambit of its jurisdiction, precisely what this high court of parliament did with regard to the criminal law of the realm. I shall not continue the discussion except to refer to what Sir Allen Aylesworth said in one case:

> In the opinion of the undersigned, a suggestion of the abuse of power, even so as to amount to practical confiscation of the property, or that the exercise of power has been unwise or indiscreet, should appeal to Your Excellency's government with no more effect than it does to the ordinary tribunals, and remedy in such case is, in the words of Lord Herschel, an appeal to those by whom the legislature is elected.

I might continue the subject at considerable length, but there is, I think no need to do so. Sir Allen Aylesworth has pointed out a fair, a reasonable and a just limitation upon the text he lays down and that is that when the proper exercise of provincial legislation may, if the legislation seems to be unwise, impinge upon the credit of Canada or the functioning of Canadian legislation, even though there is no direct interference, there we may have a case for interference by way of disallowance.

I would invite the Minister of Justice to base himself solidly upon that doctrine, which alone will preserve for us the autonomy of the provinces, an autonomy which is every day in greater danger of being lost in proportion as the federal government of Canada becomes more powerful and enters into fresh fields of jurisdiction. I do not know that the minister wants any advice from this side of the House, but I would advise him to base his action at best solely on the most conspicuous pusillanimity of the Nova Scotia legislature, and let it go at that.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Though the government seems helplessly at bay, it does appear to me worth while to drive home the lesson of this debate a little further. I am sorry that the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) has fallen into the error which in my humble judgment he has committed; I am also surprised that he has made this error. I do not think he has made

a case for his government; and of course the whole government shares responsibility with him. The minister has made the best case he could, but it falls to pieces on anything approaching a close examination. As I commence my remarks I want to dwell for a moment upon the one phase of the subject which, I think, has not yet received justice—at the hands of the House. Inasmuch as we argue that the colour of the legislation, the goodness or the badness of it, the righteousness or the wickedness of it, is not a matter for us to decide and never was a matter for this government to pass upon, we are only too likely to assume that the subject matter that came before the government was something violently and undoubtedly wrong, something which there could be no discussion upon; that the merits were all on one side and the demerits on the other. My investigation of the case leads me to no such conclusion. While I fully agree with what my hon. friend to my right who has just sat down (Mr. Baxter) says about the pusillanimity of the government of Nova Scotia, I would apply no such language to the conduct of the legislature in passing the law in question. It may have been right or it may have been wrong; there is great room for argument either way. I know it was the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, it may have been the opinion of the Minister of Justice in November, 1921, that it was not right, that it was wrong. I know it was the opinion of the deputy minister that it was very wrong. I did not know so at the time; in fact, I did not hear of the case until some time in the fall of 1922. The matter never came before the late government as a government at all. But what are the merits or the demerits of the legislation? It is quite true that three to two of the Supreme Court of Canada found that Jane MacNeil held certain land in trust and that she had obtained the trusteeship by fraud. I am not quite sure that even those words are not an extreme statement of the case. It is equally true that the other two judges held otherwise. It is true, as well, that two out of three of the judges of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia previously held the opinion subsequently expressed by the three judges of the Supreme Court of Canada; and it is equally true that another judge held otherwise. It is true also that the judge who tried the case, who within very narrow limits of appeal was the final arbiter of the facts, who was the arbiter of the law subject to full appeal, who saw the witnesses, and who got the facts at first hand, held that Jane MacNeil was entitled of her own right, and that her conduct throughout was innocent in every way. Such is the judicial history of the matter. But there is more. The records show as well that the property subsequently was sold by the curator, for whom Jane MacNeil was finally held to be trustee, to one of the witnesses for what was in effect a nominal sum, a witness who was one of the chief of those who secured the verdict, and upon whom the courts relied in reversing the finding of the trial judge. That is not the only fact that subsequently was disclosed; there were many others. But I do not dwell upon them here.

When I read a letter the original of which I feel certain I saw and a copy of which I have before me which was brought down in the return, I am sure that the House will agree that there was subsequent evidence placed before the legislature of Nova Scotia upon the faith of which the legislature in its wisdom felt that greater justice would be done by throwing open again the doors of the courts rather than by holding them fast and closed. The letter I am about to read is signed by Sir Charles Townshend, one of the judges of appeal in Nova Scotia, who reversed the finding of the trial judge favourable to Jane MacNeil, the same judge who subsequently wrote a letter in 1922, quoted by the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), in which he reprimanded the legislature of Nova Scotia for passing the legislation which it did pass. Now, I may parenthetically remark here that I question very much the wisdom of judges of the bench, whether in the actual exercise of their function as judges, or after retirement, writing letters to the press or to public men commenting upon legislation affecting judgments of their own. It seems to me it is a practice that needs no encouragement at our hands but rather reprobation. One letter has however been read by the Minister of Justice; I will now read another which is infinitely more to the point, as to the merits of the case as between Jane MacNeil and her assailants in title. I refer to a letter written by Sir Charles Townshend to Stanley MacNeil, the returned soldier claimant of the property, dated April 11, 1921.

Dear Sir,—I received to-day your letter, and as I informed you when you called upon me some time ago when the new evidence was presented, it would be highly improper for a judge to infer or comment on a decision of the court after it had passed from his consideration or the bench, and especially by a retired judge. I fully sympathize with you if you have been wronged in the matter, and if it will be of any service to you, I can say without impropriety that if the mass of evidence you showed me had been before the court, and had been received, the result of the case might have been different,—

This is the Judge of Appeal writing.

—but you must understand that courts of justice can only act and decide on the evidence adduced by counsel, and that in this case, as presented to the court, it could not have decided differently from what it did.

A clear intimation from Sir Charles Townshend that if the subsequent evidence had been developed even in appeal he might well have reversed his finding. It is admitted on all hands that these matters were laid before the legislature—allegations supported by such evidence as was at hand, to which undoubtedly weight was given; allegations that there had not been a fair trial of MacNeil's case; allegations of failure of cross-examination; allegations indeed, to put it very frankly, of collusion in connection with the trial of the action.

Now, the legislature of Nova Scotia with all those facts before it, with the very evidence referred to by Sir Charles Townshend in the letter I have read before it too, had to decide between leaving the case just as it was with Jane MacNeil deprived of her rights, with no possible court of appeal to which to go again—because the time had all gone by within which the production of new evidence could have any effect in securing a new trial—the legislature, I say, had to decide between that course and throwing the doors open once more to determination of the rights of either litigant. The legislature decided to take the latter course. It said: "While we declare Jane MacNeil the owner, we declare her the owner subject to any claims which would have been valid against her when she was the owner before, and if this curator, if the assignees, if this company, if any of those interested have any rights, and can establish them, the courts are there and the previous trial has prejudiced their interest not at all; they can go to those courts and all the evidence, the subsequent as well as the original, will be adduced, and justice may be done." Such is the action of the legislature of Nova Scotia—the action that the Minister of Justice describes in the astonishing language he uses this afternoon.

I am informed—I only give it as information; if I am wrong I will be corrected—that the Private Bills committee of the legislature of Nova Scotia before which this legislation went, and by which it would be reviewed in detail, was presided over by one who is now an hon. member of this House (Mr. Finn) sitting at this moment to the left of the Minister of Justice. Surely he was not a party, actively or passively, to the putting through of legislation of the vicious spurious character described by the Minister of Justice this afternoon. But this legislation so passed upon unanimously—I understand there was no vote at all—by the popular assembly, objected to it is true by at least one, possibly two or three in the Upper Chamber, passed upon by an hon. member of this House as Chairman of the Private Bills committee, legislation that went through all the processes of that parliament—this is the legislation that the Minister of Justice describes as so hideous, so iniquitous that his virtuous eyes cannot behold it and he must sweep it by disallowance from his sight.

I have made this review only to show that the case against the legislation is not so one-sided as the Minister of Justice would make out. It must be remembered—and I say it not in the least to his discredit, because he had a perfect right at the time to do so—it must be remembered that the Deputy Minister of Justice conducted the case of the respondent before the Supreme Court of Canada. Had I done the same, or had any one else, it is very likely that our feelings would be somewhat prejudiced and our opinion would scarcely be an opinion arrived at in the clear and open light of unshadowed intelligence in connection with the matter of disallowance.

I come now to the question whether or not on the precedents, whether or not as a matter of constitutional right and practice, whether or not as well whatever be the constitutional right and practice, it was wisdom, that the government of Canada should override and annul that legislation. I do not argue for a moment that there has been absolute consistency as between the opinions expressed by various ministers of justice and by the courts all through the history of our country. If one is to take what we describe in law as obiter dicta, that is to say, expressions of view given in a judgment that are not necessary to the judgment at all but are merely asides by the judge—if we include those, then it seems to me there can be some conflict shown. But I venture to say there has never been a judgment given in the history of confederation that is on all fours with this judgment or goes to anything like the same extent. The history of all the cases shows that the power of disallowance is being more and more curtailed by practice from the early days of confederation until now. There were in earlier years opinins expressed by Sir John Macdonald and others to the effect that the mere ultra vires character of the legislation is not alone the ground upon which disallowance may be based. The judgments read by the hon. Minister of Justice go to establish such conclusions.

Dealing for the moment with ultra vires legislation, I would not even say that in every case of such legislation, disallowance should necessarily follow. There might be many cases of this kind which safely could be left to the determination of our courts. It would be assumed that if the cases were beyond the jurisdiction of the legislatures, and they were certain to come early before the courts, the courts would themselves disallow the legislation, and consequently it would not be good practice in such cases for the government to anticipate the action of the courts. But there might be cases where although the legislation was ultra vires there would not be the probability of an early appeal to the courts at all where individual rights of any important character were not infringed. In such cases the legislation might never come before the courts, but if it was of that character and infringed as well Dominion policy, then it would be the duty of the federal government to disallow. No one in this House would dispute the jurisdiction of the federal government to the extent that I have up to this point defined.

Dealing, however, with intra vires legislation, there are opinions to the effect that occasions occur when the annulment of even intra vires legislation is justified. I am not sure that these opinions can be found in our history between 1896 and 1911; it may be that they can, but I have not been able to find them. Up to 1893, these opinions can be found, but there can be found no decision following such opinions to the effect that merely because the legislation, though intra vires, is against natural justice, that for this reason, and this alone, it should be disallowed.

Now, I repeat what I have said: I do not think a decision can be found—where merely because in the judgment of the minister the principles of natural justice were affronted by intra vires legislation, the legislation was annulled. The opinion of Sir John Macdonald can be given, and the opinion of Mr. Ouimet can be given, but I venture to say in so far as those opinions have ever been followed by action it will be found that they come within this class of cases: that the legislation, though intra vires, has conflicted with Dominion legislation where the Dominion had concurrent power with the province, or conflicted seriously with federal policy or administration. I do not require to amplify that at all. Perhaps I should repeat it. I venture to say the minister will not be able to produce a case where there has been annulment based merely on the fact that intra vires legislation was an affront to natural justice. I can only find annulment of intra vires legislation where it has been claimed by the minister of justice and the government that the legislation conflicted with competent federal legislation where the federal government had concurrent power, or conflicted with federal policy or administration. It might easily conflict with either one.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If the right hon. gentleman will allow me, I would cite the case of the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, when he was acting minister, in his report of the 19th of May, 1893.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will take up the Ouimet case.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, in the previous part of my remarks I sought first to impress that the merits of the legislation out of which this governmental action arose were at least debatable, if, indeed, the weight of the argument did not rather favour the justice of the legislation itself. I then proceeded to review the history of the operation of disallowance, and I asked to be accepted in this conclusion: That although there had been conflict not of final decision but of obiter dicta—that is expressions not lying in the pathway of the argument by which the minister arrived at his conclusion in the individual case, but lying aside from that pathway, although there might be a conflict there, there had not been conflict in the decisions actually given with certain definite principles, from confederation until the passing of this act. And I ventured to affirm, that there had not been disallowance in any single case merely because of the supposed turpitude, injustice, or unfairness of the legislation, but rather that disallowance had been justified and had actually been practised on the grounds I named a couple of hours ago, and on those only: In the case of ultra vires legislation, that is legislation beyond the powers of the legislating province, where disallowance more met the public convenience i.e. because the legislation interfering with the federal policy, could not fairly be left to the courts because it might never reach the courts. With regard to such cases, of course, I will meet with no dispute at all. As regards ultra vires legislation I do not apprehend there is any difference of opinion.

In the case of intra vires legislation the grounds for disallowance had been these and

these only: That the legislation, through intra vires of the province, had conflicted with Dominion statute or Dominion policy in cases, say, where the Dominion had concurrent jurisdiction—such, for example, as in the case of agriculture, or in the case of railways. In these spheres, the Dominion's jurisdiction is concurrent with that of the provinces; each can legislate in agriculture; each has the same powers. A provincial act might interfere with Dominion policy on a subject of concurrent jurisdiction, or the act might be such as to, of its very nature, interfere with established federal policy. An example of the latter might be given: Where the act of the legislature would be in violence of federal policy as established, say, by treaty with another country. A case at least, if not more than one, of that character has arisen.

I stated that we had not had a case of a decision where there had actually been disallowance based only upon the government's opinion that the legislation was unjust and unfair as between the rights of individuals. Now the minister rose to contradict me, or at least to refer me to what he described as the Ouimet case, a case decided by the Acting Minister of Justice, in 1893, the acting minister being the Hon. J. Alderic Ouimet. I stated that I would refer to this case after recess. I venture to say the minister has looked into it since, and if he had looked into it before he spoke, he would not have ventured the contradiction. In the Ouimet case there was no disallowance at all.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I did not say there was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then it was not a contradiction of my assertion. I had stated there had never been actual disallowance on that ground and there has not been.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Referring to that case, the Acting Minister of Justice, in his report of the 19th May, 1893, reported to his colleagues as follows:

> Assuming the statute to have the effect which the railway company attributes to it the case would appear to be that of a statute which interferes with vested rights of property and the obligation of contract without providing for compensation, and would, therefore, in the opinion of the undersigned furnish sufficient reason for the exercise of the power of disallowance.

And the report concluded as follows:

> In the view of the undersigned all these provisions are infringements upon the exclusive power of the federal parliament to legislate on the subject of sea coast and inland fisheries. An arrangement has, however, been reached between the undersigned and the attorney general of the province of Ontario by which the constitutionality of these provisions, as well as all other contentions respecting the fishery laws generally, are to be referred to the courts for adjudication, and as it does not appear that any public inconvenience will otherwise accrue, he respectfully recommends that the act in question be left to its operation.

But the minister was very clear in the expression of his opinion that there were vested rights, and that the power of disallowance should be exercised. On that there was an arrangement between the two governments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had the very quotation the then minister read before me. It is true the minister expressed that opinion in the early part of the recommendation, but the minister went on to state that though such was the case, inasmuch as the public inconvenience was not in any way affected, he would leave the statutes to their own operation. He refused to interfere. I had not denied at all that prior to 1893 anyway there had been statements of opinion, obiter dicta, that would conflict with the principles which I have laid down. I did state that responsibility of disallowance had never been taken by any government based merely upon the fact alone that there had been in the judgment of the government disallowing, a miscarriage of justice.

Mr. JACOBS: Was there ever a similar case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There have been cases, I almost said unnumbered, a great many cases. There was the Florence Mining case. The nearest case was the MacLaren case, and in that case, which is known as the Streams case, disallowance did follow. In that case though there is also an assertion of Dominion jurisdiction, of Dominion right in the streams, and this consideration undoubtedly affected the decision to disallow. But in the MacLaren case, although it was affected by this consideration, the legislation was re-enacted. It was re-enacted again and although disallowed, re-enacted again, and allowed to stay, and no case comes so close to this case. If the hon. member will review the cases as found in Keith he will find the nearest approach to the present is that very case, and by the action of the legislature and the justification of time in each case the disallowance was reversed.

But all this is pretty old. When we get down to 1893, from that date onward the practice seems a great deal more settled. Hon. members have read opinions expressed, yes, and more, the decisions on those opinions given by Ministers of Justice from 1893 to 1908. No amount of argument in the world will ever square the decision in this case with the judgment of Sir Allen Aylesworth in the cases

that came before him. Sir Allen Aylesworth in 1909 laid down the doctrine quoted, and very aptly quoted by my hon. friend for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) and he did it in terms so definite, in terms, I almost said, so sweeping, that it would be utterly beyond the pale of reason to suggest that this action could be suffered within the ambit of the reasoning of Sir Allen Aylesworth. Not at all. Indeed, Sir Allen Aylesworth said that even though the legislature, without any warrant whatever, as indeed he described it in the Ontario case, changed the property in that province from one man to another, or from one company to another, did so without any reason, without providing any consideration or any means of compensation, and in doing so shut, barred and bolted the door against access to the courts in every way—even though the legislature went so far as that, the federal government would not be justified in interfering. In his review of the constitutional practice—Sir Allen Aylesworth on the 1st of March 1909 in this House said that a federal government would not be justifiable to interfere with intra vires legislation on any ground at all. Sir Allen Aylesworth went further than has ever been gone from confederation until the present time, and there has never during that time been a case of disallowance based only on the judgment of the government that there had been an assault on the principles of primary justice in the provincial legislation.

Very well; in the cases that came before Sir Allen Aylesworth and which he decided there were none, so far as I have been able to find, in which, although the legislation was intra vires, it interfered with the Dominion policy. Consequently, I believe that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) is correct, that if the legislation, though intra vires, had interfered with the federal policy where the Dominion had a right to have a policy, Sir Allen might have been free to disallow. There is a case I am told just now where he did. But the dicta he lays down—and mind you his dicta are followed by action consistent with them—he bases the responsibility of his decision upon the doctrine which he expounds—go to show that if it is merely a case of what we may consider not right on the part of the legislature, we have no justification whatever in giving any weight to such consideration. To do so is interference with provincial rights.

Now I come to argue, how far do these doctrines, accepted, so far as decisions go, never interfered with, in fact I think I may say never questioned since 1893, justify interference in this case. Well, the matter scarcely admits of contention. This case differs wholly from that under review by Sir Allen Aylesworth on the 1st March, 1909. In the case that was before Sir Allen Aylesworth where he declined to interfere, the Minister of Justice at that time held that there had not only been diversion of the title of property from one to another, but there had been a denial of access to the courts to determine ultimate rights, or to decide the equities or trusteeships that might be in question. He knew that when he refused disallowance there was no possibility of any parties affected having their rights established in the courts of the land. The case before us to-day is wholly different. In the case before us to-day the action of the legislature, instead of closing the doors of the courts to the interested parties had really the effect of re-opening the doors of the court to the interested parties. It was really, in effect, no more and no less than to grant a new trial and upon grounds upon which courts very often grant new trials when they have power to do so. They had no power to do so in this case, because the time had gone by when one could apply. But courts grant new trials when new evidence is found, evidence that it was not reasonable to expect would be under the hands of the litigants at the initial trial. Upon such grounds as that and upon evidence of collusion, to which apparently they gave some weight, some members giving weight to one ground and some no doubt to another, the legislature decided that a new trial should be given to the parties; they placed them back in their initial position, Jane MacNeil being owner of the land, and they said to all who assailed her title: "There are the courts of our country; go to those courts and establish your claim." That is the kind of legislation against which the minister hurls his thunderbolt in this case; legislation very different in its finality, very different in anything that one could criticise as a usurpation of provincial power, from the legislation which was reviewed by Sir Allen Aylesworth.

This is somewhat aside. The minister seems to emphasize the consideration that a good deal of time had intervened between the litigation, indeed between the final decision of the Supreme Court and the act of the provincial legislature. I cannot see that the point is material; but the minister should remember that the actual owner, the man most interested, the heir in title to Jane MacNeil was, between 1914, when the decision was given, and a date shortly prior to the action of the Nova Scotia legislature, absent at the front. Upon his return, he who was interested, set

to work to try to restore what he believed were his rights. This explains the intervention of those years.

Is it of any importance that this House endeavour to reassert the correct principle in matters of this kind? I think it is of vast importance. What position are we in if the judgment of the minister and of the government in this case is to be permanent? I know there is a measure of permanency to their decision, no matter what we do. I am not sure whether the government has any power to reverse the decision which it has given; but at all events we have power to say what we believe to be right, and it seems to me that it is proper for this House, at least for those members who believe that in the interest of our Dominion, another course should have been chosen to make the record speak our views. It is in our power and it is our duty to exercise that right.

Where are we—let me repeat the question—if the minister's opinion is to be followed in the future? Other governments, other legislatures of this country may exercise their functions, and when they do, they will never know whether they are to be left in possession of the fruits and answerable for the consequences or not. They may be quite within their powers and rights; they may be legislating for their own citizens and no others; they may be legislating about matters that affect exclusively their own people and property; but they cannot for a minute feel secure. The sword of the minister hangs above them, and it may fall the moment the legislation passes. It is important surely that the responsibility of governments in provinces to the legislatures and the responsibility of legislatures to their people should remain intact. If the minister's advice to his colleagues and the decision of his colleagues—are in the MacNeil case to be followed in the future, that responsibility is gone.

A great deal of what the minister has said, if it is based on fact, is very sound argument; but it is argument that should be addressed to the legislature of Nova Scotia, not argument that should be addressed to this House, nor that he should have addressed to his colleagues when he advised them to take this course. It is for the legislature of Nova Scotia to decide whether or not they should repeal legislation which they have passed, whether, when they came to pass it in the first place, it was doing justice between the parties or whether it was not. They must decide whether by any cajolery, by any imposition, for it may be alleged that there was imposition upon the members, they were misled and took the wrong course. If they decide such to be established then it is for the legislature of Nova Scotia to reverse itself. It has power to repeal its own acts and it has often done so. We have repealed our acts, and the argument of the minister, if it were based on facts, would have been very powerful before that legislature, to persuade it to take that course. But they were not arguments which he was justified in addressing to his colleagues in advising them to annul this legislation.

In this connection, let me have a word to say of the minister's last contention that disallowance was made with the privity, or, as he put it, with the consent or even upon the request of the government of Nova Scotia. When did the power of annulment, the power of disallowance, rest before on the desire of the government responsible to the legislature which enacted the legislation? Who ever heard of the government of Canada being the agent, the instrument, of a provincial government to defeat the ends of a provincial legislature? Is that not exactly what the minister's contention means? Is the government of Nova Scotia, which takes the responsibility of permitting to pass, while it remains in power, legislation that it afterwards thinks it should not have allowed to pass, to get out of its responsibility and to defeat the ends of its own legislature, merely by coming to the government of Canada and saying: "Annul this legislation; disallow it, and there is an end of our responsibility and yours."

This is not the first case, indeed, where disallowance has been a matter, I will not say of collusion, but let me say of agreement, between the government of a province and the government of the Dominion. From what I have learned, the disallowance of legislation changing the rule of the road was also a matter of agreement between the government of Nova Scotia and the government of Canada. In that case the action of this government may have saved the government of Nova Scotia from very serious difficulty, and it may have saved the people of Nova Scotia from very serious inconvenience into which the precipitancy of their legislature and the negligence of their government had driven them. But surely such a service is no function of His Majesty in Council of the Dominion. The Governor General in Council does not exist to rescue legislatures or provinces from the inevitable, legitimate consequences of their own recklessness, or even of their own wrong doing.

Let me emphasize in this connection one more feature. In no respect whatever does the legislation in the MacNeil case affect any

other province in Canada. The land is in Nova Scotia; all parties to the dispute are, I understand, in Nova Scotia; anyway every material thing connected with the case is Nova Scotian. It does not in the remotest way affect Dominion policy. It does not even in the most attenuated way affect Dominion rights. It is a local matter only, a matter not only of civil rights, but so distinctly local that above all other matters it should have been left to the final determination of the legislature of that province.

Let us remember as well that the government, after the character of the legislation—in the mind of the Deputy Minister of Justice—had been drawn to its atention, had ample oportunity to repeal it. The minister says it did not repeal the legislation although a bill was brought before it for the purpose. He says the bill got its first reading, if it did not go further; but the minister says it was not actually repealed because the legislature closed before the House adopted the bill. Well, that is usually the reason why most legislation is not passed—the House closes before its adoption. But who closed the legislature? Did the legislature close without the will of the government? Did someone go and lock the door behind the government's back? The government closed the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia, the government that was in power when this legislation was passed, the government that had a large majority, and which if it had the will to do so, could have repealed this legislation. No, Mr. Speaker, the minister has acted not only against the first judgment of the legislature of Nova Scotia but against the re-considered judgment of that body. After the legislature had had ample opportunity to redress its action if it had felt that its action was wrong, it declined to do so; and then the government, without the consent of the legislature, comes to the minister who yields to its importunity and annuls the legislation.

The hon. minister, in order if he can to make it appear that the hands of the opposition in this matter are tied, irrespective of what the merits of the case may be, reads a letter from the Deputy Minister of Justice, or rather a part of it, addressed to the Deputy Attorney General of the province of Nova Scotia, in which the Deputy Minister of Justice expresses, as no doubt was his honest belief, his opinion of the legislation. Having done so the Deputy Minister of Justice in this letter says this to the Deputy Attorney General of Nova Scotia:

> Therefore I think you must agree that it is impossible to justify, or even to describe in terms of toleration,—

I am reading what the minister read, am I not? I am not sure it is the same letter but it is signed by the deputy minister.

> —the conduct which is sanctioned by the act in question, revesting the title in Miss MacNeil by legislative act. I can only imagine that it must have been through some oversight on the part of the government that the act was allowed to pass. In these circumstances it would seem that the wrong done by this legislation should be rectified by the legislature. It seems to be a case in which, if I may venture to say so, for the good name of the province as well as in simple justice to the petitioners, the act should not be allowed to remain, and the more proper remedy is by way of repeal. I observe that your legislature is now in session. I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Justice and he desires me to suggest that your government should give earnest consideration to the propriety of putting through a repealing act at the present session.

That was the suggestion of the then Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mr. R. B. Bennett. That matter, I may say, never came before the late government at all; the time never arrived when it should. According to this letter, the Minister of Justice suggested that the government of Nova Scotia should give earnest consideration to putting through a repealing act "at the present session". He goes on:

> Otherwise it will be difficult to resist the application to disallow. The disallowance of this sort of statute—

I think the minister failed to read this part of the letter; if he did, I did not hear it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The hon. gentleman is not quoting the letter I read; I read a letter dated November 21.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is dated April 7, 1922. Evidently this states the opinion of the present Minister of Justice.

Mr. JACOBS: You are reading Mr. Bennett's letter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I am reading a letter written by the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. JACOBS: Advised by Mr. Bennett.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, Mr. Bennett was not in office then.

Mr. JACOBS: I heard his name mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I thought this was the letter of November 21 which the minister referred to. I had not looked at the date. This letter was actually written, it appears, since my hon. friend (Sir Lomer Gouin) assumed office.

> The disallowance of this sort of statute which is, I suppose, intra vires upon the ground of its conflict with the principles of justice, would introduce a principle of action here with respect to provincial legislation which it might afterwards be found difficult to restrict within due limits and, therefore upon constitutional grounds, and from motives of expediency,

it is suggested that the necessity of further consideration by this government should be avoided by local action.

That was the view of the Deputy Minister of Justice, and apparently the view of the minister at that time; and in the previous letter which the minister read the opinion was expressed that the matter of disallowance would have to be "considered" if it should be that the legislature would decline to repeal the act. That is very different from taking the responsibility of actual disallowance. Language of that kind has been used very often through the years, but the federal government has not until now actually gone the length of disallowance upon that ground and that ground alone. Review by the entire government in this as in every case was necessary before a decision could be reached and I can assure the minister there would have been no disallowance by the late government.

All through this time the jurisdiction of the federal government as a matter of constitutional practice has been becoming narrower and ever narrower, and the autonomy of local legislatures has been growing stronger and ever stronger; and right it is that it should be so. Why should it be that a government —not parliament, let hon. gentlemen remember, for parliament has really no say in the matter at all save to express its opinion, it has no authority whatever—why should it be that a government not responsible initially to the electors of the particular province, because a federal government is just as responsible to the electors of a province three thousand miles away, why is it I say that a government sitting here, can act as a sort of moral censor of the conduct of legislatures in this country, legislatures which are themselves responsible to the people who elect them and to whom they must answer for their acts? If the federal government, merely by virtue of its own opinion as to the moral quality of legislation passed by a province, has the right to reverse that legislation and wipe it out, does not the government by that course assume the functions of the people of the province? Does not the government in that way relieve the provincial administration of the logical consequences of its own conduct and thereby defeat the ends of responsible government? Thus it is that all through these years the right of annulment has been restricted rather than amplified, and in no case has it been exercised save in so far as intra vires legislation is concerned when it interposed upon territory rightly occupied by the federal authority, or upon federal policy, where the federal government had a right to have a policy. No one would contend for a moment that this case comes within either category. Therefore I ask the House to declare that the minister was not right, and that the government was not justified in following his advice and in disallowing the legislation of a province, passed admittedly wholly within its power, and admittedly affecting only the interests of the province, affecting no property right and no individual right of any kind beyond the confines of the province, and interfering in no way in the least degree with federal policy of any kind, nor invading in the slightest measure any sphere in which the Dominion has concurrent jurisdiction. I ask the House to declare that the government in arrogating to itself an authority to reverse and defeat such legislation acted contrary to sound constitutional standards and practice.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou, Acting Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, a very peculiar situation presents itself for the consideration of the House to-night. My right hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Meighen) was the leader of the government down to the 1st January, 1922. On November 8, 1921, his Minister of Justice, the Hon. R. B. Bennett, instructed his deputy minister to write the Attorney General of Nova Scotia in the following terms:—

> Sir,—The minister desires that I should draw your attention to a recent act of the legislature of Nova Scotia, chapter 177, of 1921, "An Act to Vest Certain Lands in Victoria County in Jane E. MacNeil". It is represented to the department that this statute in effect reverses the judgments of the courts including the Supreme Court of Canada in which it was ultimately decided that the defendant Jane E. MacNeil had acquired the title fraudulently, held the lands in trust and should convey them to the curator for the benefit of creditors.
>
> It would be the duty of the Minister of Justice, as you will perceive, to consider the propriety of recommending disallowance of this statute, and he would be glad, in considering the matter, to have before him any explanation or representation which your government would desire to submit.

My right hon. friend's government therefore raised the issue as to whether or not this statute should be disallowed; they were the first people to raise any question about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon gentleman knows better than that. There is correspondence on the file before that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am speaking of those constitutionally and politically responsible to this House. My right hon. friend had the temerity this afternoon to move a vote of want of confidence in this government because we did the very thing which his Minister of Justice said should be done in

1921. The motion before the House for consideration to-night is not purely a question as to whether or not certain action taken by the Governor in Council in 1922 was right within the constitution, my right hon. friend is asking the House to turn this government out because of that action—an action which he and his government were responsible for initiating. That is the situation.

Now, do not let us have any misgivings as to where we stand in this matter. Argument as to the relative constitutional powers of the provinces and the Dominion may be made at great length and with great elaboration, but after all when we come to consider what is the issue before the House the primary points for us to consider are: First—Has the government the right of disallowance? Secondly—Was the right properly exercised in this particular matter? What is the situation as to whether the right of disallowance exists? In the British North America Act will be found an express provision that there rests in the federal Governor in Council the right to disallow the legislation of a province. There are no limits defined within which this right may be exercised there are no judicial decisions which in any way define how it should be exercised. From time to time since 1867 successive ministers of Justice have reviewed the legislation of the provinces, some holding one view at one time and others holding one view at another time. In order therefore to ascertain just where we stand in regard to this question perhaps it will be well to look at some authorities. Take, for instance, Todd on Parliamentary Government in the Colonies, a standard authority about which there can be no question. Speaking of this power of dissolution he says:

> Two possible grounds of objection to provincial enactments are noticed in the preceding report, namely: (1) Where exception might be urged to "the law" itself, as being in excess of the constitutional powers of the local legislature, or at variance with dominion legislation; (2) Where it might appear that proposed enactments were contrary to the policy which, in the opinion of the Governor General in Council, ought to prevail throughout the dominion, in view of the general interests thereof.

There we have recognition of the principle involved in the very inception of confederation—not merely that legislation which was ultra vires of the provincial government might be dealt with by the federal authority under this veto power, but also that an inherent right existed in the federal executive to deal with matters which might be within the jurisdiction of the legislatures. So we have that to start with. Has there been any change of opinion on the principle there laid down other than the varying opinions of the successive Ministers of Justice from time to time? Let us see what the practice has been.

At first legislation which was clearly ultra vires was disallowed; then as time went on different courses were adopted. The policy adopted was first, to ask the legislature to repeal or amend the objectionable legislation; secondly, to leave the question to be decided by the courts; or, thirdly, to absolutely disallow the legislation. The reason why disallowance was resorted to was because grave difficulties might arise and awkward problems be involved if legislation of doubtful validity was allowed to be operative.

Now, my right hon. friend has alleged that we can find no cases in which the power of veto was exercised in regard to matters which might be intra vires of the legislature.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that at all. The hon. member surely never thought I said so?

Mr. MACDONALD: Then does my hon. friend concede it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know there are cases of intra vires legislation where the power of disallowance has been exercised, and justly so; but I said there has been no case of disallowance merely on the ground of the injustice of the legislation itself.

Mr. MACDONALD: I shall be glad to show my hon. friend that his Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, laid down authority directly to the contrary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am speaking of cases and decisions.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will come to those later on. I understand my hon. friend now to agree with my proposition that the right of the federal authority to interfere with legislation which is ultra vires of the province might be exercised in certain cases. The former great leader of the Conservative party laid that down very explicitly. It was also laid down by the late Mr. Ouimet when Acting Minister of Justice. Then we come to 1909 on the occasion of the refusal to disallow the legislation of the Ontario government in regard to the Florence mining case, when Sir Allen Aylesworth gave an opinion which has been frequently quoted. I was in the House on that occasion and remember the discussion very well. For the information of the House I want to cite the opinion of a gentleman who took part in the debate, in fact at whose instance it arose. I refer to Mr. Justice

Clarke of the Court of Appeals of Alberta, who was then a member of this House. He said:

> Certainly we have the power to interfere. Certainly I think His Excellency has the prerogative right to disallow, whether it is because an act is beyond the jurisdiction of the province or whether, in the interest of the whole country and as a matter of political expediency, it ought to be disallowed.

There is another recognition that the right exists. Now let me cite my right hon. friend's Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Doherty. Speaking in 1912 he laid down in the Alberta case:

> The undersigned entertains no doubt, however, that the power is constitutionally capable of exercise and may on occasions be properly invoked for the purpose of preventing, not inconsistently with the public interest, irreparable injustice or undue interference with private rights or property through the operation of local statutes intra vires of the legislature.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the decision in the case?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not know whether my right hon. friend sat in council, but his former colleague did, when Right Hon. Mr. Doherty, dealing with the legislation passed by the province of Alberta in connection with the Alberta waterways case, declined, though he indicated that he thought it was ultra vires, to disallow it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear,

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes, but the courts disallowed it. The minister of that day laid down the unquestionable doctrine that I have just cited, a doctrine that my right hon. friend disputes to-night, that in cases of irreparable injustice or undue interference with private rights or property through the operation of local statutes intra vires of the legislature, disallowance might be had.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no disallowance, though.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My right hon. friend is quibbling, and he knows he is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all; I admitted when I spoke that there were conflicts of obiter dicta. That is an obiter dictum, and the hon. member knows it. What is more, the minister there referred to irreparable cases; none would suggest that cases are irreparable where the courts are opened to both parties. I admit I do not agree with the obiter dicta, but there was no dicision based on the one the hon. gentlemen cites.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Minister of Justice under the administration of my right hon friend was referring to irreparable injustice or undue interference with private rights.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "And."

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No, not "and"— "or." That was the doctrine of the government with which my hon. friend was connected. In regard to his assertion that there had been no interference since confederation with regard to these matters, I may say that he will find in Lefroy on page 46 a statement made by that distinguished lawyer, Mr. Lafleur, of Montreal, whose ability is recognized everywhere throughout Canada Speaking of Mr. Lafleur's argument, this authority says:

> Summing up, Mr. Lafleur informed the Privy Council of Canada that the number of acts actually disallowed on grounds of injustice under what he calls the old regime, from confederation to 1898, were five in number.

Five; my hon. friend said, none.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Injustice was not the only ground.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Excuse me, now, I quote further.

> But that in numbers of other cases the recommendations made by the Ministers of Justice led to a change in the law either by repeal or by amendment, and consequently the necessity for disallowance was obviated.

So that Mr. Lafleur distinctly says that my hon. friend was wrong; that not only was the attention of the legislature called to the necessity for disallowance or amendment, but that in five specific cases the power was exercised.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the hon. gentleman find the cases?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have not the law library right at hand, but
9 p.m. I would find them if my right hon. friend desires it. But surely he will not question Mr. Lafleur's statement in that respect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that Keith reviews all the cases, and there is not one that rests on that ground and that alone.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): All I can say is that I am quoting from a reputable authority, Lefroy, and I am giving the statement of Mr. Eugene Lafleur. I venture to say that my hon. friend will not question what Mr. Lafleur says in that regard. Let me quote again from Todd. At page 521, speaking of the power of disallowance, he says:

> It has been sometimes invoked in respect to acts or bills which contained provisions that were deemed to

be contrary to sound principles of legislation, and therefore likely to prove injurious to the interests or welfare of the Dominion.

Then he says that in extreme cases the Governor General in Council has assumed the responsibility of disallowing provincial enactments upon the ground that they included unsound or objectionable principles of legislation. I hope that I have made it clear that unquestionably the power exists with reference to legislation which is ultra vires, and that also, in the matter of legislation which is intra vires, under certain conditions within the lines laid down by Mr. Doherty, that power has been exercised repeatedly by Governors General since confederation in the cases mentioned by Mr. Lafleur.

Let me refer the House to some statements that have been made in this connection and that ought not, in my opinion, to be disregarded. Lord Herschell, speaking in the Attorney General for Canada and the Provinces in 1898, and referring to the powers of the legislatures and their right to exercise them, said:

> If however, the legislature purports to confer upon others proprietary rights where it possesses none itself, that in their lordships' opinion is not an exercise of the legislative jurisdiction conferred by section 91.

The Alberta Waterways case had to do with the investment by the Alberta government of a large amount of money in the construction of a railway. The money was being diverted by the company, and the province proceeded to urge for the impounding of the money in the bank. There the government were directly interested in the project. Take the Florence gold mining case in Ontario: there the government were the owners of the mine for which the lease had been granted, and it was a dispute between the lessees. Take the case in which application for disallowance was made with reference to the Ontario Power Commission. The Ontario government created the commission and undertook to protect it. In the Florence mining case, in which Sir Allen Aylesworth gave the dictum, it was held by the courts of Ontario that notwithstanding alleged objectionable clauses in the act, the legislation of itself was absolutely constitutional. But in this case the province of Nova Scotia had years ago divested itself of any possible interest in that farm in Cape Breton, and it came down from the clear skies, as it were, with this legislation and undertook to interfere with the rights and privileges of the owners.

Now, what is the situation here? Within the last two years the hon. gentleman who was Minister of Justice of this Dominion was twice called upon to deal with bills of the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia on the question of disallowance. In the one case it was suggested by the government directly that they desired the bill to be disallowed; it related to a matter that was purely intra vires of the province, a matter that was absolutely within their rights. No other authority could have interfered with it in any way; yet they asked the Minister of Justice to disallow it. If there was no power to interfere with legislation that might be intra vires of the province, upon what ground, upon what right, could the Premier of Nova Scotia ask the Minister of Justice to disallow it? Then, here is the case of men who had vested interests; who had gone on on the faith of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and invested their money, sold their bonds, and so on. They go to the Minister of Justice and point out that this case, as had been laid down by the previous Minister of Justice, Mr. Doherty, should be dealt with by the federal authority. My right hon. friend's Minister of Justice initiates the matter; the present minister was only its inheritor—the proceedings were started by Hon. R. B. Bennett. When the question is put up to the government of Nova Scotia, they say, "We have no objections to the act being disallowed."

Now, who is complaining here? Why is my hon. friend moving a vote of want of confidence? In view of these facts why is he attempting to indicate that provincial rights throughout this country are imperilled? My hon. friend is playing politics; he is more interested in the raising of an issue of this kind, with some ulterior object in view, than he is in settling any constitutional question, because on that point there is not very much doubt.

Well, what are the facts? The Minister of Justice this afternoon related some of them. The House is familiar with the first part of the proceedings. The allegation was that a man by the name of Francis MacNeil, who had received $2,000 from his partner through Molson's Bank, Montreal, to go down and buy a piece of property for the partnership, proceeded when he got in Cape Breton to take the deed for the property in his sister's name. Then the curator or assignee of the firm when it went into insolvency—

Mr. HANSON: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the witnesses on behalf of the curator were never examined at the trial, that the trial took place at an adjourned hearing and finally went by default?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): All I have to say is this: I understand some imputation

has been made against the gentleman who was identified with this case first. That was Mr. Gunn. He is a reputable man, his standing at the bar of Nova Scotia is very high. Why did not some one interested in this matter, if it was considered there was ground for complaint, make representations to the Barristers Society of Nova Scotia in regard to Mr. Gunn? But no one did that, the case went right on, and finally was heard by the Supreme Court of Canada. After it had been dealt with there the parties who had lost turned around and made complaints. Mr. Gunn acted in the first instance, as I find from the record and when the case went to appeal he was assisted by Mr. Ralston. It is not until ten years afterwards that these imputations are made. Is it likely that Mr. Ralston whom we all know on account of his position and standing at the bar would have been associated with Mr. Gunn in arguing a case in Nova Scotia if the circumstances were such as have been suggested? Mr. Ralston argued this case in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia and he also argued it before the Supreme Court in Ottawa, and I will make the statement, without having communicated with that gentleman in any way—that he would not come here and ask this House to condemn the government because it disallowed this legislation. My hon. friend is a lawyer. He knows that, time and time again in the history of our profession, after a suit is over you will find some interested party going around and making complaints, we will say, either that my hon. friend (Mr. Hanson) was no good or that I was no good, as the case may be.

Mr. GRAHAM: They might both be right.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes that may be true. To-day we are told the trouble was that the lawyers went back on them. I do not take much stock in the allegations that have been made. The case was tried in Nova Scotia by Mr. Justice Ritchie, whom I know very well. It then went to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia and Mr. Justice Ritchie expressed a very strong opinion of Mr. Francis MacNeil who took the $2,000 from Montreal. Mr. Justice Ritchie not only said what was attributed to him by the Minister of Justice, but at a later date expressed himself as follows:

> At the trial, the defendant Francis J. MacNeil said that, with the exception of $100, the proceeds of the $2,000 note went to pay for the gypsum property as no doubt it did. In his answer to one of the interrogatories he said it did not. I regard him as a man whose evidence is not entitled to credit.

That is what a learned judge of the province of Nova Scotia said in regard to the gentleman who took this money from Montreal. The case was decided in Nova Scotia and an appeal taken to the Supreme Court of Canada. Now let us see what Mr. Justice Idington said about it. It would seem from what we have been told that everybody is prejudiced in this case. The lawyers were prejudiced and now, I suppose, we will be told that the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada were prejudiced. What does Mr. Justice Idington say with regard to Francis MacNeil:

> When we find that her brother, who was one of the said firm of Sparrow and MacNeil in question, managed personally and through his solicitor, and agent, the whole transaction relative to getting the deed executed and paid the money got as above mentioned, I submit that these statements under oath can hardly be properly described as counsel suggested as being merely "uncandid".
>
> It rather shocks one to be asked in face of such a perversion under oath, of the truth by the appellant, to treat her as a credible witness when testifying relatively to the same transaction.

Now, I want to say—and I leave it to any gentleman in this House who is connected with the bar—that rarely you find judges in an appellant tribunal undertaking to condemn a witness in such clear and explicit terms; rarely do they express themselves in such unqualified terms with respect to witnesses; it is only in extreme cases that they do it. Well, that was away back in 1912 and 1913. The decision was accepted. There were lots of MacNeils in Nova Scotia who were friendly to Fletcher but nothing was said about the matter. They accepted the decision. The Supreme Court of Canada had decided that this property did not belong to Francis MacNeil and for six years that situation was accepted.

All of a sudden an energetic young fellow who had done good service overseas goes and visits former Chief Justice Townshend. This gentleman had retired from the bench for quite a number of years; he had become very aged and was living in Wolfville: he is one of the most highly regarded gentlemen in our province. The young man who started this went to former Chief Justice Townshend and got some kind of a letter from him which was read by my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) this afternoon. Then he goes to some of his friends in the legislature and prevails upon them to start the passing of legislation through the provincial legislature. The Premier of the province was away. No notice of this contemplated legislation was given to the people in Montreal who were the owners of the property and, as sometimes occurs in this parliament, the legislation slipped through without very much attention being paid to it. My hon. friend read a letter from former Chief Justice Townshend

on this matter. The Minister of Justice read a portion of another letter. Now let me read a letter which indicates what Sir Charles Townshend's view of the situation was when he found what use the young man in question had been making of the first letter referred to.

WOLFVILLE, N.S., June 30, 1922.

R. B. BLAUVELDT, ESQ.,
Barrister,
Wolfville, N.S.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of June 29 inst. containing an extract of an alleged letter from a Mr. Francis MacNeil as to what I said to him respecting a case from Cape Breton in which he was interested, I beg to state that the alleged statements made by MacNeil are a tissue of deliberate falsehoods in which there is not a word of truth.

I said nothing more to him or rather different from that contained in the letter I gave him. You, as a barrister, can readily understand that it would be inconceivable that I should make any such statements concerning a judgment to which I was a party. I tried to impress upon him that there was no possible way in which the final judgment of the court could be disturbed.

I never dreamt that any legislature could be guilty of such an outrageous act as to pass a law reversing the decision of the final court of appeal. I do not know why I should have given him the letter I did except that I felt at the time some sympathy for a returned soldier who alleged his loss was a consequence of his being absent from the country and that perhaps some of his friends or comrades if they believed his story might give him some assistance.

I should not have given him the letter at all, but certainly would never have done so for the use that has been made of it.—Yours truly,

(Signed) CHARLES TOWNSHEND.

Now let me quote from another letter written in June, 1917 after this legislation had been passed.

WOLFVILLE, June 17, 1922.

Dear Sir,—I feel much shocked as well as indignant to learn from you that a most unjustifiable use has been or is intended to be made of a short letter of mine in a Cape Breton case—Plaster Quarries vs MacNeil. It is some years since I as one of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court heard this case on appeal, and I never had nor have I now the slightest doubt as to the correctness of the decision the court rendered afterwards confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada. A year or more afterwards, a young man named MacNeil called at my residence asking me to make some order to have the case reheard, and produced a solemn written statement to convince me that the court had erred and that gross injustice had been done to him. I told him very emphatically that I as Chief Justice and other members of the court could do nothing for him, that the matter was now out of our hand, and finally settled for all time.

He pressed me to send the statement which to gratify him I did, and at his urgent request wrote a note to say that if all the statements had been proved satisfactory to the court, there might have been a different result, but I either asked or told him that as matters stood, the judgment was right and nothing could disturb it.

I felt some sympathy for the man if his statements were true, especially as he stated that he was absent in France as a soldier when the case was tried.

I never dreamed that any legislation of a civilized country could be guilty of such an outrage as to pass an act setting aside the solemn judgment of the court as I learn has been done in this case, and I do sincerely trust you will succeed in having such a gross violation of constitutional right disallowed by the Dominion government if for no other reason a notice to the local legislature that they will not be permitted to interfere with the courts of justice.—Yours sincerely,

(Signed) CHARLES TOWNSHEND.

H. S. Ross, Esq.,
Montreal.

Now so much for the opinion of Sir Charles Townshend and so much for the letter which was read this afternoon. Under the circumstances, the position of Sir Charles Townshend was somewhat difficult in this matter. Here was a kindly old gentleman who had been pressed by a young man who had been overseas, and in order to get rid of the young man he wrote this letter. It was an unwise proceeding, but immediately he had done so, he realized the enormity of the manner in which his letter had been used and he took steps to put himself right. Let us look at the act. I submit to the judgment of the House that if it was intended by the legislature to deal with this case upon any reasonable ground, they would never have placed such an act as we find upon the statute book. If ever there was an occasion on which a bill was being presented to parliament, or an act passed, where there should be embodied in the preamble of the bill the reasons why the decisions of the highest federal court in the country, delivered six years previously, should be interfered with, it was this bill. I leave it to the judgment and fairness of hon. members. If such a proposition came to us for consideration—and I question whether it ever could come here—there is not an hon. member in this House who would not ask the promoters at once, "Where in the preamble of the bill have you set out the reasons or justification? Why this haste? Why are we asked to over-ride a decision of the court which has been in effect for six years?" But they adopted the other course, without rhyme or reason, and without a suggestion of the why or wherefore. Here is an act which undertakes to say that a certain lot of land known as the gypsum property in Nova Scotia, describing it by metes and bounds,—

> Is hereby vested in Jane E. MacNeil, in fee simple subject to the same trusts and equities in favour of any other person, persons or body corporate, if any, under which she held the said lot of land on the tenth day of July, 1911, or any prior time, notwithstanding any proceedings or judgment, legal or otherwise, in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, or an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada therefrom, had or taken, and notwithstanding the operation of any statute of limitation in force in this or any other province of the Dominion of Canada,

This act undertakes to nullify the operation of any statutes of any province of the Domin-

ion of Canada which undertakes to stand in the way of this act. The act further states—

and notwithstanding laches, if any, on the part of any person, persons or body corporate, if any, claiming a beneficial interest in the said land.

Then it goes on to state:

The claims, rights and interests of all persons and bodies corporate in respect to the trusts and equities, if any, mentioned in section 1 of this act, shall be forever barred, unless an action, suit or other proceeding is brought in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia for the purpose of declaring, enforcing or establishing of such claim, right or interest within one year after the date of the coming into force of this act.

The plea is made that that is a very wonderful section. It is said this is only putting things back to where they were in 1911. Is it? Let us see what the situation was. What did the Supreme Court of Canada decide in this matter? Did they decide anything about the trustees? Here is the decision of the court in a head note:

Held, affirming the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, that the curator was entitled to have the transaction set aside and the lands purchased treated as part of the insolvent's estate.

Let us see what would happen supposing the assignee or the curators started an action in Nova Scotia under that act. Suppose they got through the courts of Nova Scotia, and declared MacNeil to be holding the property as trustee. Before the Supreme Court, what do we find? Six or seven years ago that court held, not that Miss MacNeil could or could not be a trustee, but that the land was actually the property of a curator. What a farce in judicial procedure to ask the Supreme Court to turn around, and, basing the decision upon the fact that the legislature had enacted that this property was vested in Miss MacNeil as trustee for somebody, hold that she was a trustee, and that some imaginary cestui qui trust had a right under it. That is the situation. I venture to say there is not a lawyer in this House who will risk his reputation on the proposition that such a thing would be possible in a civilized country. The act is a farce, as far as the second clause goes. It is adroitly drawn to mislead the public. It was said by the legislature of Nova Scotia "We do not want to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, but just to fix it up so that the case can be tried all over again," and when they come to do it they put it in such a way that it is absolutely impossible for the case to be treated on the basis on which they want the Supreme Court to treat it.

Is it any wonder that when the application is made to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice he at once instructed his deputy to take steps to have this act disallowed. In the first place, he saw that the act itself was a ridiculous absurdity, intended to mislead the public into the belief that they were providing for a new trial, in which the thing was dead open and shut before they ever started. There was confiscation without compensation in the act, and it was intrusion by the legislature into a matter of absolute private right in which the province as a whole had no right to interfere, and in which the whole matter had long been settled. Suppose, for instance, one of our friends opposite from the West had the misfortune to have his title to his section of land or to two or three sections of land questioned by some person, who alleged that he was entitled to the property, and the Supreme Court of Canada, or the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan, as the case might be, decided this year that there was not anything in the claim, that the property belonged to the hon. member opposite, and, that—which I hope would never occur—seven or eight years after this, when he had gone to his fathers, and his wife and family were left alone, all of a sudden the gentleman who litigated this year might have become powerful or become interested in a wealthy corporation, might influence the legislature in the province in which he lived to pass an act to declare that, notwithstanding what had been decided by the court of Manitoba or Saskatchewan in the year of grace 1923, it was of no value whatever, that the property was to be vested in this man who had been the former litigant, and that he would have the property for evermore. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what was done in Nova Scotia. That is what is to be done by this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS: I understood the hon. member to say that that act possibly might have been passed in Nova Scotia without mature consideration. In case that was a fact, would it not have been possible for the legislature of Nova Scotia after mature consideration, to repeal that at a later session?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is a fair question. All I can say in regard to that is that I see in the record the statement of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia that a bill was introduced and that it passed its second reading. If the hon. member had lived in Nova Scotia as long as I have and seen how fast the legislature closes up in the spring when the members want to go home, he would understand that a great deal of legislation goes by the board, just as is the case in this

parliament when the weather gets hot. This was legislation not introduced by the government, and that is the situation.

In view of all this situation, in view of the fact that my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) the desk mate of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has moved a vote of want of confidence in this government, in the light of the facts I have given and the acknowledged authorities as regards the question of veto, in view of the fact that my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) sat with the then Minister of Justice through all the period when he was in the government, when that gentleman went on record in exactly such a case, asserting that it was a proper case for disallowance, and in view of the fact that his own Minister of Justice initiated these proceedings and asked his deputy to take them, this House would be stultifying itself, would be an object of ridicule throughout the country, were we to entertain for a moment the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations in connection with this amendment. We have just listened to a very interesting address by the new fo'castl member of the government. It reminds me of some eight, ten or twelve years ago when the hon. gentleman was the leader of that celebrated coterie in this House known as the "Dark Lantern Brigade"—much sound and fury, signifying nothing. I must congratulate the hon. member on having lived up to his reputation. I hardly think, however, that his colleague the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) will take a great deal of comfort from the remarks that have been made by his colleague the fo'castl minister, because I believe he has added nothing to the arguments adduced in opposition to this amendment.

Some hon. members have endeavoured tonight to make some point by reason of a letter which was written by the Deputy Minister of Justice on the 8th day of November, 1921, to the Attorney General of Nova Scotia. I venture to suggest that my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has misconstrued the effect of that letter. First of all, if I understood him correctly, he stated that the Minister of Justice of the day himself brought forward the matter of disallowance of the act in question. I rather challenge that point of view. I am of opinion, reading between the lines of this letter, that the question of the propriety of the legislation in this case was brought forward by the Deputy Minister of Justice of the day in view of his personal connection with the subject matter of this legislation and of the suit in question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He says that the minister instructed him.

Mr. HANSON: I know he says that the minister instructed him to draw his attention to the matter. He says also that:

> It would be the duty of the Minister of Justice, as you will perceive, to consider the propriety of recommending disallowance of this statute.

That is as far as he goes. In the light of authorities and especially in the light of the authority of Sir Allen Aylesworth in the Florence mining case, I venture to say that any Minister of Justice at that time would have paused and considered very fully before he would have recommended disallowance in connection with this particular measure. I pause here for a moment to say this, that we all recognize that Mr. Newcombe, the deputy minister, is a leading counsel in this country, and that he is an outstanding counsel before the Supreme Court of Canada. But I question very seriously the propriety of the Deputy Minister of Justice of this country acting as counsel in private litigation in cases and questions which may ultimately come in some other form before him in his official capacity. I doubt very much, if Mr. Newcombe had known or realized for a moment that the subject matter of the case of Sparrow and MacNeil would have come before him in its constitutional aspect, as it did five years later, if he would ever have accepted any retainer to argue the case before the Supreme Court of Canada.

Let me pass from that for a moment. A good deal of doubt has been thrown upon the bona fides of Stanley MacNeil in his effort to rectify what to him at all events has seemed a glaring miscarriage of justice. I desire to put upon the record and to read to the members of this House a letter in which he details the situation as it presents itself to him. Hon. members will recall that in the letter of the 8th November, the Deputy Minister of Justice called upon the Attorney General of Nova Scotia to justify the passing of the legislation in question. What happened was this, that the Deputy Attorney General of Nova Scotia passed the inquiry along to the gentleman who had introduced the bill in the Nova Scotia legislature, and he in turn passed it along to Stanley MacNeil. On the 1st December, 1921, Stanley MacNeil replied to that letter by writing to the Deputy Attorney General of Nova Scotia this letter, which I shall read:

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your communication of the 14th ultimo addressed to Mr. A. C. Buchanan, M.P.P., re a bill entitled an act to vest certain lands in Victoria county in J. E. MacNeil. This bill was passed at the last session of the Nova Scotia government. Your communication stated that the Department of Justice desired an explanation of this act, as it sets aside decisions given by the courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada.

I will endeavour to give sufficient reasons at this writing to satisfy the Department of Justice, that said act should not be disallowed. If, however, the Department of Justice should deem the facts set forth in this letter insufficient to justify the act referred to, I trust they will do me the honour of permitting me to present my case before them, together with the evidence I have to support various statements in connection with same.

I might say that the court decisions referred to, were gained through fraud and as a result of a conspiracy engineered by various parties in Montreal, including Mr. W. F. Sparrow, a business partner of my brother.

That is a pretty strong statement.

But notwithstanding this fact, nor the fact that I can produce absolute evidence to show that the evidence of each of the six witnesses—on whose evidence the courts had to decide—can be placed in various categories ranging from perjury to concealment of facts—

Then in parenthesis he says:

The witnesses were not cross-examined, nor was evidence filed in rebuttal—their evidence was given at a defaulted hearing, and the true facts were never presented before the courts. Yet, notwithstanding this, nor a volume of like facts, which I can produce in connection with the decisions obtained against my interests, I have no intention of defending the legislation passed (Bill No. 124) on these grounds.

The main facts to be considered in connection with the legislation passed which I will refer to as Bill No. 124, are: That if this bill is disallowed, the courts of our country cannot deal with my claim for justice.

I never owned nor had interest in the firm of Sparrow and MacNeil of Montreal, yet through the supposed insolvency of this firm myself and family have been deprived of a property, in which the firm of Sparrow and MacNeil had absolutely no interest, although the false evidence before referred to led the courts to believe differently.

After four years and nine months' enlistment, I returned to Canada to learn that through misrepresentation practised upon them, the courts had awarded the property referred to in Bill 124, to F. W. Sharp, as curator of the firm of Sparrow and MacNeil. Mr. Sharp, with the approval of two inspectors of the supposed defunct firm of Sparrow and MacNeil, under circumstances—too lengthy to deal with at this writing—disposed of same to Mr. G. C. Fletcher for the sum of $2,500 (Mr. Fletcher was a witness at the defaulted hearing, and filed before the court a document in which he is supposed to have undertaken to pay $35,000 plus $9,000 royalty for the same property he now obtains for $2,500). Mr. Sharp, Mr. Fletcher, and the two inspectors referred to, are four of the six witnesses who gave evidence at the defaulted hearing. All our efforts to have them cross-examined failed.

Mr. Fletcher in turn disposed of the property—the fifth witness represents the supposed owners of the property at the time Bill 124 was passed—the sixth witness was W. F. Sparrow, whose fraudulent conduct made possible the whole conspiracy. Since Bill 124 has been passed, I have declined a suggestion that I compromise with the parties who claim title.

It was only after efforts were made unsuccessfully with the Department of Justice, the Supreme Court of Canada, etc., to have my claim considered, that Bill 124 was introduced and favourably acted upon by the government of Nova Scotia, as the only means by which the courts could function in their duty of administering justice in the case referred to.

The disallowing of this act, Bill 124, would infer that the Department of Justice condoned the practice of parties courageous enough to resort to misrepresentation on our courts, as a means of obtaining their unholy ends.

Bill 124 provides ample opportunity to anyone having a just claim to enforce same. If the parties who through misrepresentation obtained the court's decision, decline to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded them in Bill 124 to show whether their claim was a true one or not, and the Department of Justice has any desire to investigate the matter, I will be pleased to place at their disposal all evidence in my possession.

That the evidence I have may be deemed concrete and conclusive can be judged from the fact that it has been under the inspection of some thirteen law firms, officials of the G. W. V. A., the government of Nova Scotia, and an ex-Chief Justice (who had decided against my interests, owing to the fraudulent evidence on which he had to give his decision) and has not been found wanting.

Trusting this will sufficiently explain the matter, I am, very respectfully yours,

(Signed) D. STANLEY MACNEIL.

I have read that somewhat lengthy letter in order to show that this young man was smarting under a sense of injustice, because he believed that there had been an absolute miscarriage of justice in the courts of Nova Scotia. Naturally enough the Appellate Court went only upon the material placed before them; but the man having discovered the manner in which the trial had been carried on and the verdict based upon it, having discovered what he alleges to be new and sufficient evidence, I do submit that there was no other way in which he could again bring the matter before the courts of the country save by such legislation as was passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia.

Let us consider that legislation for a moment. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Macdonald) has attempted to throw ridicule upon the provisions of section 2 of that act. I submit that the sole purpose of the act was to put the parties in the position which they occupied previously to the beginning of the first litigation, and that it was open to Plaster Quarries, Limited, or any other persons having an equity, or claiming to have an equity in the property, to begin that litigation, de novo and have the case tried and concluded on the strength of the evidence that might then be presented. By reason of the action of the Minister of Justice that privilege has been denied and the miscarriage of justice, if it may so be termed, has been made complete. That legislation was drawn up by one of the best lawyers in Nova Scotia, Mr. Stewart, who

wrote the letter to my hon. friend's son, who was instrumental in having the bill passed. He appeared before the committee, as I understand, and other counsel were present—I refer to the private bills committee in the legislature of Nova Scotia in the year 1921, presided over then by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Finn) who, in addition to being chairman of the committee was a member of the government of Nova Scotia, and who, no doubt, was chairman of the committee because he was a member of that government. I wonder what that hon. gentleman's feelings were this afternon and evening when he heard the language with which his legislation was characterized. I can imagine some of his feelings; perhaps he will be able to give vocal utterance to them after I have taken my seat. I do not think that the legislature of Nova Scotia is so bad, bad as I believe it to be, as to have railroaded legislation of this character without having given it some consideration. Let me say this further. This is not the first time that legislation of this character has been put through the legislature of Nova Scotia, and I venture the assertion that it will not be the last. This is not the first time that such legislation affecting the title to real property in the province of Nova Scotia has been put through that legislature. I recall to mind an act passed in 1915 by the legislature of Nova Scotia validating and placing at rest title to a tract of timber land that sold afterwards for nearly one million dollars, and the transfer of which took place on the strength of the act in question. The legislature of Nova Scotia has adopted a policy of validating titles by legislation. It is the only legislature in the Dominion that I am aware of which has adopted that policy; but it has adopted it in numerous cases and I have no doubt it will do so again. So that this was no new piece of legislation in that province. You may not be able to justify the policy, but it exists nevertheless; and I suppose the whole question might have been under review years ago if any vested interests had been interfered with or had taken the trouble to bring the matter before the Justice department. Certainly the Justice department never undertook to disallow the act of 1915 validating the title of the Halifax Lumber Company, or title of the Davidson Lumber Company or the numerous other lumber companies in the province, whose titles have been made good in the way I have indicated. I submit therefore that the legislature of Nova Scotia acted in perfect good faith. The members of the private bills committee of that legislature who heard the evidence on both sides as well as the arguments acted in perfect good faith. If not, with what term shall we characterize that legislature and the members thereof? I prefer to leave that to the hon. member for Pictou who himself has described what kind of legislation we are considering in this particular case.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does the hon. member wish to imply that the legislature of Nova Scotia ever validated a title which was doubtful and which was worth anything in the vicinity of a million and a half dollars?

Mr. HANSON: The hon. gentleman's question is really double-barrelled. I would answer the first part by saying that the legislature of Nova Scotia has validated titles which were really doubtful, and no one knows it better than my hon. friend for Colchester (Mr. Putnam), because he must remember the experience he and I had over that very act this year when he tried to get another private bill put through the legislature of Nova Scotia in the interests of one of his own clients exempting a certain lot which was affected by the earlier legislation.

Now, to resume. I have stated that this class of legislation is nothing new in Nova Scotia.

Mr. PUTNAM: Will the hon. gentleman answer the other part of my question?

Mr. HANSON: I have really forgotten what it was.

Mr. PUTNAM: Is the hon. gentleman seriously claiming that the validation affected property to anything like a value of $1,000,000?

Mr. HANSON: In this case or the case I cited?

Mr. PUTNAM: The Fraser Lumber Company.

Mr. HANSON: I do say that on the strength of the validating act passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia in 1915 my clients invested in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000, and that that act validated titles many of which were objectionable—just what proportion I am not prepared to state.

Mr. PUTNAM: Would you allow me to give my opinion on that?

Mr. HANSON: You can speak when I am through; there will be lots of room and lots of time.

Mr. PUTNAM: Thank you.

Mr. HANSON: I do not want to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman but I do not think he ought to make a speech in the middle of the few remarks I am addressing to the House. In respect to the act in question, the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Macdonald) made some very scathing references to section 2. With all due deference to himself and other legal lights in this House and to the opinion of those who may differ from me, I submit that this section did adequately preserve the equities of the present owners. Unquestionably that was the intent and meaning of the statute, and if the legislature of Nova Scotia—I have confidence enough in them to say this—had understood and believed, or if the law officers of the Crown in that province under whose scrutiny this act must have passed had believed for one moment that the interest of the Plaster Quarries, Limited and the bondholders, would have been prejudicially affected in promoting new litigation, they would never have passed the bill in question. Therefore I say that the legislation was undoubtedly well considered in the local legislature, and I do submit that it gave nothing more and nothing less than the right of a new trial, which could not have been obtained in any other way.

Reference has been made to the extraordinary powers given to the Minister of Justice under the Criminal Code in capital cases to order a new trial without the interposition of judicial proceedings. But that power is exercised very sparingly. However, there have been cases, and I had intimate experience with one such case where the exercise of the power was absolutely justified. Of course, in civil matters there is no such power given to anyone, except the sovereign power in the legislature of Nova Scotia, and I submit that that sovereign power was not abused in this case.

A great deal of time has been taken in arguing the constitutional aspect of this matter. I do not propose to follow along the paths that have already been well trodden in that connection, except to say that I venture the assertion that the opinion expressed by Sir Allen Aylesworth in the Florence mining case correctly sets forth what is the constitutional practice in the cases and decisions.

Mr. HAROLD PUTNAM (Colchester): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) dropped a remark by which, whether intentionally on his part or inadvertently, the opinion would naturally be formed by this House that it was not unusual for the legislature of Nova Scotia to settle titles by legislation. Having watched legislation there for a long term of years, and being a native and a lawyer of that province, I say the practice is utterly unusual and that the valuation placed by the hon. member upon the land which happened to come under a validating bill would lead to a wholly wrong inference. It is true that in a validating bill property was included which according to my hon. friend—and I do not doubt his word—may have sold for something like a million and a half. But as to 99 per cent of that property there was no possible question about the validity of the title. There was some doubt as to about $800 or $900 worth of property included in the tract, and it was for the purpose of settling title to that small portion that the blanket bill was put through covering all the lands that the Fraser Pulp and Paper Company required. And even in respect of the title which was doubtful, my hon. friend and I had a friendly contest this winter and the Lower House of Nova Scotia put through a bill undoing the injustice which they did to the man in regard to the $800 or $900 worth of property which was taken from him, and before it reached our House of Lords —our Legislative Council—the parties arrived at a settlement. But it is absolutely erroneous to suppose that the government of the province of Nova Scotia have any policy of validating titles of substantial value. There is, however, in some counties an optional Lands Title Act in effect where after an extensive system of newspaper and poster advertising a person may by motion have a title declared, but the most ample notice must be given to every abutter and to every person who can possibly be considered as having any interest or claim in or to the land in question. Exceedingly infrequent are the occasions when the legislature of Nova Scotia purports to settle a title which is in any degree doubtful.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that owing to absence from the chamber I did not hear the earlier portion of this debate, nor am I able to say that I am in any way familiar with the merits of the controversy which has taken place in the courts and in the legislature of Nova Scotia. My knowledge in regard to the matter has been gathered solely from what I have heard of the debate this evening, and I think I may safely say that anyone who has listened carefully to the proceedings this evening must be forced to the conclusion that the question now before the House does touch one of the most important

and one of the most vital interests which the provincial governments and the Dominion government have, under our great constitutional charter known as the British North America Act. The subject now under discussion involves in a most pointed way the respective jurisdictions of our provincial legislatures on the one hand and of the Dominion executive on the other.

For the purpose of the brief remarks which I propose to make to the House the merits of the controversy really need not be considered. The address delivered to-night by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) was largely a discussion of the rights and claims and counter-claims of the individuals in Nova Scotia who sought either to enforce or to repel some alleged claim. In the view I take of the matter we need not concern ourselves with the claims of the various interested parties in the province of Nova Scotia. In coming to a determination upon this matter, it is of no moment whether the claims of the MacNeils are well founded or ill founded. The point and the single point which we are called upon to decide is the constitutional question, should this parliament or should the government of the Dominion exercise jurisdiction to annul or to disallow an act of the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia, passed by that legislature while acting strictly within its legislative rights as laid down by the British North America Act? That is the simple question we have to decide, and I doubt if any more important question or any more far reaching question can be raised in this parliament than this: Should this parliament, should the government of this country in any case, undertake to disallow or to annul an act of a provincial legislature when that act has been passed within the legislative jurisdiction of that province.

I assume we are all agreed upon certain points in regard to this case. All the parties interested are residents of Nova Scotia. The property over which the conflict has taken place is situated within the province of Nova Scotia. The transaction itself does not affect the rights of any other province or the rights of the Dominion. The whole matter lies within the province itself. The property is there; the parties are there, and the legislature is there, and the question concerns—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If my hon. friend will permit me, I think he is in error. All the parties are not in the province of Nova Scotia. Sparrow and MacNeil were doing business in Montreal. They went into liquidation in Montreal and the curator was appointed in Montreal. They had creditors in Montreal, who are still creditors, unpaid. The Plaster Quarries Company is not, that I know of, a company having interests only in the province of Nova Scotia. The bonds were sold and distributed all over Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am glad my hon. friend has put me right on that point. But after all, it is the property itself, and where that property is located with which we are more particularly concerned. Where is the corpus? Where are the assets? It is in regard to the assets that this particular legislation imposes rights or obligations or seeks to change title of ownership. I do not think that anyone would controvert the statement that the whole question under discussion is within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of Nova Scotia. If we can come to that conclusion, as I think we must, then I think the next step is a very simple one. The constitutional practice which has grown up in the course of over fifty years in this country is simply this, that in regard to questions over which provincial legislatures have within themselves legislative jurisdiction, this House, this government, shall not interfere. I agree that the constitutional development in the Dominion of Canada has not been a matter of a few months or even a matter of a few years. Our constitutional rights were settled, it is true, in a written constitution in the year 1867. But there has been a slow but steady development of constitutional practice; and views which were entertained in the seventies and the eighties and the nineties do not prevail to-day and are not considered good parliamentary usage or good constitutional practice. One has only to glance over the works of the various constitutional authors who have written upon the subject to follow step by step the constitutional development which has taken place in Canada since 1867. The case cited this evening by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Defence (Mr. Macdonald), including the argument of Mr. Lafleur, K.C., of Montreal, puts the matter more conclusively than any argument of mine could do. The citation made by the hon. gentleman was from Lefroy's work on Canada's Federal System, page 46, and I am going to repeat the quotation, because it is very appropriate to the discussion which is now proceeding:

> Mr. Lafleur informed the Privy Council of Canada that the number of acts actually disallowed on grounds of injustice under what he calls the old regime, i.e., from confederation to 1898, were five in number; but that in numbers of other cases the recommendations made by the ministers of justice led to a change in the law either by repeal or by amendment, and consequently the necessity for disallowance was

obviated. As to the five cases thus referred to by Mr. Lafleur where disallowance actually followed, Mr. Masten, arguing on the other side, remarks as to them: "I find that in two of these cases, one principal ground of objection was that the rights of Dominion companies were prejudicially affected, which always is a recognized ground for disallowance, and therefore, it takes away from the strength of the remarks which are obiter on the other question."

Mr. Lafleur makes it clear in the first place that under "the old regime" five cases have arisen in Canada where the Dominion government saw fit to interfere and disallow provincial acts. "Under the old regime," mark you, but the development from 1896 down to the present time has been entirely the other way. I appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), and I refer him to the language of the late Edward Blake, who was probably the most outstanding legal mind that ever adorned this House. The late Hon. Edward Blake, speaking in this House, declared that a provincial legislature might do wrong if it liked so long as it acted within its strict constitutional rights under the British North America Act; it could do wrong if it liked in regard to property and civil rights and there was no right in this government or this parliament to correct it. Let me mention another authority. Another minister of justice, who was in that office when I first entered parliament, the late Hon. David Mills, held the same view. He stated on more than one occasion in this House that there should be no interference by federal authority in cases very similar to the present one. Following him, Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, when Minister of Justice, afterwards Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, took identically the same view. Following him again, Sir Allen Aylesworth, now a member of the Upper House, when minister of justice, stated his view of the question in a speech which actually became famous in Canada. In fact, that speech, which was connected with the Florence mining case, was reported in full in Great Britain, and Sir Allen Aylesworth himself told me that Right Hon Mr. Asquith, at that time Prime Minister of Great Britain, had spoken to him in regard to it, had expressed his approval of the constitutional practice which Sir Allen Aylesworth had so forcibly expressed in this House.

10 p.m.

In the face of such outstanding authority can anyone for a moment argue that the actual constitutional practice in Canada to-day is otherwise than Sir Allen Aylesworth stated it to be? I grant we have the right to disallow provincial legislation—that is one thing. It is declared in the British North America Act that we have such a right; but is it good constitutional practice to exercise that right? To have a strict legal right to do an act is one thing and to have a constitutional right to do it is another thing. After having had experience of over fifty years in this country, in constitutional government under the operation of the British North America Act, I submit that we are turning back precedent after precedent and page after page of constitutional development if in a case of this kind we attempt to interfere with the legislative jurisdiction of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my hon. friend aware whether any objection has been raised by either the government or the legislature of Nova Scotia to this act of disallowance, and if not, wherein has there been any invasion of provincial rights?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I speak purely from the standpoint of the province of Ontario. I do not know that any objection has been taken by anybody in Nova Scotia; but if it is going to be recognized in this country that the government of Canada can disallow provincial acts passed by the legislatures of the various provinces when acting strictly within their provincial rights and jurisdictions I think every province of Canada is vitally interested in the question; and it is only from that point of view that I thought proper to interject a few remarks upon this question to-night. I am satisfied that as I make the statement which I have made to-night that the Minister of Justice and the Acting Minister of National Defence--

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What does my hon. friend say to the opinion of Hon. Mr. Doherty?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot say that I am wholly in accord with the opinion given in this House by Mr. Doherty as read by the Minister of Justice and the Acting Minister of National Defence to-night; I would like to consider more carefully that opinion and inquire into the special facts of that particular case. But I do know this in respect to it, that no action was taken towards disallowance of that particular act.

I have this remark to make in regard to the letter sent by the Deputy Minister of Justice to the Attorney General of Nova Scotia on 8th November, 1921, which has been quoted in this debate. I think it was the duty of the law officers of the Dominion government to call directly to the attention of the law officers of the province of Nova Scotia what, in the opinion of the law officers here, was an apparent wrong or injustice. That is the reason, I fancy, why the letter of 8th

November, 1921, was sent by the Deputy Minister of Justice to the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, and the intimation in that letter is very plain that in the opinion of the law officers in Ottawa injustice is likely to be done by this particular act of Nova Scotia. The attention of the authorities in Nova Scotia was called to the fact that the legislature of that province should remedy the difficulty itself and a hint was certainly thrown out—probably we should call it a threat—that if no action were taken in the matter by the government of Nova Scotia the federal government might see fit to act in the matter. Let me quote the concluding statement made by the deputy minister in this letter,

> It would be the duty of the Minister of Justice, as you will perceive, to consider the propriety of recommending disallowance of this statute, and he would be glad, in considering the matter, to have before him any explanation or representation which your government would desire to submit.

Then followed the notification of the 22nd March, 1922, when my hon. friend, the present Minister (Sir Lomer Gouin) was the incumbent of the office of Minister of Justice. Note particularly the language of the letter of the 22nd March, 1922, which also is from the Deputy Minister of Justice:

> I observe that your legislature is now in session, I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Justice—

That is the present incumbent—

> —and he desires me to suggest that your government should give earnest consideration to the propriety of putting through a repealing act at the present session—

Here is the same threat, here is the same hint.

> —otherwise it will be difficult to resist the application to disallow, but disallowance of this sort of statute, which is I suppose intra vires, upon the ground of its conflict with the principles of justice, would introduce a principle of action here with respect to provincial legislation which it might afterwards be found difficult to restrict within due limits, and therefore, upon constitutional grounds and for motives of expediency it is suggested that the necessity of further consideration by this government should be avoided by local action.

That is precisely the point which I desire to make. If we disallow this act where is the practice to stop? To-morrow it may be the case of Alberta; the next day it may be the case of Saskatchewan; the next day it may be the province of Ontario. The right to disallow provincial legislation is expressly conferred by the British North America Act upon the federal government. Our constitutional practice established for many years says no, we should not act. What are we going to do? Will the minister, because of this present act of disallowance not be tempted to act in a similar manner on subsequent occasions, or may another Minister of Justice, at some time in the future history of the country, not justify some further act of disallowance by citing what the present government did with respect to the present statute of Nova Scotia? What are we really doing in regard to that statute? The government is assuming here that it is the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia. It is doing what the legislature of Nova Scotia has not seen fit to do. That is the point so forcibly argued by Sir Allen Aylesworth in the debate on the Florence mining case: The government will have to put itself into the position of the legislators of Nova Scotia in order to repeal an act which the legislature of that province has not seen fit to repeal. Is this House going to approve such a course? Do we know sufficient about the matter? Even if we do should we take such action? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we should not.

The Acting Minister of National Defence rallies his supporters to the support of himself and the government by stating that this amendment will mean a vote of want of confidence. Well, it is about the only way we can bring this matter directly to the attention of the government. I have not the permission of my colleagues on this side of the House to make any statement upon the subject but if the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice will assure the House that this particular act of disallowance was an extraordinary proceeding on their part, and that the government will not under any circumstances repeat the operation in the future, I am quite satisfied that no one on this side of the chamber would desire to press this motion. But when the government take the other ground, when they say we did what we did because it was right constitutionally, then people in other parts of Canada have to be aroused to the situation because we believe that where a province legislates strictly within its own jurisdiction this government has no right to disallow such legislation under the constitutional practice and usage of this country. That is the broad ground we take, and upon this ground I have not yet heard any serious defence urged on the part of the government. There is a tendency to argue the merits of the case and to argue very ably—as did my hon. friend the Acting Minister of National Defence—the rights of the various parties affected by the legislation and he may be absolutely right in his facts and in his argument of the merits of the case. Even if he is right in all that he contends the only tribunal to right the wrong, if

there be a wrong, is the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia. If the government overlooks that fact and assumes to itself the functions of the legislature of Nova Scotia, while it may say that the strict language of a section of the British North America Act permits it to do so, the correct constitutional practice in this country recognized from 1896 down to the present time practically by every government and every Minister of Justice distinctly affirms that a government should not do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would ask my hon. friend one other question before he concludes his remarks. Do not all the opinions that have been cited to-day have reference to cases where the provinces have protested against the act of disallowance?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I really cannot answer that question. I do not know, I was not here when the discussion took place this afternoon but I would doubt it. I cannot see what difference it makes whether the provincial government protests against or agrees to disallowance. I have heard it said that the government of Nova Scotia actually requested that this act be disallowed by the federal government. I think the provincial government assumed a great responsibility in so doing and is guilty of a great impropriety. The government of Nova Scotia is not the legislature of Nova Scotia, and when the legislature of Nova Scotia passes an act, I think it is highly improper that the government of Nova Scotia, without consulting the legislature, should ask that an act of the Legislative Assembly be annulled by any outside authority. If the act is wrong in any particular what more simple than to have it repealed by the legislature of Nova Scotia. The government of Nova Scotia is in power in the province by a large majority. Were the legislature to repeal the act it would obviate all this difficulty, clear up this constitutional tangle, and relieve the federal government from doing an act which in my humble opinion is a grave constitutional injustice. I am satisfied that from year to year, hereafter, as parliament and the government continue in this country the disallowance in the present case of this legislation of Nova Scotia will be cited and referred to as a precedent for disallowance in the western provinces, the eastern provinces or in the central provinces of the Dominion, and I, for one, protest with all my might against such a practice.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I propose to say a few words on the subject at

[Mr. Guthrie.]

the present time. I notice that most of the members who have taken part in this debate to-night have been of the legal fraternity. The debate has taken on largely the aspect of the legal right of the Dominion and provincial parliaments. Dealing with the case in its primary aspect—that is in relation to MacNeil—I am inclined to think, from all the information I have been able to gather, that there was nothing very reputable about the whole transaction from beginning to end. However, I do not suppose that really affects the question at issue at the present time. Dealing with the action of the legislature of Nova Scotia, it does seem a little dangerous that the legislature should interfere with any decision that has been reached by the courts of the province or by the Supreme Court of Canada. It might have a tendency to lessen the dignity and the standing of those courts. On the other hand, I am struck with the supreme importance of coming to a correct decision in a matter of this kind. I hope that it has not been made a political football at any time and that the question is being discussed entirely upon its merits, because I believe it is one of very great importance. I have come reluctantly to the decision I have reached, simply because the question is involved, and it has many aspects, and many different angles from which it can be viewed. Nevertheless, I cannot but think it would be a dangerous precedent for the Minister of Justice to have the power, or to make a practice, of disallowing acts of the provincial legislature when it is acknowledged that they are intra vires of the province. That is the situation as I see it. I have come to that decision reluctantly because perhaps with the knowledge and experience I have, I may not be competent to form a correct judgment, but I have come to a conclusion, it is my honest opinion, and I will have to stand by it.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): The debate which has been carried on this afternoon has been very interesting and we have listened with great attention from this corner to the deliberations of the various legal lights in the chamber. I am forced to the conclusion that, as is generally the case, when lawyers debate a case, no conclusion is arrived at in their own minds; that is, neither the one nor the other proves his case. But to the lay mind it seems that we who have followed the arguments must come to the conclusion that there is some individual in the fore part of the story who has not been dealt with adequately. I am minded to say that the governing body of

Nova Scotia comprises two bodies; that is a legislative council and a governing council, and it seems to me that with the evidence submitted to them, the evidence upon which they passed the statute under debate, and which has been disallowed, those two legislative bodies of Nova Scotia were in a better position to judge the merits of the case than those who followed can possibly be. I do not claim to interpret this question from a legal point of view, but if I have had any concern in life, it has been to try to find out what is the status of the other fellow, the under dog, and if I can say a word I would like to speak to-night on behalf of the other fellow. I refer to the primary individual who is very much interested in the case. I understood the Minister of Justice to state that he took the position that MacNeil, the individual in question, had perpetrated a fraud. According to the evidence which I read—and I may say that I looked into the evidence for a considerable length of time—it seems to me that is not the first premise we have. If it be substantiated that MacNeil perpetrated a fraud, the fact seems to be that others prior to that time had perpetrated a fraud. I refer to statements that have been made that notes had been given by MacNeil's partner to the partner's parent, and no value received, that a bogus contract, I think, alleged to have been made in Calgary, was the cause of sending MacNeil out to Calgary. As I stated, that was a bogus contract. All these things were submitted, and submitted, I believe, to the Nova Scotia legislature and after a full discussion by the two legislative bodies, they came to the conclusion that an injustice had been done MacNeil, and the consequence was that the statute was passed.

Then we come to the appeal of the legislative bodies in Nova Scotia. The two legislative bodies had the opportunity again of reviewing the newer evidence that had been brought out. The appeal being brought before the Nova Scotia legislature, and not being allowed, seems to me to support the statement or attitude they had taken in their first case. It is also said that, on the first hearing that was given before the Minister of Justice, it must have been only the evidence of Quarries Limited, that could be taken into consideration, because I understand that the defendant in the case had not submitted evidence at that time. Again I find the order for disallowance was dated October 17th, while it is a fact that the Great War Veterans' Association asked for a second hearing on October 18th. Now if that is the case there seems to be something wrong here. There is a conflict of dates. In that case, it does go to prove—and I believe we are right in assuming —that evidence that might have been submitted the second time could not have had the reasonable consideration of the Department of Justice here.

Whether that be right or wrong, the fact remains that such things as those have been published throughout the length and breadth of the country. Listening to the speeches this afternoon, one must come to the conclusion that there has been discussed upon the floor of this House, evidence pertaining to the case, evidence that was submitted to the Nova Scotia legislature, before the courts, and so forth. As I have endeavoured to explain, I have taken it upon myself to present the case of MacNeil on its merits, and I have in my hand a statement which, although it is quite lengthy, I should like to place upon Hansard, because it presents the other side of the case, and, perhaps, the ultimate decision in this case will rest upon the judgment put upon this statement. I do this, not because I wish to take responsibility; I am not taking responsibility at all for the statement. But this has been handed to me, and looking upon it as a disinterested spectator, I feel that there has been an omission of evidence in rebuttal of that which has been given to-day. I think I am justified in stating that the individual from whom I have received this statement says that he is prepared to prove all this evidence in any place in the Dominion of Canada. If that be the case, there are some very strong statements in this. The statement reads:

> That I am prepared to prove that certain parties in Montreal in 1911 did conspire to obtain possession of the personal assets of F. J. MacNeil.

That is F. J. MacNeil, a partner of the firm of Sparrow and MacNeil. That is the allusion I made to the fact that there was a primary premise to the statement made that the MacNeils themselves had not acted on purely legal grounds.

> That there were grounds for warranting a belief amongst those parties that the gypsum property would be one of F. J. MacNeil's assets.
>
> That the value of the property was surmised by these parties in 1911 as much as it is surmised to-day.
>
> That F. J. McNeil and W. F. Sparrow were equal parties in an unlimited contracting firm in Montreal, known as Sparrow and MacNeil, and that W. F. Sparrow used this business connection to further the conspiracy against F. J. MacNeil. The steps taken by Sparrow to further this end were as follows
>
> F. J. MacNeil was lured to Calgary—

I made reference to that statement before.

—in the latter part of June, 1911, in connection with a contract from which tremendous profits were expected. Later, he was advised that the firm was in difficulties,

and that failure to act on a certain suggestion would result in the loss of this large contract to the firm. On July 6, 1911, F. W. Sharp notified the creditors of Sparrow and MacNeil that the liabilities of this firm were in the vicinty of $50,000, and assets about $20,000; that firm had a large contract in the West, and that if partner MacNeil would make over his assets to him (Sharp) as trustee for creditors, the firm would be allowed to continue business; that on partner MacNeil refusing to do this, an assignment would be made.

For various reasons MacNeil refused to do as desired. On July 12, 1911, Mr. Sparrow made a judicial abandonment of the firm's affairs, listing both movable and immovable property belonging to the firm. He swore the firm owned no immovable property. Creditors were informed by Mr. Sharp that Mr. Sparrow (a supposed millionaire's son) did not have a cent for them. Mr. MacNeil was considered wealthy and Mr. Sharp, who following the abandonment was appointed curator, informed creditors that he was taking steps to secure MacNeil's assets.

MacNeil's assets were levied upon, presumably for the benefit of creditors. (Registrar's records in New Jersey in 1921 show MacNeil's land in that state held as a personal asset of F. W. Sharp.) But the creditors of the firm have not been paid. The firm's notes for thousands of dollars were given to parties by Mr. Sparrow without MacNeil's knowledge. Private debts were charged to the firm's accounts by Sparrow.

MacNeil learned that the Calgary contract was with a company that did not even exist. The supposed president of this company had been given the firm's notes by Sparrow unknown to MacNeil, to the amount of $15,000.

It was learned that the gypsum property was not a personal asset of F. J. MacNeil's that he never held title, same being in the name of Jane E. MacNeil.

That the subsequent action taken by F. W. Sharp to deprive Miss MacNeil of her property was founded on fraud which it served as a cloak to cover.

That the expense entailed in prosecuting this action against Miss MacNeil's title was borne by innocent parties whose interests the courts were falsely led to believe would be benefited by Mr. Sharp receiving a favourable decision, while an adverse decision would deprive them of their just claims against an insolvent firm.

That a statement which led to action being taken against Miss MacNeil's title is not entitled to credit inasmuch as it appears in the firm's books, the care of which Mr. Sparrow would be responsible for, and was alleged as follows "Investment account, gypsum property—Island point, Cape Breton, $2,000."

That the evidence given in Mr. Sharp's behalf and on which the courts of Canada gave decision was not subjected to cross-examination, was given at a hearing granted under writ of commission at Montreal, which hearing took place without knowledge of the MacNeils. They learned of it after it was over.

That the witnesses who gave evidence in Mr. Sharp's behalf were parties who played a part more or less in the affairs of Sparrow and MacNeil and subsequent insolvency, or previously been interested in the gypsum property.

That when the case came to trial in Sydney, evidence in rebuttal to plaintiff's evidence was entrusted to Miss MacNeil's lawyer, but was not filed.

It seems to me that some very important points are being brought out here.

That according to records, nine judges in Canada gave decision on the case, five against and four in favour of Miss MacNeil.

[Mr. Gould.]

That evidence has been brought out before and I do not need to repeat it. The statement continues:

That a document representing F. J. MacNeil as owner of the gypsum property was filed by G. C. Fletcher, witness for plaintiff Sharp, for the purpose of misleading the courts. That said document also led courts to believe that G. C. Fletcher had paid F. J. MacNeil $1,000 to bind a certain agreement re gypsum property. This agreement required that G. C. Fletcher pay $35,000 plus $9,000 a year royalty for the right to mine and ship gypsum from the said property.

That when courts awarded property to Mr. Sharp for benefit of firm's creditors, Mr. Sharp disposed of it through G. C. Fletcher for the sum of $2,500.

That two of Mr. Sharp's witnesses were also inspectors with duties to assist Mr. Sharp in disposing of firm's assets to the best interest of firm's creditors.

That without any new discoveries being made, the property was subsequently represented in a statement issued through Bradstreet's as being worth more than $2,750,000.

That aside from local branches, two provincial commands and the Dominion command of the Great War Veterans' Association of Canada who investigated Miss MacNeil's claims, following return of J. Stanley MacNeil from overseas active service, came to the conclusion that the courts had not been given an opportunity of fully weighing the respective claims. They joined him in appealing to the Supreme Court of Canada, the Department of Justice, and finally the government of Nova Scotia to have the case reopened, in order that all the evidence could be fully considered and an equitable decision reached.

After hearing the full statement of Miss MacNeil's claims the Nova Scotia legislature at its 1921 session passed an act vesting the property in her right. That legislature took this step with the object of placing the case in the position where the courts could deal with it, and set a period of one year in which action could be taken to test Miss MacNeil's title. The title was subsequently transferred by Miss MacNeil to her brother, D. Stanley MacNeil, in return for consideration and in fulfilment of an arrangement made at the time the property was originally purchased as a family home, at which time Stanley MacNeil was a minor. On September 5th, 1922, Stanley MacNeil received in Ottawa the information that notice of writ obtained on May 20, 1922, had been served on his sister on August 31, that action against the property was pending and that if appearance was not filed in Nova Scotia he would lose by default. He then proceeded to Halifax, had appearance entered and was awaiting action. On the evening of October 4, he received a telegram from Mr. E. L. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, which informed him that the parties who were bringing action against his right to the gypsum property had also petitioned the federal authorities for disallowance of the statute on which his title rested, and that the minister would hold a hearing at Montreal on Monday morning, October 9.

The point is brought out that Stanley MacNeil had only five days, one of them Sunday, in which to consult legal counsel, to prepare his case and to travel from Nova Scotia to Montreal, and he maintains that this was absolutely inadequate time for him to take the necessary steps.

Mr. MacNeil claims that he had no opportunity to have counsel prepare argument for him and at the hearing at Montreal he refused to file evidence or present an unprepared case and requested that hearing be postponed. To meet the convenience of counsel for petitioning parties the minister proceeded with the

hearing, inferring that there would be a further hearing later. Counsel for petitioning parties made no statement that they could support which would be of sufficient importance as an argument in support of their petition, to be worthy of consideration or criticism.

On October 13 it was thought advisable by the Great War Veterans Association of Canada to present argument in defence of Mr. MacNeil's interests, and the minister was requested to grant a further hearing for this purpose. The minister complied and named October 18 for the purpose. Mr. MacNeil further contends that it would require weeks for counsel to get acquainted thoroughly with the case and the moves made by the parties connected with it to regain possession of the property without appearing in court. He placed a written presentation of the facts, covering fifteen pages, before the minister and filed some fifty extracts of evidence to support them. No witnesses were called, nor were any records kept of the hearing, but a few days later he was informed that the statute was disallowed on recommendation of the Minister of Justice to the Governor in Council.

I have already called the attention of the House to the fact that the disallowance was made on October 18 and the letter he received bore date October 17. Another statement is to the effect that upon the request of Stanley MacNeil a hearing of the parties was had "before the undersigned", but no hearing was held at his request previous to October 18th. The statement continues:

The undersigned is not aware of any circumstance whatever, moral, equitable or legal, which can be pointed to in justification of the legislation under review. In addition to the Great War Veterans of Canada, and the legislature of Nova Scotia, eminent legal authority throughout Canada and the ex-Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, who gave an adverse decision in the case of Sharp versus MacNeil, rendered assistance in having the statute passed. The record of Sharp versus MacNeil is founded on the un-cross examined evidence of witnesses, including W. F. Sparrow and the gentleman who acted as counsel for disallowance of statute on October 18. It would be impossible for the minister to give careful consideration on October 17 to material filed and representations made to Stanley MacNeil on October 18. It would be impossible to give full and complete consideration to the statement and evidence submitted by Mr. MacNeil to the Minister of Justice in the short period of time from the actual date of submission to the actual date upon which the statute was disallowed. No reference was made in the recommendation to the fact that a court action was pending, and no reference was made to D. Stanley MacNeil as owner of the property; nor was any reference made to the fact that Plaster Quarries, Limited, who brought the petition was formed for the purpose of acquiring the property. Witness in the case of Sharp versus MacNeil held fifty per cent of the stock of the company.

There are other points, Mr. Speaker, but I think the salient features of the matter have been outlined in the memorandum I have read to the House. I desire to make it clear again that I am not acting from any prejudiced point of view at all; but as a layman listening to the discussion that has taken place this afternoon and evening, and reading much of the evidence that has been submitted in various quarters, in the press, in the House and throughout the country, I have come to the conclusion that the under dog should have his case presented in some way in this House. I cannot present it from the legal point of view. This memorandum was supplied me and I consider I am only doing my duty in bringing it to the attention of the House. There is one thing I wish to comment slightly upon and that is the peculiar circumstances which surround this property the initial payment of $2,000 and the statement made that there was a knowledge that gypsum was on the property, and yet immediately after the statute was disallowed, or when the litigation was taking place, Bradstreets estimated the value of the property at no less than $2,750,000. There are many thoughts that occur to the mind of an ordinary man when he considers these figures, many thoughts that perhaps are not justified; and I only stand here and say a few words in the hope that justice will be done; for justice is due each and every one of us.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): It has been suggested to-night that this is simply a matter of politics, but I want to say that for some of us at least politics do not enter into the matter at all. There obviously is room for a very careful investigation into the merits of a difficult case. Apparently, as has been brought out, there has been an injustice; at least there are some very suspicious circumstances attendant upon this transaction. I do not believe that we have the machinery here to deal with this case, but I take it that the matter must have been reviewed very carefully in the provincial legislature. If I understand rightly, the argument was advanced in defence of the government that the decision of the courts ought to be regarded as final, and that the action of the government at this time was a vindication of the courts. It seems to me that that is not solid ground to take. Rather I think the courts ought to be subservient to the legislative act, and if for any reason whatever it is felt that the judgment is not in harmony with justice, it seems to me it should be reviewed as apparently it was by the provincial legislature.

Then we have the other matter coming up as to the action of this government. As I listened to the arguments which have been advanced it struck me that we have no other course to take than to stand out decidedly for provincial rights. Some weeks earlier in the session my colleague (Mr. Irvine) introduced a motion proposing that an adverse vote should not be taken as indicative of a want of confidence in the government. We still believe that if there were a change of procedure in this House some of us would

not be driven to the awkward position in which, by voting on the principle involved, we have to vote want of confidence in the government. But since the government rejected the motion I have referred to, and since there has been no revision of the procedure, and since it is increasingly difficult for a private member to bring a motion or a bill before the House with any hope of its acceptance, there is no alternative left us than to simply vote on the principle involved, even though our action may not indicate our attitude towards the government. I think it is only fair to make this explanation because it is not a matter of politics, it is a matter of principle, and possibly by voting often enough along these lines we may ultimately bring about a change of procedure.

Mr. WALTER G. MITCHELL (St. Antoine): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate, and although I am not very familiar with the facts of the case, yet one feature has struck me most forcibly. The question of the right of MacNeil or the corporation that now owns the property in dispute is not one that I intend to deal with at any length, because to my mind what we have to decide is not whether the courts of Nova Scotia decided rightly or wrongly upon this issue, but whether, when the Supreme Court of Canada has rendered judgment on a question of this magnitude, the local legislature can ten years later interfere and say that, notwithstanding any rights created between the time the judgment was rendered and the act of the legislature was passed, the Governor in Council has no right to interfere.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the hon. gentleman think the statute of limitations or any other statute which we might consider for the purpose of this question ought to run against the soldier while he was fighting for his country overseas?

Mr. MITCHELL: I said a few minutes ago that I was not familiar with the facts of the case, but that one feature of it struck me, namely, whether the rights of third parties created between the time that the Supreme Court of Canada rendered its judgment and the local legislature passed its enactment should be interfered with by such legislation.

Let me make myself clear. Some ten years ago this judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada was rendered. In virtue of it title was given to a company, and that company issued bonds which were sold not only in Nova Scotia but in Quebec and Ontario, and I do not know but what they may also have been sold in some of the western provinces. If I am not misinformed, under the terms of the trust deed the bonds so issued were made payable in the city of Montreal. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that ten million dollars' worth of bonds had been issued upon the property in question and were in the hands of third parties all over the Dominion as well as in Great Britain and the United States, would it be right that ten years afterwards the legislature of Nova Scotia should be allowed to say: "We do not care what the rights of third parties may be, we do not care for the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, we do not care for the trust deed under which the bonds of this company were issued. We decide that because this property is situated in Nova Scotia we will wipe out all other rights and treat these bonds as nothing but scraps of paper, that the act which gave title to the company is no good, and we are going to hand the property back to someone who says that he has been prejudiced by an act of fraud, notwithstanding that three courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada, have held that the title of the company is valid."

Mr. MEIGHEN: If all this is so, was it not something for the consideration of the legislature of Nova Scotia?

Mr. MITCHELL: I admit that the legislature of Nova Scotia should have intervened. I may say that I think it should not have passed the act when it did pass. But the fact remains that the legislature took this course ten years subsequent to the title which was created in virtue of the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no.

Mr. MITCHELL: Certainly, the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the title belonged to the company eight years ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1915.

Mr. MITCHELL: In 1915 the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the title was vested in the company in question. Are we to say that ten years after the legislature of Nova Scotia can declare this title to be no good and pass legislation nullifying the act by which the company obtained title to the property?

We have heard a lot this afternoon about civil rights. There is no man in this House who believes more in provincial autonomy than I do, but we have got to remember that when confederation was brought about a right of appeal was given to the Supreme Court in such cases. Therefore in my judgment it is a grave question whether we should allow the

provincial legislature to interfere in this case because by passing such legislation they are going beyond the confines of their own province and affecting rights created in virtue of a judgment of our highest federal court.

In order to explain my point a little further, let us assume that the title of the British Empire Steel Corporation is questioned by someone who happened to be overseas at the time that the title was given. Since the incorporation of the company millions of dollars worth of bonds have been sold in Canada, the United States and Great Britain. Let us assume that the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia is asked to set aside the company's title. While it might be within the jurisdiction of the legislature to pass such an act, surely no hon. member would contend, in view of the obligations created since the incorporation and in view of the rights of third parties all over the country, that the government or the parliament of Canada should not disallow any act of that nature.

I do not intend to argue the question further, but it does seem to me that it is not only a question of the rights of individuals, created at the time this act was passed; we must consider seriously all that has happened between 1914 and 1923. We must consider the rights of all parties who have bought the bonds or debentures of this company, in other words, the rights of third parties—rights which were bought and paid for in cash and have perhaps since been transferred time and again. Are we going to say here to-night that the government was wrong when they disallowed an act of a provincial legislature which declared that a title granted in virtue of a judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada was nothing more than a scrap of paper?

11 p.m.

The House divided on the amendment (Sir Henry Drayton) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Bancroft,
Baxter,
Beaubien,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Black (Yukon),
Boys,
Brethen,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Charters,
Church,
Clark,
Coote.
Davies,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Drummond,
Elliott (Dundas),
Evans,
Findlay,
Forke,
Garland (Bow River),
Garland (Carleton),
Good,
Gould,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hanson,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hubbs,
Irvine,
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kellner,
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
Leader,
LeSueur,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacKelvie,
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McKillop,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Millar.
Preston,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
Senn,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spence,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thurston,
Tolmie,
White,
Woods.
Woodsworth—69.

NAYS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette.
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Cahill,
Cardin,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chevrier.
Cl sholm,
Copp,
Déchène,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desrochers,
Duff,
Elliott (Waterloo),
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Finn,
Fontaine,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Graham,
Hammell,
Hatfield,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Jacobs,
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Leger,
Lovett,
Low,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
McBride,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McMaster,
McMurray,
Marcil Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Mercier,
Mitchell,
Morin,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Reed,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robichaud,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Sinclair (Oxford).
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stork,
Tobin,
Walsh—97.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips)

Messrs.

Logan,
Murphy,
Power,
Bristol,
Porter,
Mewburn.

McKinnon,	McQuarrie,
McCrea,	Stevens,
Malcolm,	Duncan,
German,	Chaplin,
Kay,	Wilson,
Chew,	MacLaren,
Clifford,	Stansell,
Lavigueur,	Sheard,
Healy,	Hocken,
Lapointe,	Ladner.
Laflamme,	Spencer,
Bureau,	Campbell,

Mr. CHAPLIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN: I was paired with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. STANSELL: I was paired with the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Clifford). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SPENCER: I was paired with the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Laflamme). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. POWER: I was paired with the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). Had I voted I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Chew). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

SUPPLY

SECRETARY OF STATE

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Civil government, Secretary of State—salaries, $127,837; contingencies, $29,620.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I find no fault with the government getting into supply and taking up an item so that it will be possible to take supply in the case of the estimates of the Secretary of State on Thursday and Friday, but it is hardly fair to ask the committee to start passing any estimates now.

Mr. DUFF: Go ahead and get the work done. You have talked all day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You did, we did not.

Mr. DUFF: You are the worst offenders.

Mr. FORKE: You will not get any items through if you sit all night.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Mr. COPP: I should like to pass a few items that are uncontested. If my hon. friend objects to that we will not insist.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know of anything that is non-contested or anything special that is contested; there will be a general discussion.

Mr. COPP: I would like to pass the salaries of the deputy heads and a few items of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are all in the one vote. We cannot pass the deputies' salaries and not pass the whole vote.

Mr. COPP: Very well. If my hon. friend insists I will move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 140 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mahlon Beach.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 141 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alfred William Kelly.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 142 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilmot Austin Pickell.—Mr. Martell.

Bill No. 143 (from the Senate), for the relief of Annie May Vogelman. Mr. Duff.

ADJOURNMENT—GOVERNMENT'S TEMPERANCE PROGRAMME

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is in charge of the government's temperance programme, since the retirement of the Solicitor General?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Justice.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Wednesday, May 2, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

EXPRESS BUSINESS AND SALE OF ELECTRIC LINES

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 152, respecting the Canadian National Railways.

He said: The object of section 1 of this bill is to enable the Canadian National Railway

Company to carry on the express business as a department of the railway, taking over the business of the Canadian National Express Company and the Canadian Express Company. Section 2 provides that the Canadian National Railway Company may, if it so decides, sell certain parts of electric lines within the corporation of the municipality of the city of Toronto. Under the wording of the act these lines could be sold to a company. This section amends the act to make it possible to sell to a municipality or to a company.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

MONTREAL AND NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY

Mr. MERCIER:

1. Does the government intend to connect, by a branch line, Montreal with the National Transcontinental railway?
2. If so, at what date do they expect to begin the necessary work?
3. If not, would the government be disposed to grant subsidies to any person or company willing to undertake said work?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

Parliament voted a subsidy in 1908 "for a line of railway from Montreal to a point on the National Transcontinental railway not exceeding 200 miles", and re-voted same in 1910. Any application for subsidy which may now be made would be dealt with on its merits, final decision resting with parliament.

SALE OF PRE-EMPTIONS

Mr. EVANS:

1. Were not the proceeds from the sale of pre-emptions thrown open in 1908 in what is known as the dry area in western Canada to be used for the purpose of constructing the Hudson Bay railway?
2. How much money has been realized from that source to date?
3. Was any other trust fund created for the purpose of constructing the Hudson Bay railway?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. There was no specific authority under the Dominion Lands Act 1908 for the sale of land for the purpose of Hudson Bay Railway construction, but pre-emptions were sold under the provisions of the said act.

2. Sale of pre-emptions $15,649,674.83 to 31 March, 1923.

3. No, so far as the Interior department is aware.

COLLECTIONS—LUXURY TAX

Mr. BIRD:

What is the total amount collected under the excise taxes, commonly called luxury taxes, imposed under section 19BB of the Special War Revenue Act?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Excise taxes collected under section 19 B.B. of the 1920 amendments to The Special War Revenue Act 1915.

Fiscal year, 1921, excise taxes, $31,921,756.51; 1922, $4,053,076.09; 1923, $6,212,775.99.

TAX COMMISSION

Mr. BIRD:

1. What was the gross amount of income reviewed by the Tax Commission for the purposes of the income tax for the year ending March, 1922?
2. What was the amount of income assessed for the purposes of the income tax for the year ending March, 1922?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. No information, as statistics were only compiled from taxable returns.
2. $1,462,529,169.94.

DISMISSAL MISS BARBARA LEE

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. From what date was Miss Barbara Lee dismissed from the service of the Immigration department at St. John, New Brunswick?
2. On whose recommendation was she dismissed?
3. By what officer or officers of the department was such recommendation approved?
4. For what reasons was it approved?
5. Why was she dismissed?
6. What part, if any, had a man named Byrne in the dismissal?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

1. 20th December, 1922.

2. Mr. Jos. Byrne, officer of the Department of Immigration in charge of the catering at St. John, N.B.

3. Mr. W. R. Little, Commissioner of Immigration, Eastern division, and Mr. J. E. Featherston, Supervisor of Personnel.

4. Refusal to perform duties for which engaged.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Answered by No. 2.

U.S. LABOUR DELEGATES DETAINED

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) any further word in regard to Alexander Howat?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are still in communication about the admission of Mr. Howat.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I wish to draw attention to the fact that an unopposed motion for a return was passed by this House on the 18th of last month, giving the names of newspaper companies and printing companies receiving money from the government, and the return has not been brought down.

Mr. MURDOCK: We have that particular information ready, but another order was passed asking for the same information for five years, which we are preparing, and we will bring down within the next day or two the information for the five years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is the information asked for delayed pending the other matter?

Mr. FIELDING: The greater includes the lesser.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House has given the order.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not sure that the first order was completely ready to bring down, before the other question was asked, and we decided that it would be advisable to bring the five years down together.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not an answer at all. The hon. minister stated that it was ready. If it is ready there is no reason for delay. That is an order of the House and the return should be brought down when ready. The minister is simply trifling with the orders of the House.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON PENSIONS

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I believe that last year a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into certain charges laid by the Great War Veterans against the Board of Pension Commissioners. That report has now been submitted to parliament, and printed and distributed to members. What is the intention of the government in regard to putting into effect immediately the conclusions of that Royal Commission?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment): Some legislation will be introduced later in the session to give effect to most of the recommendations in the report to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. CALDWELL: Will an opportunity be given to discuss this report in the House?

Mr. BELAND: I understand that an item for pensions was held over some days ago with the intention of affording members an opportunity to discuss that feature of the report itself. I expect this item will be under consideration within a week.

ITALIAN TREATY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide that a certain convention of commerce dated the fourth day of January, in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, entered into at London by the Plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and by His Majesty the King of Italy be approved, and to give effect to the provisions of the said convention.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister please explain?

Mr. FIELDING: I think that would be more convenient in committee, if my hon. friend is content.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite content. I do not want to delay this at all, if we have a clear understanding that by letting it go into committee, questions of principle will then be open for discussion.

Mr. FIELDING: I have no objection to going into the matter now. As regards the French treaty, for reasons explained, it became necessary to deal with details to a considerable extent, and, therefore, schedules were attached to the bill. In this case we are relieved of the necessity of dealing with schedules because the Italian fiscal policy permits treatment of the question in a general way. Therefore, all we need to do is to adopt the few clauses in order to establish what we call the most favoured nation treatment.

Some years ago, in 1910, we came to an agreement with Italy, not in the form and shape of a treaty. A good understanding was reached, and for years our commercial relations have been very pleasant, although by the words of the agreement they have been rather limited. We agreed at the time to which I refer that certain mentioned products of Canada should be admitted into Italy under most favoured terms and reciprocally that certain mentioned products of Italy should be admitted into Canada similarly on the most favoured terms. The chief products of Canada, perhaps the products that most concern us were included in that list, and I presume that our Italian friends mentioned the things that most concerned them. The trade that has been carried on between Canada

and Italy has been, on the whole, of a most satisfactory nature. I suppose the question of imports and exports has been disturbed somewhat by war conditions. The figures as they stand for a few years are as follows:

Year	Imports	Exports
1914..	$2,090,000	$ 514,000
1918..	771,000	3,336,000
1919..	555,000	13,181,000
1920..	1,745,000	57,758,000
1922..	1,387,000	15,335,000

Evidently 1920 was quite an exceptional year. Thus, as regards comparison, the trade is quite favourable to Canada. The existing arrangement is satisfactory as far as it goes, but it gives us no guarantee as to what may happen with other countries. It will be quite possible, under our present arrangement, for Italy to give more favourable terms to somebody else. Therefore, although no particular case has arisen demanding a treaty and business is satisfactory as far as it goes, we thought it well to guard against any misapprehension of that sort, and so we have agreed as regards, not only the limited list already mentioned in our existing agreement, but the products of Canada and the products of Italy generally, that we shall give and receive the most favoured-nation terms. No details are required. Whatever we grant to any foreign country we must grant to Italy. Whatever Italy grants to any foreign country she must grant to us. That is the whole story of the treaty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think, perhaps, we could make greater headway if, instead of discussing the matter now, we were to reserve whatever observations we have until the House is in committee, as long as it is understood that we can raise questions concerning the principles without being debarred from that point.

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 153, respecting a certain trade convention between His Majesty and the King of Italy.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 153, respecting a certain trade convention between His Majesty and the King of Italy.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My suggestion to my hon. friend now becomes operative. Under my suggestion we would have no discussion on the second reading, reserving our remarks to the committee stage.

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Convention approved:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not a copy of the bill, but I presume this clause is merely putting into effect the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Therefore, under this clause we can properly discuss the whole treaty. I was going to ask my hon. friend whether his view is, as mine is, that the effect of the treaty with France and this treaty with Italy is to extend, for example to Italy, the right of giving more favoured terms to all its border states than it gives to Canada. In the case of Italy, if I am right, that would give Italy the right to prefer in her markets. France, Switzerland, Austria and Jugo-Slavia. I do not think there are any more,

Mr. FIELDING: I would not like to say that. Canada gives to Italy all that the French treaty gives to France. We discussed that in connection with the French treaty My hon. friend's interpretation of that I admit is possible, but I do not think it is of practical importance. Whatever we give to France we certainly give to Italy. That is plain enough.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the hon. member not think the committee ought to know this? The explanation given to us in connection with the French treaty was that while the treaty might well carry that construction, and, indeed, it seems impossible that it could carry any other construction: all that France wanted was to be able to look after reparations and to give more favoured treatment under the reparations clauses. Of course, the obvious answer there was: if that be the fact, if that is all that France wants, why was not the treaty so drawn? The trouble is that we must take the treaty as we have it, and we should understand what we are doing. As drawn, it provides that France can give to her neighbours, Spain, Switzerland and Belgium, more favoured treatment than she may give to Canada. Surely we should know where we are. If my hon. friend is in doubt about it, should not the point be cleared up before we go on? I

thought it was conceded in the discussion of the French treaty that whatever the reasons might have been, whatever the argument of France was, the neighbours of the French republic might be given better treatment than Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: Whatever rates we give France we are certainly bound to give to Italy. There is no dispute about that; that is the meaning of the favoured nation principle.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly. Then when I came to find out what was given to France I thought my hon. friend acknowledged that under the terms of the treaty the bordering states might receive benefits over and above the benefits guaranteed Canada. If I am wrong my hon. friend will set me right.

Mr. FIELDING: I told the hon. member that such was a possible interpretation of the treaty. I think the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) called attention earlier to that phase of the question and I said that the treaty was open to that interpretation but that I was satisfied that this was not what the French government had in mind. And that is what I say now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend admits that the treaty is open to this interpretation, and that being the case, Spain, Switzerland and Belgium, for example, are entitled, if France chooses to give it, to more favoured treatment than Canada may receive under the treaty. Following up just exactly what my hon. friend has stated, that Italy is entitled to everything France has got,—the selfsame covenant—it is obvious that Italy may give to France, Switzerland, Austria or Jugo-Slavia a preference in her markets against Canada. Surely that is the case. But if my hon. friend disputes it I suppose we shall have to debate the question. I think, however, it must be apparent that this follows necessarily from what he says.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not very much concerned about the neighbouring countries coming into conflict with Canada. I have said that whatever we give to France we give to Italy and all the other favoured nations, but I do not seriously look upon Jugo-Slavia as a competitor of Canada. The main object of the treaty with France is to see that we get even terms with the United States. I say now that in this case our chief competitor will probably be the United States and if we get even terms with that country I do not think we need be very much disturbed about all the others.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if my hon. friend realizes the situation; I am sure he does. He says that Jugo-Slavia cannot be looked upon as a competitor with Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: In Europe

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In Europe, yes. I would point out to my hon. friend, though, that the vast amount of the exports of this country to Italy consists of wheat, and I am going to ask the Minister of Finance whether once upon a time central Europe was not a great wheat producer and whether there are not wheat fields to-day on that continent which, if not perhaps actively under cultivation in Jugo-Slavia at least—and my information is that they are—are at any rate potential competitors of the Canadian wheat producers in the Italian wheat market. I should have thought that wheat raised in any quantities in central Europe and sold in the Italian market would be an important competitor against this country.

Mr. FIELDING: Wheat is free in Italy, and all countries are treated alike. I do not think therefore that there is anything to be alarmed about in that regard. All I can say is that if at any time Italy granted preferential treatment to any other country competing with us in wheat it would be good ground for us to give Italy notice to terminate the agreement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is getting back to the chief argument he used in reference to the French treaty, which was that he could get rid of it in six months.

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But he cannot get rid of this treaty in six months; this is for four years, subject, if I remember rightly, to cancellation on a year's notice. So that the argument about being able to get rid of the agreement if it is not satisfactory does not apply here. I want to impress upon my hon. friend that the result of the treaty as negotiated is this, that if Italy chooses to put a duty on our wheat and flour she may do so and at the same time give a preference to Jugo-Slavia. She may give free entry to Jugo-Slavia and hold her tariff as against Canada. If I am wrong will my hon. friend put me right?

Mr. FIELDING: There may be a possibility of such a thing, but I must say that it is so utterly unlikely that I cannot treat it with as much gravity as my hon. friend does.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But we have here a solemn document which is supposed to cover

these things. If we have not reserved to us in connection with our chief export to Italy, namely wheat, that which my hon. friend declared to be the real reason for making the treaty, that is, the assurance that Italy will not give someone else better treatment, what is the use of having the treaty? After all, wheat is our chief export to Italy and if my hon. friend can rely on Italy not to give a preference in respect of this commodity to other countries as against ourselves then there is really no use for the treaty. The effect of the treaty is to enlarge the scope of the most favoured nation compact, as pointed out by my hon. friend; it is a recognition of the principle. But it further complicates the situation to this extent, that so far as Italy is concerned the favoured nation treatment is to apply for four years subject to termination at the end of one year's notice. I do not know whether my hon. friend thinks or does not think that the most-favoured nation arrangement is a good thing for Canada; he has not told us yet his view on that question. But we did the best we could to point out to him in connection with the French treaty just exactly how that most favoured nation provision works as regards Canada on the one side and France on the other. I notice that the matter has been discussed in the other House, and I see that Hon. Senator Beaubien is reported in the Senate Hansard at page 350 as follows:

> In our exchange of commodities with Spain, from 1912 to 1922, both inclusive, ten times out of eleven our imports have surpassed our exports. In the nine months ending December 31, 1922, our imports have exceeded by 200 per cent our exports to that country.
>
> In the same period of 11 years—from 1912 to 1922, both inclusive—we imported from Switzerland over 60 million dollars' worth, exported to that country less than 4½ million dollars. Whenever Switzerland bought $1 worth of goods from us, we purchased $15 worth of merchandise from her. During practically all this time Switzerland was a free-trade country and we could hope for no valuable tariff concessions from her. Lately Switzerland has adopted a policy of moderate protection, and we might perchance obtain from her useful tariff privileges. She imports yearly 250 million dollars' worth of products which we can furnish, amongst them, cereals, prepared foodstuffs, live stock, leather, furs, asbestos, mica, iron and steel sheets and tubes, agricultural implements and machinery, small hardware and tools, stationary and portable engines, varnishes, lumber, wood-pulp, paper, boots and shoes, cotton goods and tobacco.
>
> On the other hand, our clientele, which is of great value to Switzerland could be easily shifted by tariff rearrangements to France. In 1921 we imported from Switzerland a total of $8,671,608, out of which textiles and fibres amounted together to $7,266,353, all of which textiles and fibres could have been purchased in France.

Hon. gentlemen will observe, Mr. Chairman, that the senator takes the position which we took in connection with the French treaty; that the French treaty, as the result of the facts which he points out, could be much better described as a treaty, not with France for the benefit of France, but a treaty with France for the benefit of the most favoured nations. It was in that connection that I particularly pointed out to the hon. minister the position of the silk industry which France was so much interested in, that in connection with a tariff which was supposed to be for the benefit of France, she sent us $1,000,000 worth of silk products, while Japan and Switzerland sent us $8,000,000 worth; and that while there was some assistance given to France, at the same time the effect is to help France's competitors in our own market absolutely to the same extent as we help France. So that France is not helped very much after all.

The hon. gentleman will also recognize this fact in connection with that very item of silk goods—and it comes in here again because the basis is the same—that we have a silk industry in Canada. I am going to point out to my hon. friend what has been done in a country where the manufacture of silk is just as foreign to it as it could be said to be foreign to Canada, where they are not entangled with the most favoured nation treaty clauses in connection with their tariff. The statistics of the United States show that their silk industry—which industry was entirely formed in that country as a result of a protective tariff, and which has resulted in silk to-day being cheaper in the United States. even with a high tariff, than it is in Canada —those statistics show the silk industry to be in this condition: In 1919—I am sorry I have not the later figures; I think they are better—there were 1,369 establishments; their employees numbered 126,782; they had an invested capital of $532,732,163; they paid in wages $108,226,330, and the value of the product was $688,000,000. So there is a country which grows just as much silk as Canada does and no more—that imports every single bit of silk, whose people to-day are enjoying silk at a lower price in their common markets then we enjoy in Canada. Under a protective tariff—and it was a high one—they have worked up this industry, and at the same time besides having cheaper silk they distribute $108,000,000 among their wage-earners and produce manufactured articles to the value of $688,000,000. Is it any wonder that the ministry has to report an exodus from Canada to the United States? I merely point out these facts to my hon. friend.

If any further evidence is required as to the effect of the treaty, having regard to the activities of other most favoured nations, I

have a list of the different countries supplying Canada with goods similar to those received from France for the years 1914, 1920, 1921 and 1922. If my hon. friend desires the information I will read it, or if he likes the figures can be placed on Hansard.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman's remarks have touched some really important questions and some questions that I think are not so important. First, let me again remind him that he may talk of these silks coming in, whether they come in from France or from Italy, Switzerland or Japan, the greater proportion—I will not raise the question of 90 per cent and 10 per cent—but certainly the greater proportion of these silks have got to pay a duty of 27½ per cent, less 10 per cent discount. It is necessary to keep that in mind. The whole tendency of my hon. friend's observations is that we are bringing in these silks for nothing. If these enormous quantities of silk are paying this duty it is a good thing for the revenue. And I think 27½ per cent, less 10 per cent discount, take it all in all, is not lacking in a fair measure of encouragement to the silk industry of Canada. I think it will be held by many in this House that 27½ per cent less 10 per cent, or a net duty of 25 per cent, is a pretty stiff rate and a fair measure of encouragement to our domestic industry. Wiser people than myself will say that any industry which cannot live in Canada under a 25 per cent protection is of questionable value to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: But I want to say this. My hon. friend in referring to the United States tariff on silks says that silk is cheaper in the United States than here. If he has made inquiries and finds that to be the case I will take his word for it, but offhand I think he is mistaken; I do not think that as a rule goods that are paying high duties are cheaper in the United States than here. However, no industry ought to complain if it is allowed 25 per cent protection in Canada. I think the silk industry is not going to suffer under these circumstances. But if my hon. friend thought a high protective system was so valuable, why in heaven's name did he not put it in force when he had a chance? Again and again he talks of this high protection as if it were something very good. We have a moderate system of protection now. Some people do not like to call it protection. But if my hon. friend thinks that cheap silk and general prosperity could be created by raising the tariff, why in heaven's name did he perambulate this country from Dan to Beersheba and end by doing nothing? Why did he say in the Speech from the Throne that he was going to revise the tariff and then not revise it at all? I do not think my hon. friend has so much faith in his own high tariff ideas. If he really believed so much in its merits he would have given us a high tariff long ago. On the contrary he gave us a tariff not very much different from what we have to-day, and yet my hon. friend—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING: What is the fun? We took something off last year, and we are going to take off—possibly we could take off something this year if we wanted to.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING: At all events the point of my remarks is this: My hon. friend is trying to establish that you can bring about prosperity by increasing the tariff; I think I am not misstating his position. Well, I ask him in all seriousness, why did he not do it? He went all over the country; he travelled from ocean to ocean, as I have said; he accumulated a vast amount of information, and the result was that he made up his mind to do nothing. Well, I do not think he ought to complain of what we do under similar conditions.

My hon. friend talks of the favoured nation provision as if it were something created by these treaties. Again I must direct his attention to the fact that there is nothing in this treaty, there was nothing in the French treaty which says a single word about what rates should be given to Switzerland or Japan or any other foreign country. The privilege of importing from Switzerland, from Japan and all those other countries arises from treaties made not by this government, but by governments of long ago, treaties which the hon. gentleman respected and recognized when he was in office. If they were the wrong thing; if favoured nation treatment is wrong, then why did my Conservative friends, in all the years they were in power, allow these treaties to stand? The Swiss treaty to which my hon. friend refers was in force during all the years that he and his associates were in office, and they did not seem to find anything wrong with it. How is it that it is only now discovered to be wrong? I cannot understand that. Again I say that if there is anything arising out of this so-called favoured nation treatment, it has been there for years, and that when my hon. friends had to deal with it they accepted it as something good and stood by it. Only now that they are sitting

on the other side do they suddenly discover a very great evil in it.

The main question is this: Is favoured nation treatment a sound policy or not? Many hon. members will think it is not. For myself I would say that it might not be well to apply it universally. There might be conditions under which the favoured nation treatment would not do you much good. I would not value an agreement with the United States now on the favoured nation principle because the best they can give us under present conditions would not be anything favourable or satisfactory. But where a country has a low or moderate tariff, what more can we ask from them? Take the case of Switzerland; my hon. friend says their tariff is a low one. Well, can we expect them to do more? If they give us all they are giving to the wide world, and if their tariff is low, what more can we ask? We have had that question debated many times, and I suppose it will be debated again. But if you have no favoured nation treatment you must be forever on the watch to gain access to the markets of another country.

Let me illustrate by an incident from my own experience. In the early days of the Liberal government I remember the late Mr Barker, of Hamilton, a very able member of this House, getting up one day and saying that some of the manufacturers from his city had gone to Japan and that on the same vessel that carried them there were some American manufacturers of similar goods. He went on to say with indignation, "You will wonder when I tell you that what actually happened was this: the United States goods were allowed entry into Japan at a low rate while we in Canada had to pay a high rate for the very same article." Well, the fact was that a few years before, a treaty had been entered into between Great Britain and Japan with the privilege that Canada might or might not adhere to it. The Canadian government of that day—I am not sure at the moment who were in power—thought it would not be wise to adhere to the treaty, the consequence was that Canada was not included in the favoured nation arrangement, and when cotton goods from Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, and similar goods from New York arrived in Japan, the United States goods were admitted at a low rate and the Canadian goods were taxed at a high rate. There was an illustration of what resulted from our not having come in under the favoured nation provision. Well, the Canadian government very soon got busy and adhered to the treaty, and from that day to this United States goods and Canadian goods have gone into Japan on the same terms. That shows how some other nations may get ahead of us where there is no favoured nation treaty as applying to our own country.

I am not laying down the doctrine that in all cases we should adopt the favoured nation principle, but in the main, especially in the case of a country which has a low tariff, I think the principle is a good one. No country will give to Canada, or to any other country, exclusive commercial privileges; but the best it gives to any country it may hold itself free to give to any other country. It would be preposterous for us to go to Switzerland and say: You must give us a lower rate than you give a certain other country. No country would do it; we would not do it. We would not give exclusively to any one country any special commercial privilege. We might give what we thought would suit them, but we would retain the right to extend the same privilege to any other country. And I repeat, if a country has a low tariff and is giving us the best it is giving to anybody else, what more can we ask? That, in brief, is the argument for the favoured nation principle. There may be cases in which its application might not be wise if, for instance, we discovered that we were suffering any great injury through the admission of Swiss silks at 27½ per cent less the discount, why, we could get rid of it, I suppose. But it was there all the time my hon. friend was in power; he did not want to get rid of it then, and I am not sure he wants to get rid of it now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is always a great pleasure to hear from my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), even though the subject may be old and threadbare and pretty well washed out. Now, he says, why did we not increase the tariff? I would ask him to turn up any of his own speeches or the speeches of his leader when we were in power and to answer his own question from the arguments then advanced. Why, the whole time that hon. gentlemen opposite were over here they were declaiming to the House that we had no mandate and could not do business of any kind at all.

Mr. FIELDING: Did you believe that?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That was the claim then made. No, we did not believe it. We believed we had the right to try to keep things going on in Canada and to put the country in proper shape after the war. And we were right in our belief; we were successful in our work, because when my

hon. friends attained power they were able to say that no country in the world was in better shape than Canada was. That is what we did.

Mr. JACOBS: In spite of a Tory government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend asked, why did we not do it? Why did not my hon. friend himself do what he said he was going to do—reduce the rates of duty? What was his answer? Why, his answer was that the great American republic was doing something. What did we say? We said that until the policy of that country was absolutely fixed; that until they were really committed to a course of action, Canada would do nothing to give them the slightest excuse for their action in the premises. That is the stand we took, and twelve months later that is the stand my hon. friend takes; yet he turns round now and says, why did we not do it? That is the kind of argument we get when we try to talk business.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the sort of argument, and one or two laughs—that is all. During the last session, although my hon. friends were insistent in their argument that we had no mandate, no right to do anything, the demand was nevertheless repeatedly made that a redistribution bill be brought down. But last session, a year afterward, hon. gentlemen opposite said that it was impossible to bring down a redistribution measure—although one of the claims previously made was that there should be a special session of parliament to deal with that question. Well, two years afterwards we still have not a redistribution measure, although I understand there is a committee somewhere, waiting and hoping and struggling to get something like a settled declaration of government policy. That is how we stand on the question of what we have done. But what difference does it make whether we did the right thing or the wrong thing? The question now is what ought to be done to-day for Canada, regardless of old history, regardless of efforts to draw herrings across the trail. Is my hon. friend content with the exodus from Canada? Is he content with the conditions in his own province to-day—idle factories; 15,000 people moved out of Halifax since he came into office? Does he like that? And if he does not like it, should we not discuss it instead of simply saying nothing is to be done for Canada because I happened to be in office, I think it was two and a half years, and did not do then what is now the right thing to do, not being met with the same necessities for action that this government is met with? The exodus came with this government, the exodus was not with us.

My hon. friend says that if I have made an investigation of the silk price business he is quite ready to take my word. I will tell him frankly that I have not, but I am going to ask my hon. friend to ask the ladies of his own family whether they cannot buy their silks in the United States cheaper than they can in Canada. I need not go any further. Ask them if they cannot get their silk stockings when they are across the line cheaper than they can buy them here. I know that is what my women folk tell me, and they wonder why it is. The answer is not to be found in the tariff, as my hon. friend understands it, it is to be found in connection with the silk industry just exactly as it was shown in the tin plate industry in the United States and practically every other industry in that country. Why, the time was when there was not a single tin plate mill in the United States. The United States imposed a very high duty on tin plate, 75 per cent if my recollection is correct. The price of tin plate went up, and although previously Welsh tin plate had been sold altogether in the United States and not a bit of tin plate had been produced in that country, within a comparatively short space of time the United States was not only producing all her own tin plate but exporting as well to the Mother Country. I do not know how it is to-day, but I know that at the time I made the investigation my hon. friend speaks about, tin plate was selling lower in the United States than it was in the Mother Country. That is what they did with the tariff, and what they did there for tin plate they have done for silks here. Would it not be a good thing if we had that $108,000,000 of wages spent in Canada to-day? Would it not be a good thing if there was just a little movement from the south to the north instead of an uninterrupted stream from the north to the south? I ask my friend seriously to consider the position in which he finds this country getting to-day, and seriously considering it I think he will come to the conclusion, if he does not find himself so tied down by pledges here and pledges there—and I have to congratulate him on the ease with which he can get rid of these things—that we need a little more industry at home and a change in the direction of that stream, turning it from the south to the north.

My hon. friend is probably right in what he says about the favoured nation treaty. It

is an old treaty, and we did not do anything to hurt it. He did a very good thing—I have given him credit for it before and I have to give him credit for it again—when he got rid of the favoured nation treatment
4 p.m. of Germany. He did a good thing for Canada then, but that is a long time ago, and the necessity for action to-day is more insistent that it was in the past. Our condition is more serious; our need for employment at home is greater now. If it was right for the hon. gentleman to do that with respect to Germany, will he not be good enough to look into the question to-day and see if something cannot be done in that connection? As I say, I have all the figures. They are all worked out, but I do not want to take up the time of the committee in reading them. I shall be pleased to send a copy of them to my hon. friend or to hand them to Hansard for the information of the members. My hon. friend will find that these figures substantiate just what I have been saying.

What my hon. friend says is perfectly true about the first start of that most favoured nation clause. It can be got rid of so easily. If my hon. friend will refer again to the speech of Senator Beaubien in the Senate he will find that he can get rid of that clause just as easily to-day as he got rid of it when he was dealing with Germany.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to inquire from the minister what the Italian rate is, whether the tariff generally speaking is ad valorem or specific duties.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is mostly specific duties. It is a moderate tariff on the whole, to the extent that I am acquainted with it. It is not an excessive tariff.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Would the minister consider giving the committee a list similar to the French list of the principal exports, so that we can get a general view? I think it would be a good thing for the trade of the country. I would like to see what the duties are on the different things we have for export.

Mr. FIELDING: In the case of the French treaty there was a long list of items many of which my hon. friend thought were not important, but in order that the committee may know the extent of our exports in the principal articles I am quite willing, before the third reading of the bill, to bring down a list.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to see a list of our exports in the principal articles. Our exports to Italy are very limited, leaving out some of the articles in the French treaty that the minister refers to in the French treaty. I am not interested in those, and I think very few others are, but I would like to see what the Italian list is in the articles of importance to this country.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall be very glad before the third reading to bring down a statement showing what our principal exports to Italy are.

Mr. MacLAREN: May I ask the minister if Italian goods in order to receive the benefits under this treaty, are required to be imported through Canadian ports?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. The French treaty requires that, and in order to get the benefit of the French treaty they would have to accept the same conditions.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am referring to Italy.

Mr. FIELDING: Italy would have to come under the same conditions.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is it so stated in the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: Not expressly so. It is a favoured nation treaty. Whatever the best terms we give to any other foreign nation Italy can claim, and the best terms that were given to France contain the condition the hon. gentleman mentions. They can get the benefits only by accepting the responsibilities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not a fact that it is only to France that the Canadian port clause applies? These duties we are giving to other countries too, and as a consequence any goods that another country sends to us at a certain rate Italy can get at the same rate, and does not have to send them through Canadian ports.

Mr. FIELDING: My impression is that they will be subject to the same restrictions that France is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see the reasoning at all. It is only France that has the Canadian port clause. Any other nation to which we are giving these rates has no Canadian port clause. Italy is entitled not only to as good treatment as France but as good treatment as any other country. Consequently the goods that another country can send in by American ports, Italy can send in too.

Mr. FIELDING: But I do not think any other country could. The privilege was especially given to France, and the other nations who get the benefit of the French treaty must comply with the same terms.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps we will have to await events. I would ask the hon. minister

this: Outside of one or two clauses reserving certain rights to France in respect of border states and the like, is the French treaty itself aything more than a favoured nation treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: No, I do not think it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree with the minister there. He stated in his speech that he would not consider a favoured nation treaty with a higher tariff country any good.

Mr. FIELDING: The United States for example.

Mr. MEIGHEN: France is a far higher tariff country than the United States. Then does it not follow that his French treaty is no good?

Mr. FIELDING: That is a far-fetched statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see it. That is about as short a piece of reasoning as I have ever seen, and I do not see any escape from it. The minister says the French treaty is a favoured nation treaty and nothing more. He says that a favoured nation treaty with a high tariff country is no good. France is the highest tariff country in the world.

Mr. FIELDING: I said a favoured nation treaty with the United States would be no good, because she is a high tariff country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister illustrated it by the United States, and I think he is right, but it follows that his French treaty would be no good. I am sorry that reasoning did not appear to him.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I for one would not be inclined to offer any adverse criticism to this proposal. In my judgment, it is a far superior agreement, so far as Canada is concerned, to the French treaty. Many of the objectionable features of the French treaty are eliminated when we come to the Italian treaty, notably those provisions which appear in respect of the right of France to make such treaties as she may see fit with bordering nations, also the reservation on the part of France in respect of her colonies and protectorates, and also the reservation on the part of France in respect of enemy countries. Those features are all eliminated when we come to the agreement with Italy. This apparently is a most favoured nation agreement, out and out, and as I read it, I am inclined to differ from the opinion expressed by my hon. friend the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) in regard to border states. I would doubt if Italy were entitled to any reservation in respect of border states, although France is undoubtedly entitled to such reservation. I think I would be inclined to take issue with the opinion expressed by the Finance Minister in regard to shipment to Canadian ports. As I read the agreement with Italy, there is nothing to bind Italy in respect to shipments to Canadian ports from Italian ports, but there is in the treaty with France. There is express provision in the treaty with France, in article 11, in regard to natural and manufactured products originating in and coming from France, when imported into Canada. I would doubt very much if that provision in the French treaty has any application to the goods of Italy coming to this country. Therefore, I submit it is at least doubtful whether there is anything in the Italian treaty which would compel shipment of goods to Canadian ports, in order that they might obtain the benefit of the most favoured nation treatment. The Italian agreement is very straightforward and very simple, as compared with the arrangement made with France. Article 1 merely provides for the imports of the two countries at the lowest rates of tariff granted to any foreign country. Article 2 applies to the exports of both countries at lowest rates granted to any foreign country. Article 4 provides that each country shall receive the most favoured nation treatment. Article 5 expressly provides that the convention shall apply to the colonies and possessions of Italy, and then provides for the termination of the treaty. If the principle of making agreements with other countries in the world, upon what we know as the basis of most favoured nation treatment, be a good one, then I think, in respect of Italy, we probably have a model convention, and I do not anticipate that any particular ills will flow from it. I would be inclined to think that, in respect of the trade of Italy there might possibly be some advantage to this country, as well as to Italy, and I would doubt very much if the provision in the French treaty in respect of border states would apply at all in regard to the treaty now made with Italy. Certainly, it would not apply in regard to the case of Jugo-Slavia, which was cited by my hon. friend, because that is not one of the border states of Italy. The border states of France would be Spain, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium.

Mr. FIELDING: And Germany.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And Germany. There is in respect of these countries a special reservation in the French treaty which is omitted

in the Italian treaty. I do not think Italy could take advantage of that reservation, but I may be wrong in that respect. However, I think that in the question asked by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. MacLaren) there is a suggestion which we should clear up before the matter is finally settled. I am inclined to think there is nothing in the present arrangement with Italy to compel shipment to a Canadian port at all. A shipment may be made from an Italian port to an American port, and the provisions of the treaty still apply to the imports of this country in the matter of duties, whereas in the French treaty it expressely provides for the shipment of goods from France to Canada. That cannot apply to Italian goods, because they would necessarily be shipped from Italy to Canada. If goods originating in Italy were shipped from France to Canada, they might be entitled to the same treatment as French goods under that treaty. But I doubt very much if any would come that way. It would requre a special provision with respect to goods shipped from an Italian port to a Canadian port—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister state whether there are any of our actual exports to France that secure at the hands of Italy favoured nationed treatment under this agreement that did not secure it before?

Mr. FIELDING: I think not. I think they already had our principal exports under the agreement made some years ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there any real permanency to this agreement that did not attach to the other? What were the terms for cancellation in the other treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: It was not a treaty in fact at all before. It had not the form of a treaty, but it was an understanding come to here in Ottawa with the Italian consul. My recollection is that it required four months' notice, but substantially it covered our main exports. As I said a while ago, there is not much extension of business in this treaty, but it is a benefit to have it in a permanent form. That is all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It really is a matter of form. I have not been able to find what form the last agreement took. Was it not ratified by parliament?

Mr. FIELDING: No. I think it was done by order in council, and did not require ratification by parliament. It was not done by form of treaty. The Tariff Act authorized the Governor in Council to extend the benefit of the intermediate tariff, and my recollection is that it was done under that provision.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was done under statute.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It really was a statutory enactment.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only difference was that it had a four months' notice of cancellation, whereas this has one year. The rest is a difference of form.

Mr. FIELDING: This is more comprehensive. It includes all things.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The other included all that we sold.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps it did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose this would apply to the list of mysterious drugs that appear in the French treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: It would include them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why was the term four years fixed as the length of the treaty? Four is an unusual number; the usual term is five or ten years.

Mr. FIELDING: The idea was that the term should not be made too long. We thought it well to withhold the right of parliament to revise its judgment upon the matter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It had no connection with other expiring treaties?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This term was fixed just arbitrarily at four years?

Mr. FIELDING: I think the Italians talked of a longer period, and we thought it wise not to make a longer period.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I notice the name of Lord Curzon of Kedleston in connection with this treaty. If we are to judge from the pronouncements of the government and the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), this government would consider it a great indignity that a British plenipotentiary should sign, along with Canadian plenipotentiaries, a treaty in which Canada alone is affected and interested. Why did the minister submit to it in this case?

Mr. FIELDING: Whatever others may have said, it appeared to me that the name of the distinguished Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Curzon of Kedles-

ton, rather added to the weight of this document, and I was glad to have it there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thoroughly agree with the minister and I congratulate him. I am sorry that his counsel as well as his sentiments did not prevail later.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 43, to amend the Canada Temperance Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Importation of intoxicating liquor prohibited.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would the minister explain the necessity for this legislation?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The purpose of this legislation is to limit the importation of intoxicating liquor into provinces like British Columbia and Quebec, where the sale of intoxicating liquor is under the control of the provincial government. The scheme of the bill is that whenever the federal government is in receipt of an order in council of a province where the sale of intoxicating liquor is controlled by the provincial government or by a commission of the provincial government, such order in council asking that the prohibition decreed by these sections shall be put into force by a proclamation of the Governor in Council, the Governor in Council may declare these prohibitions in force in that province. If hon. members will look at the bill, they will find that a general prohibition of importation of intoxicating liquor is provided. Exceptions are made for the government, for the manufacturer, for the blending of their products, and for the exporters. These are three exceptions. Exception is also made for the carrying of such liquor in the province and outside. This, I might say, was asked for by the government of British Columbia. In the other provinces, as hon. members know, where they have prohibition, no importation is possible. Last year the then Solicitor General, the Hon. D. D. McKenzie, introduced a bill providing for prohibition of exportation and prohibition of importation of intoxicating liquor. The measure passed this House; it went to the Senate where it was amended. The prohibition of exportation was accepted by the Senate, but the prohibition of importation was rejected. It is for that reason that we come this year with this amendment, which is about the same as that introduced last year.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. CLARK: Under section 163, subsection (2), paragraph (c), as it appears in the printed bill, is it not a fact that power is retained by British Columbia and Quebec to continue the existing bonded warehouses?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Under paragraph (d), as amended, warehouses would be allowed. Paragraph (c) covers the manufacturers. I will ask to have this amended by the addition of the word "brewers". I was told that there might be some doubt as to that.

Mr. CLARK: It was paragraph (d) I meant.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Paragraph (d) is in regard to exporters, and we made this exception at the request of the British Columbia government.

Mr. CLARK: That is the exceptions may be continued by order in council of the government of British Columbia?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is to say, with the proviso that is to be found at the end of the amendments, that whenever such order in council of the provincial government is passed and sent to the federal government, in such order in council the provincial government may say: "We wish to have prohibition of importation for everybody in the province, except manufacturers, brewers and exporters", or the order in council may limit the exception to manufacturers and brewers and refuse the exception to the exporters.

Mr. CLARK: If they pass an order in council providing for the continuance of bonded warehouses, I suppose they may go ahead and give assent to the establishment of new bonded warehouses?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: It is a fact that to-day the Department of Customs and Excise requires the unqualified request and consent of the attorneys general of such provinces before they will grant licenses to such bonded warehouses. Is that correct?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: And it is also a fact that the attorney general of at least the province of British Columbia has requested the granting of such licenses in recent years as well as in the present year.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That I do not know. There is nothing in my department that I know of to show that.

Mr. CLARK: In the provinces which now have total prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors, before the importation into such

provinces of such liquors can be prohibited it is necessary to submit to the people a plebiscite for their judgment. Is that correct?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: And in the case of Quebec and British Columbia it is proposed to legislate without submitting such a plebiscite to the people—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Exactly.

Mr. CLARK: —and altogether prohibit the importation either privately or by means of bonded warehouses.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes. According to the statute passed in 1919, after a referendum to the people has been voted upon the importation of liquors is prohibited by legislation. In the province of Quebec the sale of liquors is under the control of the government as also is the case in British Columbia. There is no prohibition of importation provided for, and unless we legislate, as we propose to do, there is nothing to prevent importation in these particular provinces, except possibly the provincial law which is in existence in the case of Quebec. The province of British Columbia is not satisfied with such a law and now asks that we legislate to prohibit importation. By this legislation we simply add to the regulations controlling the sale of liquor the prohibition of importation. Last year we legislated to provide that there should be no exportation of liquors from those provinces in which the prohibition of such exportation has been voted upon. We say nothing of prohibiting exportation in this bill; we are providing only for the prohibition of importation. I understand that it is the wish of the province of British Columbia that such an amendment be adopted. It was adopted last year in the House without much objection and we hope it will pass this year not only in this House but in the Senate as well.

Mr. CLARK: Is the object in the case of British Columbia, in short, to control bootlegging?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is the purpose, I understand.

Mr. CLARK: I have a few remarks to offer on this subject and I may as well say now what I have to say. I desire just as much as any other citizen of British Columbia to see the bootlegging traffic controlled. It is a curse in that province as it is in many other provinces in the Dominion to-day, and anything that will assist to curb it I am only too anxious to do my best to support. But this legislation is in my opinion bad, and if it can be put in such a form as to be effective I would concur in it. At present in British Columbia private individuals are permitted by law to import liquor into the province, but the provincial government imposes a tax which makes it practically prohibitive for anybody to import liquor to-day. For instance, if I wish to import any liquor into British Columbia I must pay, in addition to the price charged by the vendor in the Old Country, the tax levied by the government, and that would bring the price up to what I would pay the liquor vendor of British Columbia. So that there is no advantage for a private individual to import liquor, and I may say that private persons are not importing, unless it be wealthy people who can afford to do so. So far as the prohibition of private importation is concerned, therefore, there is in my opinion no necessity for the bill, because there is no such importation to-day. Liquor can be imported privately but it is not practicable.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Except on the part of wealthy people.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, and they would import in such small quantities that I do not think it would be desirable in any case to pass a law to prohibit that importation. Everyone has the right to buy liquor to-day; he can go to the vendor and get it, and if he has to pay the vendor the same price as he would pay for the imported article, and the government gets the profit in any case, it makes no difference whether anyone buys from the vendor or from the Old Country—the province gets the same profit either way.

Mr. JACOBS: Except that people might want special brands.

Mr. CLARK: If they want special brands they can import them and pay the tax which goes to the province. So far as the private individual is concerned I can see no necessity whatever for legislation. There has been litigation in regard to the tax imposed by the province. It was held by the Supreme Court of British Columbia that the tax was legal, and that decision was confirmed by the Court of Appeal of the province. The appeal was taken no further, so that the province is within its rights in imposing the tax; it may collect it, and as a matter of fact is doing so to-day. That is the position with regard to private persons. The other phase of the question relates to bonded warehouses. We have in British Columbia to-day twenty-five customs warehouses for storage of intoxicating liquors in bond. All the licenses for such warehouses were issued since 1920. I think I

am correct in saying, all; if not all, practically the whole lot have been issued since that time, there may be one or two exceptions, but I feel almost sure that they have all been issued since 1920, that is to say, since the present law came into effect. In other words, the warehouse business has grown up since the coming into force of that law, and it is very interesting to know that many of these customs warehouses are located in places like Fernie, Cranbrook and Grand Forks, down in the interior of the province, two or three hundred miles from the sea coast. If the purpose is export, why keep them in that part of the country? Surely the intention is obvious. If any man intends to export liquor in a bona fide way he will certainly have his bonded warehouse on the coast; he will not handle the liquor four or five times.

The effect of this bill is to enable the province of British Columbia and the province of Quebec to continue these bonded warehouses by passing an order in council providing that clause (d) of subsection 2 shall be enforced, which simply means that these provinces by order in council can make whatever law they choose. That is not sound legislation. That is enabling the province of British Columbia, for instance, to make laws by order in council. I should be perfectly satisfied if the minister would revise this bill so that we will know what we are going to get—either that prohibition is to be complete, or that we are to submit the question to the people, as is done in all the other provinces which have this prohibitory law. Let the people decide by plebiscite whether they want liquor to be imported privately or not. That question has been voted on in those provinces which have prohibitory laws, but it has not been voted on in British Columbia. In those provinces which have prohibitory laws the Canada Temperance Act provides that before private importation of liquor can be prohibited the question must be submitted to a plebiscite vote of the people. A fortiori, I would submit that provinces which have authorized the selling of liquor should be entitled to such a plebiscite. I cannot see why there should be any objection to inserting in this bill a provision similar to that given to the other provinces, namely, that the question should be submitted to the people; otherwise make this measure specific, make it mean something. As it stands the Lieutenant Governor in Council in British Columbia or Quebec can make whatever law they choose. That is what we object to.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We cannot order a plebiscite, Mr. Chairman, it has to be asked for by the legislature. My hon. friend objects to this clause providing for the prohibition of importation by private individuals and says that as a matter of fact there is no such importation except by a few people. But if so why not accept the request which comes to us from the government of the province of British Columbia by whom we are told there is a great abuse of private importation? The hon. member says this importation is only done by wealthy people. Well, I am not so sure that he is correctly informed on the point, because the Attorney General writes us that there is a great abuse of private importation.

The second objection is that by the exceptions we make, especially by exception (d) of subsection 2, we maintain the warehouses. This exception does not mean that the government will license such warehouses; it is inserted because in British Columbia the people have not pronounced on the question of prohibition, and consequently the authorities of the province do not want to raise too much objection to their legislation. The exception in favour of manufacturers and brewers does not mean that warehouses will be licensed; the provincial authorities may license them or they may refuse. My hon. friend asks: Why leave it to the provincial authorities to decide by themselves alone what the law shall be, with liberty to change it whenever they like by order in council? Well, Mr. Chairman, the province of British Columbia as well as the province of Quebec think the best system for the sale of intoxicating liquor is to take control of it themselves directly or through a commission. The system, I understand, is favourably looked upon by the people of the two provinces. They now wish to make that system more complete, if possible, and they tell us that to repress the abuses of importation and bootlegging generally it will be for the good of the people of those provinces that we should legislate prohibiting the importation of liquor by private individuals or by corporations, and only permit it by manufacturers, brewers and exporters. If the hon. members for British Columbia are of opinion that the principle itself is right, that is to say, that importation should be prohibited, with the exception in favour of the manufacturers, brewers and exporters, I may say that we have no objection to discuss the point raised in regard to subsection (d). But as to the main principle, that is, the prohibition of importation, I think it is the wish of all the people of British Columbia to have such prohibition accepted, while desiring to maintain their system regulating the sale of intoxicating liquor.

Mr. STEVENS: I want to make my position clear on this question. Last year similar legislation was introduced. I supported it, for one reason only, which was this. The Attorney General of British Columbia claimed that he was unable to efficiently administer the liquor laws of his province because this parliament was preventing him from controlling importation by export houses as set forth in these amendments. He sheltered himself behind that excuse. I may say that last year I had very little sympathy with the measure as a measure, but rather than allow the Attorney General to succeed with the excuse he was making I supported the measure, I may say it did not result in any attitude of appreciation on his part, because he declared publicly on several occasions that I was the cause of the defeat of his measure in the Senate. As a matter of fact I think the Minister of Justice will recall, as the Prime Minister would if he were in his seat that on the last day of the session I was a medium for bringing about a conference between the members of the Senate and the members of the House to see if some common ground could not be reached; but unfortunately it could not. I wish, however, to say a few words on the merits of this bill and to state certain facts that I think the committee should be aware of.

I again say that my hands are more or less tied by the contention of the attorney general that he needs this legislation in order properly to administer the law. Frankly I do not think he is sincere in that contention. We meet at this moment in the shadow of the closing scene in that tragedy of the Crowsnest pass, where to-day two human lives went out in connection with the murder of the policeman Lawson. I have nothing whatever to say regarding the guilt of these two wretches who have paid the final penalty; in fact, I think they simply met the just deserts of their evil lives and of the crime that they committed. About that there can be no question whatever. But let the committee get a few facts squarely before it. The export business of British Columbia was largely concentrated on the Pacific coast, the only place from which that business can be properly carried on. Where can we export legally and in honour from British Columbia except overseas, to Mexico, China, or other foreign countries? There is a strong prohibitory law in our neighboring country to the south; there is a prohibitory law in Alberta, so that our export business, as I say, was largely concentrated on the Pacific coast. Certain houses, however, asked for and received from the Attorney General of British Columbia and the government permission to transfer their business to the Crowsnest pass, five or six hundred miles from the point of export, and there they established export houses. Everybody in British Columbia knew that the export business carried on from these houses was a bootlegging business, deliberately violating the laws of the United States and deliberately contravening the laws of Alberta. And those wretches to whom I have referred, who were hanged this morning, committed their heinous crime in the carrying out of that business in the Crowsnest pass, based upon the consent of the Attorney General to establish the business in that section. Let me put it in another way—and I told the Attorney General this from the public platform on three different occasions last winter. I want the committee to understand these points, because they very materially affect this bill. When export is contemplated a permit is granted by the Attorney General's officers, and the only legal export is out of the province by water, we will say to Mexico, which is usually the destination. A large fleet is maintained on the Pacific coast for the purposes of this so-called export business, which is not export at all. I wish the Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau) were in his seat, because I have a few words to say to him on this subject. They do not export to Mexico at all; they ship to Seattle, Portland and San Francisco, and in the case of these houses which were moved six hundred miles from the sea coast, the export is directly across the line southward or into Alberta. The traffic is known to be in contravention of the law, and yet not in one single case has the Attorney General of British Columbia during the past year seriously attempted to stop it. How could he stop it? In two ways. Upon the application being made to this government for warehouse license he could have refused his consent to the application, but he has never done that except perhaps in a few cases where his prejudice may have been aroused. In every case where an export license was granted the Attorney General had to give his consent before this government issued the license—and I am speaking of the government as it has been during the last several years. So that the Attorney General had that control in his hands and has it to-day, but he has never exercised it. What other control did he have? Upon the issuance of a permit for the movement of this liquor from the export warehouses, supposedly to Mexico, it would be a very simple matter for him to have one of his numerous inspectors see that the goods were actually

exported, but as a matter of fact no serious effort has ever been made in that direction. So that we have had this crime to which I have referred and numerous others, some of them resulting fatally. Now, let me read what the legislature of British Columbia asked. They requested this House—I quote:

—to enact legislation providing for the prohibition of the importation of intoxicating liquor into British Columbia for use therein except by the provincial government, such legislation to be for the purpose of supplementing and giving effect to the aforementioned Government Liquor Act, and to be contingent upon and to exist only during its continuance.

Now, what does this bill call for?—and this is what I want to bring to the attention of the committee as an evidence of the insincerity of the Attorney General in this matter. The bill provides for what the resolution of the provincial legislature calls for, with certain exceptions. The first exception is subclause (a), government sale; the second (b), deals with transport in bond; I shall not debate these. The next exception is in subclauses (c) and (d). In the former provision is made for exceptions in the case of manufacturers and distillers—to that I make no objection, and subclause (d) extends the exception to export houses. But if this House determines that an exception should be extended to the distillers for blending purposes to bona fide exporters, then let us say so in the act. What does the act say? The act merely provides for it, but this further condition is added:

Provided, hovewer, that the exceptions contained in paragraph (c)—

Namely, for blending purposes.

—and in paragraph (d)—

Namely, for export purposes.

—or either of them, shall not be applicable to any province in which this section is declared to be in force, unless in the order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council mentioned in subsection 5.

And so on. In other words, this parliament is asked to make these exceptions, but to make them subject to the whim of the provincial governments. What does that mean? I know what it means in regard to British Columbia, and I am going to state it; I am not referring to Quebec, because I have no knowledge of the administration of the law there. Having in mind that for the last year and nine months during the term of the present act in British Columbia and its administration no effort has been made to control these export houses, it simply means that so far as distilleries and export houses are concerned the Attorney General wishes to hold control over them for the purposes of political expediency and for no other reason.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. JACOBS: Why does my hon. friend make that assertion?

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend wants me to bring some evidence, I will do so, as other hon. members can. I assert again that it is for political expediency that the Attorney General is asking for that power. If the Attorney General is sincere, why does he ask for the proviso at all?

Mr. JACOBS: This does not apply to British Columbia alone. It also applies to Quebec.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not talking about Quebec. I am discussing something of which I have some understanding. I have no personal knowledge of the conditions in Quebec.

Mr. NEILL: Will the hon. member tell me where he finds subsection (d)? It does not appear here in the bill.

Mr. STEVENS: It is in the amendment of which the minister gave notice, which will be found at page 2284 of Hansard.

Another point I wish to make is this. This legislation was first asked for two years ago, in 1921. I have under my hand the opinion of the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Doherty, who declared that in his opinion the law as it stood was sufficient and that there was no need of this legislation. I have also the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, which reads as follows:

OTTAWA, March 24, 1921.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of 21st instant enclosing copy of a minute of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of British Columbia, which sets forth a resolution of the Legislative Assembly of 9th instant, whereby it was resolved that the Federal parliament should be requested to enact legislation to prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquor into British Columbia for use therein, except by the provincial government, and I think it would be advisable in reply to direct the attention of the Lieutenant Governor to the existing Dominion legislation which is embodied in chapter 19 of 1916, as amended by chapter 30 of 1917, and chapter 21 of the second session of 1919. These statutes, so far as I can perceive, contain provisions substantially in accord with those which the Legislative Assembly considers desirable. It will be observed that by the first section the importation of intoxicating liquor into the province with the knowledge or intention that it will thereafter be dealt with in violation of the law of the province is prohibited and made an offence punishable by fine or imprisonment. The extent of the prohibition which is thus enacted is therefore dependent upon the legislation of the province in which it is to be applied, and in so far as British Columbia has legislated to make the possession of intoxicating liquor in the province unlawful the importation is already prohibited by force of these Dominion provisions.

Your obedient servant,

E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

The Under-Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

The opinion of Mr. Doherty is similar to that of Mr. Newcombe. The Minister of Justice—I know that he has been given a great deal of concern in regard to this legislation, it is of rather extreme type—mentioned a moment ago that there was a general demand for this legislation. There has been no general demand for it except from the attorney general's department of the provincial government. I have in my hand a letter from the British Columbia Prohibition Association, dated February 1 of this year, and I want to read it for the purpose of showing the attitude of mind of a large section of the public in regard to this legislation and in justification of my position to-day. He goes on to say:

At the approaching session—

That is, this session.

—of the Dominion parliament there will come up again the application of the government of British Columbia for an act to prohibit the importation of liquor except through the Liquor Control Board, into British Columbia.

This act was introduced under government auspices last year, and in the House of Commons encountered no serious opposition, being represented as calculated to improve moral conditions, and as being in line with provisions already incorporated in the Canada Temperance Act.

It would have had a similar safe passage through the Senate except for the intervention of the veteran prohibitionist of parliament, Sir George Foster, who called attention to the character of the British Columbia Liquor law and showed that it was not a measure for the suppression of the drink evil, but only one for the transfer of the whiskey trade with its profits and its possibilities of political advantage, to the government.

It is to be hoped that the bill will not get through parliament this time, without some one, preferably one of the members of the House of Commons for British Columbia, raising the question as to whether it is desirable that the Dominion parliament should lend endorsation or recognition or reinforcement in any shape or form to the policy of liquor selling by the governments.

Already the debauching influence of the profits reported by Quebec and British Columbia has done something to undermine the moral defences of the other provinces.

And so forth. It is true that the Prohibition Association are not now taking any formal stand in this matter. This letter was received a month or so ago, but all through this controversy, such as it is, the inference on the Attorney General's part is that he requires this legislation in order to enforce the law, when those of us who have studied the enforcement of the law in British Columbia know perfectly well that he has not attempted to exhaust the powers that he now possesses, that he has not in any sense exhausted the rights he possesses regarding export liquor warehouses, for instance, or to properly enforce the law. I do not wish to go into further detail as to his enforcement of the law than I have done up to the present.

Let me turn to the bill again for a moment in connection with these two clauses (c) and (d) to which I have already referred. I object to this legislation as it is drawn because it transfers power to the Attorney General of British Columbia to decide whether or not these exemptions shall be applicable. I contend that this parliament, being the parliament entrusted with the power of determining that, should absolutely determine it, and not determine it with a proviso of that kind. If we decide that this should pass, let us pass it, and let these exemptions be part of the bill and not subject them to the whim of the Attorney General. For instance, suppose the provincial government should decide to harrass the distillers. They can go to the distillers and say: Now unless you do thus and so to suit us we will pass an order in council asking the Dominion government to put you all out of business. And the minute that order in council was passed, without any review or discussion by the legislature or the public the proclamation is effective. Or they might go to the exporter in the same way. Now, if the exporting and the other business is bad, it should not be in here. If on the other hand, it should be allowed—and we say by this act that it should—then let us make it the law absolutely by this statute.

5 p.m.

Those are the main points I desire to make in connection with this bill. The legislation as regards these last two sections is more or less frivolous. It is not the type of legislation this parliament should pass. I do not think we should hand over absolute rights and powers in a matter of this kind to the province unless we do it in a constitutional manner by an amendment to the British North America Act, and forego any rights that we might have in that regard. Furthermore, I again assert that the contention of the Attorney General that there is need of this legislation is not based upon any established facts. It is an effort on his part to get further control of the liquor business. Let me give an illustration of the point. Under his present powers as the supreme purchaser, through the liquor board, of liquor sold in the liquor stores in British Columbia, what does he do? What has he done, as the records of the last session of the legislature will show? He has picked out certain firms from which he buys his liquor. These are firms that are suitable to the agents of the government, and many other brands of liquor, some of them the very finest I am told, not knowing by experience, are not sold at all, or very little

if at all. Now, under this law we are giving him still further power to restrict firms and prevent, say, Johnny Walker, Black and White, Haig and Haig and other brands, from being sold if the Attorney General decides that it is not in the political interest of hon. gentlemen opposite to allow it.

Furthermore, in support of what I am saying, I will give a practical illustration to my hon. friend who interjected a remark a moment ago. The liquor board in Vancouver imported $400,000 worth of these recognized brands into their warehouse, and still went out and bought cheap unknown brands and sold them in their liquor stores, and actually advertised and pushed the sale of them. Let me say something to my hon. friend who is interested in the matter—

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Is it not a fact that the purchases of liquor made by the British Columbia government are made through the purchasing commission of that government?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, and there has never been a more hideous orgy of corruption in connection with any purchasing agency in Canada than in the case of this agency in British Columbia.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the hon. member going to introduce British Columbia politics into this question?

Mr. STEVENS: If the hon. member wants to attach politics to what I have said he can do so. I am stating facts.

Mr. JACOBS: We are not interested in the politics of British Columbia.

Mr. STEVENS: I am making statements in answer to what has been said by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), and I know these statements to be correct.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The statements that were made were investigated by the public accounts committee of the British Columbia legislature last session, and if the hon. member will take the report of that committee he will not speak as he has spoken this afternoon.

Mr. STEVENS: I know the report of that committee and I know how it was arrived at. I am not anxious to introduce it here, but I think hon. members have it under their hand, and, perhaps, would like to do so. I do not intend to introduce it. When I was interrupted I was going to say something, but it has escaped my mind and perhaps it is just as well for my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and his friends in British Columbia that I have forgotten it. While I am desirous of removing from the Attorney General any excuse for the maladministration of the liquor laws of British Columbia—which excuse he is now making, and charging this parliament with responsibility—at the same time I do not for one moment lend my endorsation to this legislation in itself and on its own merit. I do not think it is necessary. I think they have the powers to-day, and, furthermore, I do not think that either the province of Quebec or the province of British Columbia should be in any different position from the other provinces: that is that such powers should be exercised by a plebiscite of the people, and not by the whim of the Attorney General or of the Lieutenant Governor in council who would be advised by the Attorney General. That is my chief objection, but rather than allow my friend the Attorney General to continue this excuse, which perhaps many people accept, in ignorance of the fact, as being sound, I am not going to personally force my opposition to the bill to the extent of voting against it.

Mr. WOODS: I am not sure that I know very much about the conditions in British Columbia or in Quebec, any further than that there is control by the government which I believe to be the case. I do not know what bearing this bill may have on the province of Ontario, but to my mind any bill that will prohibit importation of intoxicating liquors into a province will certainly be a benefit to the province of Ontario. In Ontario we have the Ontario Temperance Act, and I believe they are trying honestly to enforce that act, yet in spite of that fact they have a great many complaints of breaches of the law, bootlegging, and liquor going through the province into the country to the south of us. If the bill that is before this House to-day has any effect whatever in cutting off the importation of liquor, and in any way confining it to the transportation entirely from the province of Ontario to some other place, I think it will be a benefit. The only regret I have in connection with temperance legislation is that the government is not going far enough along those lines. I believe the temperance forces of the province of Ontario would gladly hail any law that would not only prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquor, but also the manufacture for beverage purposes in a province where they have prohibitory law. I believe that is one of the things that the temperance forces of the province of Ontario are aiming at, and I do not think they will rest satisfied until that is accomplished. They

have been on the warpath for temperance legislation for a great number of years, since the Canada Temperance Act, or what we remember as the old Scott Act, was in force and from that time up to the present the temperance forces of the province of Ontario have been fighting earnestly and faithfully for the prohibition of the liquor traffic for beverage purposes. That has been accomplished to a great extent, though not to the extent we possibly would like to see, on account of the little breaches of the law, and we did not accomplish our purpose until the terrible war, which brought the temperance forces more unitedly together, and resulted in the introduction of the Ontario Temperance Act. As I understand this bill before the House, it is a measure that will prove beneficial along temperance lines. It is going to help the province of Ontario, I believe, as well as other provinces, in curtailing the consumption of alcoholic liquor.

Mr. PARENT: Would the hon. member include the prohibition of the manufacture of native wine in Ontario?

Mr. WOODS: As far as I am personally concerned, I would. I cannot speak for Ontario, nor for the masses of the people, but from my own standpoint I would go to that extent. I have a few figures here that have been compiled by the Sons of Temperance in connection with the convictions for drunkenness in the province of Ontario under prohibition and before prohibition. The convictions for drunkenness were as follows:

	1914	1921
Toronto	14,247	4,727
Ottawa	991	411
Kingston	482	168
Port Arthur	1,376	541
Hamilton	1,425	383
Fort William	716	359

Therefore hon. members will see that under the Ontario Temperance Act the number of convictions for drinking has been cut down to a great extent in Ontario, and that would certainly show that there was a decrease in the consumption of liquor. I want to conclude by saying that I am in favour of the measure before the House, because I believe it is in the interest of temperance generally.

Mr. TOLMIE: As regards the bill now before the committee, certain power for the selling of liquor was given to the British Columbia government after a plebiscite had been taken. I rather agree with what has been said already by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) that before any such drastic legislation as this should pass, another plebiscite should be taken, so as to afford the people of British Columbia an opportunity to say whether or not they are willing to extend further privileges to the government of that province in that connection. When this power to control the liquor business was given to the British Columbia government, it was hoped that good administration would follow. But we find, as a result of an investigation made by the public accounts committee during the last session of the legislature, that this has not been entirely satisfactory. In purchasing the liquor, we find that much bigger prices have been paid for liquor than the same goods or goods of the same quality could have been purchased at nearer home. It has been peculiar too that many of these men who have done the buying have been friends of the provincial government. That may be just a coincidence, but hon. members can judge for themselves. We often found them handling a cheap quality of goods and building up these goods by the addition of "prune juice" and other adulterants of that nature, and then selling this liquor for a price that should have purchased a liquor of good quality. We find that, in other liquors, they have used water to break down the liquor and make a cheaper product. This is in contravention of the pure food laws of this country. There has been established a factory for the manufacture of port wine at False Creek, Vancouver. Anybody who has ever been there will recognize the fact that it does not look like a vineyard down there, and certainly it does not smell like one. This port wine is being purchased by the provincial government at $10 a case, when first-class Spanish and Portuguese port can be secured at $7.80 a case.

I have had some communications from prohibitionists in British Columbia objecting to further powers being extended to the provincial government. We are paying very high prices for this liquor in British Columbia, and we have no guarantee that if this legislation is passed, the government will not take advantage of it and we shall suffer from further abuses and also a further monopoly in this connection. I feel that after the way in which the act has been administered in British Columbia, for us to support this move at the present time and give them further power, would be an endorsation of what they have done in the past. I can assure the committee that when the people voted on that plebiscite in British Columbia, they expected that the government would give good administration and handle the liquor question in a proper and businesslike manner. They certainly did not vote for the "prune juice" administration we are getting at the present time.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am in a position similar to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), in that, although last session I did not take any part in endeavouring to secure the passage of this legislation, I did not take any objection to it. I remained silent as it were, and I did so for the same reason which induced the hon member for Vancouver Centre to support the legislation, namely I wanted to see the attorney general of the province given the opportunity, which he was asking for, to enforce the law. The attorney general was a new man, having lately been appointed, and having made certain statements to the effect that he was going to see that the liquor law was administered to the very letter; that no influence could be brought to bear upon him which would induce him to relax the enforcement of that law, and that he for one was going to be able to step out of the position of Attorney General of British Columbia without anyone saying that he had in any respect neglected to enforce the liquor law of that province to the fullest extent. I was also informed—I think the statement was made publicly—that the Attorney General of British Columbia proposed so to reduce the price of liquor that there would be no chance for a bootlegger to make any money, and consequently that he would in that way put out of business this illicit trade.

Without desiring in any way to reflect upon the Attorney General of British Columbia, I must say that the general consensus of opinion, irrespective of party politics to a large extent, is that the administration of the liquor law in British Columbia has not been satisfactory, and also that prosecutions for breaches of that law have not been impartial. I take very violent exception to editorials such as one which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of April 20, of this year. I am going to take the time of this committee to read this editorial, because I think it is a matter which this committee should take some notice of. The editorial reads:

> Federal prohibition agents in Los Angeles recently arrested a group of illicit liquor traders including one from Canada who gave the name of Joe Morris. According to the Vancouver Sun, this person was later identified as Jack Miller, secretary of the Independent Exporters Limited, a wholesale liquor firm of Vancouver, British Columbia. The shareholders of the Independent Exporters Limited are recorded as Albert Loftus McLennan, Maurice De Leon, Jack Miller and Samuel Diamond. Miller's record, according to the statement of Mr. Bowser, opposition leader in the British Columbia legislature, is well-known to the police. Among other offences it includes a sentence of five years for forgery.

The CHAIRMAN: I doubt very much whether the editorial that the hon. member is reading has anything to do with the subject matter of this bill. Unless there is something further in it that does touch on the general question it surely cannot be relevant to the debate.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am sure you will see that it is relevant.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not so far.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have not reached that yet, but you will see it is very relevant. If you will permit me, I will continue reading the editorial and I think you will agree with me that it is perfectly relevant. I will hand it to you first, if you like:

> It must surely be humiliating to the Liberal party to have the same Jack Miller figuring as a leading party worker. Perhaps the Attorney General of British Columbia, Mr. A. M. Manson, had such persons in mind when he said, a few weeks ago, in an address in Victoria:

Mr. McBRIDE: Surely we do not have to come here to listen to people reading newspapers.

Mr. McQUARRIE: My hon. friend can go outside if he does not like to hear what I have to say; that is his privilege. The editorial continued:

> Speaking generally, we value our friends, but in politics we sometimes curse our friends.

The CHAIRMAN: I must rule the hon. member's reading of this editorial out of order. It is not relevant to the subject matter under debate, which has reference to the importation of intoxicating liquors to be prohibited in two provinces. The subject matter is definite and the hon. member who has had long years of legal training, knows exactly what the position is.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I certainly do, and I submit with all due respect that you are absolutely wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule the reading of the editorial out of order.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I have to accept your ruling; but if there is any hon. gentleman in this House who can read the editorial and say it is out of order to quote it I certainly will question his intelligence.

The CHAIRMAN: I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is again out of order in criticizing the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am very sorry to have done that, and I apologize to the Chair. The substance of what I was going to read

is that charges have been made that objection will be taken to the particular bill by reason of money which is being contributed for the corruption of the legislature by liquor interests. That is what the editorial says. I want to say that charges of that kind should not be made without investigation, and I for one take exception to the charge that any money has been distributed to members of this parliament for the purpose of procuring the defeat of this particular bill. Personally I have received none of that money; I have not heard of any money being distributed for any such purpose; and I think that the writer of the editorial is undoubtedly a very fair sample of the Ananias brood. So far as I am concerned I did, as I said last year, remain silent when the matter came up before the House. But when I got home I was told that I should not have remained silent, but should have opposed the bill. The consensus of opinion in my constituency, as intimated to me, was that the bill should have been opposed, and I was so informed not only by men interested in the use of liquor, but also by prohibitionists. I got it from both sides; I was told on all hands that the Senate of Canada had justified its usefulness in having defeated that measure. Now I come here to-day and join with the members from this side of the House who think that this measure should not be passed. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) has said something about an investigation which was held before the public accounts committee of the Legislature of British Columbia during the last session. I think possibly it would be illuminating for the committee to know something in regard to the results which were brought out in that investigation. I might say that the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) in his statement to-day was very mild indeed. In October of last year he made a public statement under circumstances which would not entitle him to any privilege if he said anything incorrect that might be regarded as slanderous. He launched a series of charges against the administration, and very serious charges they were. Included in his statement was a charge in respect to a man named Dawson, of Prince Rupert. I am not going to say who Mr. Dawson is, or anything about him, unless I am required to do so. The member for Vancouver Centre on that occasion did say something about him, and he declared that the Attorney General of British Columbia was not enforcing the liquor act in his own city of Prince Rupert. In that connection I should like to read a synopsis of a part of the evidence which was submitted to the public accounts committee of British Columbia referred to by the Minister of Public Works:

George Miller, Inspector of Enforcement, gave evidence before the Public Accounts committee.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Who is the author of the document my hon. friend is reading from? Is that an official record?

Mr. JACOBS: I rise to a point of order. It is not proper for the hon. member to discuss this matter on the question now before the Chair.

Mr. STEVENS: Was it proper for the Minister of Public Works to raise it? No one else did.

The CHAIRMAN: He asked a question.

Mr. STEVENS: I suppose the minister has a special privilege.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I merely asked a question of the hon. member, as to who the author of the document was. If he does not think fit to reply, it does not matter.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The heading is this:

The following is but a brief statement of a few matters brought out by the probing of the Conservative members of the Public Accounts committee in the session of 1922, dealing with the liquor administration of the government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Who is the author?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The document, as I understand, is unsigned, has been distributed throughout the province, and is not an official report of the public accounts committee of the legislature.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Possibly not.

Mr. STEVENS: May I say a word in regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs). As a matter of fact the Minister of Public Works raised the question a moment ago when I was speaking. I declined to be drawn into a controversy on the subject and I told him at the time that if he desired to dispute a question not perhaps directly germane to the discussion I was engaged in, I was willing to meet him.

Mr. JACOBS: Where?

Mr. STEVENS: Here or anywhere.

Mr. JACOBS: Not here; they won't permit it.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) is dealing with the same subject and is prepared to offer some observations upon it. I submit that if

the Minister of Public Works was in order in raising the question as to the probe before the public accounts committee of the Legislature of British Columbia, then my hon. friend (Mr. McQuarrie) is quite in order in giving such light as he may have on the subject. That is merely my observation on the point of order raised.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Minister of Public Works did not raise a point of order. He simply asked who was the author of the document.

Mr. STEVENS: I am referring to something that preceded that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend for New Westminster is free to answer the question or not as he thinks fit.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that any discussion is relevant if it has regard to the question of importing intoxicating liquors and the effects which will attend any legislation to prevent law-breaking under the bill. It is not, however, pertinent to the subject matter before the Chair to detail instances illustrating individual cases of law-breaking. Hon. members may submit information bearing on the question under discussion that will tend to prove any increase or decrease in the illicit use or sale of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What I intended to discuss was this point, whether in view of the record of the provincial government in the administration of the liquor law in the province of British Columbia, this parliament was justified in extending to that government additional powers such as are contemplated by this bill.

Mr. CAHILL: What did you vote on last night?

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is what I was getting at. I intended to quote facts, which cannot be disputed, tending to show that the administration of the act is not at all satisfactory, that instead of sending bootleggers to gaol, as could have been done on the evidence adduced, the attorney general allowed the accused to escape punishment by fining the companies for which they were working or which they controlled. I was also going to show that these men included one or two very prominent workers in the Liberal party out there who were delegates to the Liberal convention from the attorney general's town.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member mean to suggest that it is relevant to the particular clause under discussion whether those men escaped punishment or not?

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think so.

The CHAIRMAN: And that this clause may or may not cure the trouble?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Then I rule the discussion out of order.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If I may say so Mr. Chairman, the point is this, whether the personnel of the provincial government is of such a calibre that we should further extend the powers that it already has in this connection. Of course, if you rule this out I must accept your ruling.

Now, something has been said by other hon. gentlemen as to the unfairness of passing this legislation and forcing upon the people of British Columbia something which they may not want and which they have never had the opportunity of saying whether they wanted or not. In a prohibition province if it is desired to prevent the importation of liquor it is necessary that a plebiscite should be taken to afford the people an opportunity of voting on the question. Well, how much more is that necessary in a province where there is not prohibition? Take the province of British Columbia. Previous to the question being voted upon by the electors they were told that if the bill passed they would still have the right individually to import all the liquor they might require for their own purposes. The bill itself contained a similar provision. I venture to say that a great many voted in favour of government control because of that stipulation, and the knowledge that they would not be required to accept liquor which was mixed for them by any provincial government.

Mr. GRAHAM: Say "blended."

Mr. McQUARRIE: Well, blended. I have the greatest respect for some of these mixers in British Columbia. In the old days we used to get some very good cocktails, but I am afraid we never had a bartender with enough courage to mix prune juice with inferior whiskey and hand it over the bar as a drink which he expected to get credit for.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Is this propaganda for the people of the province of Manitoba in the forthcoming referendum next June?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I do not know what the hon. gentleman is referring to, whether to this bill or to the reports of the public accounts committee in British Columbia. But following along the lines of the argument in regard to the people of British Columbia having the right to say whether they want this kind of

legislation or not, I have to suggest the following amendment to the minister for his consideration, and I think he should embody it in his bill. It is as follows:

Strike out subsection 5 and insert in lieu thereof:

5a. Upon receipt by the Secretary of State of Canada of a duly certified copy of an order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province in which there is at any time in force a law vesting in His Majesty or the executive government of the province authority for the control and sale of intoxicating liquor in the province or in any board, commission, officer, or other governmental agency, the right of selling intoxicating liquor in the province requesting that the votes of the electors may be taken for or against the following prohibition, that is to say:

"That the importation and the bringing of intoxicating liquors into such province may be forbidden."

The Governor in Council shall proceed to take a vote on such question in the manner provided in section 152, and the provisions of sections 152 and 152A and 153 shall as far as applicable mutatis mutandis apply to the taking of such vote.

5b. If the prohibition is declared to be in force, the Governor in Council may by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette declare the prohibitions of subsection 1 of this section in that province, and the same shall thereupon be and continue in force therein.

In order that this amendment may be before the committee, Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in moving it.

Now, one hon. member has stated that he thinks this bill should be supported because it is legislation along temperance lines. I fail to see how that is so, Mr. Chairman, because the government of British Columbia is not operating its liquor department for the sake of temperance; rather it is operating that department for the purpose of making money. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. McBRIDE: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it not a fact that the government of British Columbia is operating the liquor business when the people of that province gave it a majority of over 30,000 to do so?

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is something we discussed a moment or so ago—how that favourable majority was obtained. I have already referred to that. I say that the government of the province of British Columbia is not selling liquor for the purpose of advancing temperance but to make money. We have out there what is known as the Pacific highway, a road leading to Washington, Oregon and California. That road will be paved all through British Columbia from the border to Vancouver, and will be completed this year. Hundreds of motorists come across from the other side of the line every week, particularly during the summer time. The first things that greet those motorists are large signs, some advertising the virtues of certain brands of whiskey, and others performing the same service for certain brands of beer. The first idea that a motorist from the other side of the line gets is, naturally, that he can buy whiskey, beer and other liquors in British Columbia; and he does not have to go very far before he finds a liquor store, a vendor's establishment. We had one at New Westminster, but that was about eighteen miles from the border; it was not near enough. Although New Westmister is the first place of any consequence on the road from the border to Vancouver, the government, in order to help the poor individuals from the other side who might feel the necessity for liquor, put in another vendor's place on the south side of the New Westminster bridge, where there is no population at all. There are perhaps three or four houses in that neighhourhood; practically nobody lives there, and the only object of establishing a vendor's place at that point is to assist the government to sell liquor. The same applies all over the province. They have even put in vendor's places for the benefit of the Japanese and the Chinese; they have put in Japanese and Chinese wines and that kind of thing. They are doing business there for the purpose of making money, and they do not make any bones about it. They will sell to anyone any quantity of booze that he wants. I use the word "booze" advisedly, because I understand it is a good old English word which has been in use for many centuries. So far as I know, there is not in British Columbia, as there is in Quebec, any restriction upon the quantity of liquor that a person may buy. But I do know that out there, through the vendors, they sell liquor to individuals in such large quantities that the vendor, and the government through the vendor, must know that that liquor could not be consumed by the individual himself. After the poor man buys the liquor and disposes of it—because a great part of the liquor that is bootlegged in British Columbia is sold to the bootleggers by the government itself—after the poor man gets rid of some of this liquor in an effort to get his money back, he is summoned before the court and sent to gaol, unless he has a pull with somebody. I know of one case in my constituency where a poor fisherman was given, out of the liquor vendor's store in New Westminster, 120 dozen bottles of beer in a very few weeks. It was not sent to the man's residence, because his wife would not have allowed it to be there.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend, but really this has no

bearing on the bill that we are now considering.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I submit it has a bearing.

Mr. GRAHAM: Was the amendment put, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: No; the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman is in reference to clause 5. At present we have reached paragraph (c) of subsection 2. An amendment has been moved by Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil), and that amendment is now before the committee. The point has not been reached where the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) could submit his amendment.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The passing of this legislation cannot by any possible stretch of imagination be said to be assisting the cause of temperance. This poor man to whom I referred had the liquor sent to a place in the business section of the town, where he was running an alleged club.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must know that he has been out of order regularly and continuously this afternoon in going into individual cases in very great detail. Where he discusses the general principle of the importation or the restriction of importation, he is quite in order, but he must know that he is not in order in going into minute details of individual cases.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have always understood that details are what are required; when you deal in generalities you are open to censure. However, if details are ruled out, I have to bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. But I would say this: So far as temperance is concerned, you can forget it when you go to British Columbia. I do not know how it is in Quebec, but I see that they do sell liquor in places like Hull, and it does not seem very hard to get it over here in Ontario no matter where you go. But when you think about temperance, do not think about British Columbia. Some of the Liberal papers have called British Columbia the "bootleggers' paradise", but I do not see why it should be a bootleggers' paradise when you can buy all you want in the government stores—wine, beer or anything else. All you need is a permit, which you can get on the payment of a small fee; then you can buy what you like.

What good is this bill going to do? If the Attorney General of British Columbia wanted to stop the business of the liquor warehouses, all he had to do was to proceed as was done in Alberta and refuse to consent to the issue of licenses to those warehouses. Did the Attorney General of British Columbia do that? The minister knows that he did not. The return brought down shows that he consented not only to the renewal of old licenses, but to the issue of new ones. The minister knows also that a great many of these export licenses were issued to places where legitimate export could not have been carried on and could not have been expected to be carried on. There is no doubt about that.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Is my hon. friend in favour of export licenses?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that my own opinion has nothing to do with it. I am trying to reflect the views of my constituents as I find them, namely, that the administration of the liquor law in British Columbia is rotten, and we do not want to give to that government—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Do my hon. friend's constituents desire the continuance of these liquor warehouses in British Columbia?

Mr. McQUARRIE: My constituents are in favour of the importation of liquor by individuals rather than the confining of importation to the government under the present circumstances. They do not feel that this government should be given any further chance to debauch the public. That is about the size of it. The question of whether there shall be liquor warehouses or not would be disposed of if this bill were for the purpose of making it impossible for liquor warehouse licenses to be issued. Then I think I would be in favour of it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: You are not sure?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Absolutely in favour of it. But the question is not whether they shall be done away with or not, but whether the provincial government shall be given authority to say whether they shall be done away with, and whether they shall have the right to issue liquor licenses to their friends and keep others from getting them. I submit that this is a serious matter and one that should be very carefully considered. The liberty of the subject should not be unduly interfered with without giving the people a chance to say whether they desire such legislation or not. The amendment which I have suggested is simply to the effect that there shall be a referendum, and if the province really wants to get rid of these liquor warehouses, all it will have to do will be to ask for a referendum, when the people of British Columbia will have the right to say whether or not importation into the province shall be prohibited. Personally, this does not make any difference to me. I am not here representing any liquor

concern; I am not interested in any liquor or beer concern either directly or indirectly. I do not use liquor at all, and have not done so for many years.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, May 3, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral Officer certificate of the election and return of Edward Nicholas Hopkins, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Moose Jaw.

Edward Nicholas Hopkins, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Moose Jaw, introduced by Mr. Robert Forke and Mr. J. Fred Johnston.

REPORT

Fifth Report of the select standing committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.—Mr. McGiverin.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain) moved:

That the name of Mr. A. M. Carmichael be taken from the list of members comprising the special committee appointed to inquire into the operation of the Civil Service Act, and that the name of Mr. A. J. Lewis be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. SPEAKER: The custom is that such motions are generally made by the leader of the House. I do not, however, see that there is any objection to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SALES TAX

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What is the amount of revenue collected from the sales tax and other war taxes in the province of Alberta for the past three years?
2. What is the cost of collecting same for each of the three years?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Department of Customs and Excise—Revenue collected from Sales tax and "other excise taxes" in the province of Alberta during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1921, 1922 and 1923.

1.

Fiscal Year	Sales Tax	Other Excise Taxes
1921	$ 778,841.08	$1,216,370.08
1922	1,275,984.48	201,271.62
1923	1,814,623.91	409,550.73

2. Information not available as collections are made by customs excise officers who collect customs and excise duties and perform other work.

Department of Finance—

1. The special war taxes on trust and loan company income, insurance premiums (other than life) and bank note circulation, are paid to the Department of Finance and Insurance from the head offices of the corporations concerned, and no compilation is made of the amount of taxes paid from different provinces, nor is information returned upon which the amount of taxes paid in respect of income derived from the several provinces could be established.

2. The administration of the taxes does not involve the maintenance of special staff for the purpose. The cost is not separable, therefore, from the general expenses of the departments.

VERMILION, ALBERTA

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What sum does the lessee pay the Dominion government for the use of lots 31 and 32, block 8, town of Vermilion, Alberta?
2. What rent does the government pay the postmaster at Vermilion for the use of his building as a Post Office?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. No rental paid as no lease has been entered into, nor has permission been given to use these lots.

2. Postmaster is paid an allowance of $719 for rent, light and heat.

YUKON TELEGRAPH SYSTEM

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. What was the revenue during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, from the Yukon telegraph system?
2. What was the revenue during the same period on the said system from messages sent and delivered within British Columbia?
3. What was the revenue during the same period on said system from messages: (a) Sent and delivered within Yukon territory; (b) Sent within Yukon territory and delivered elsewhere; (c) Sent from points outside Yukon territory and delivered within Yukon territory?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. $105,717.22.
2. $65,070.88.
3. (a) $7,142.94; (b) $9,492.02; (c) $6,644.54.

DR. BOYER

Mr. MARTELL:

1. When was Dr. Boyer appointed consulting neurologist under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
2. What was Dr. Boyer's war service, what unit did he serve with and in what capacity?
3. (a) What fees have been paid to Dr. Boyer, and (b) what travelling expenses have been allowed him while in the service of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment as physician or neurologist?
4. Does Dr. Boyer carry on a private practice?
5. What review is there of the findings of Dr. Boyer?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. On the 1st of January, 1921, Dr. George Florian Boyer was appointed to the staff of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment in Toronto as a part-time consultant neurologist.

2. Appointed Captain C.A.M.C. No. 4 General Hospital, 13th April, 1915: proceeded to England 16th May, 1915; proceeded to Salonica, 17th October, 1915; returned to England, 19th June 1916, sick; promoted to Major, 25th January, 1918; employed in England until 9th April, 1918, when he was returned to Canada; struck off the strength of the Canadian Expeditionary Force 17th November, 1920.

3. (a) Dr. Boyer receives a part-time monthly remuneration of $250, aggregating $6,669.35 for the period of 28 months, ended 30th of April, 1923. (b) No amounts were paid as travelling or other expenses.

4. Yes.

5. The findings or reports of examinations submitted by Dr. Boyer are for the information and guidance of the executive medical officers of the department or the medical advisors of the Board of Pension Commissioners, as the case may be, and are subject to review by these officers in the same manner as the reports of other consultants and examiners.

ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK

Mr. SHAW:

1. Does the Hudson's Bay Company own or claim any lands within the "Rocky Mountains Park of Canada"?
2. If so, what is the area and legal description of such lands.

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.

2. The claims of the Hudson's Bay Company to lands within parks have not been admitted by the Government.

[Mr. George Black.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—SUPERANNUATION FUND

Mr. GAUVREAU:

When does the Canadian National Railways intend to put into force the new regulation in regard to the superannuation fund of the employees of the whole Canadian National Railway System?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The matter is now under active consideration by the management, and it may be possible to bring down necessary legislation during the present session.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PENSIONERS

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Are the old pensioners of the Grand Trunk Railway still entitled to an annual pass on the National Railways?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Minister of Railways to grant the same favour to the old pensioners of the Intercolonial Railway?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. The matter is under consideration by the management.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend section 487 of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing that a master or mate upon application as therein provided may, if his application be approved by the pilotage authority, be thereupon examined, and if found competent, a pilotage certificate may be granted to him.

He said: The subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, he has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN AIR FORCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LUCAS: Has the government any information that there have been three desertions from the Canadian Air Force at Camp Borden within the last few weeks and that eight of the best technical men have, made urgent demands for their discharge? Is this true and if so, what does the government intend to do in regard to the situation?

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for calling our attention to this matter. I will make inquiry as to the report to which he refers and will give a reply later.

U.S. LABOUR DELEGATES DETAINED

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have to ask my daily question: What decision has been come to in regard to Alexander Howat?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil: I have no answer from our port officer at McAdam Junction.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT NEW YORK

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. LADNER: May I ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) whether or not he has come to a decision in respect to the question of the customs officer at New York? In the Vancouver Sun of April 27, there appears an interview in which he is reported as saying:

It is sheer nonsense to collect duty on steel shipped from Nova Scotia to British Columbia via Panama canal.

Then the Prime Minister continues:

I am in favour of some system being devised by the Customs department to provide for bonding through Canadian goods which are carried by an all-water route.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that as the Order of the Day has already provided for an answer to a question put by himself, his speech now is out of order. Besides, if my memory serves me right, a categorical answer was given by the Minister of Customs a few days ago on this very same subject.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 43, to amend the Canada Temperance Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Importation of intoxicating liquor prohibited:

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been moved that paragraphs (c) and (d) of subsection 2 of section 1 be struck out and the following two paragraphs be added as paragraphs (c) and (d) respectively:

(c) The importation of intoxicating liquor into a province by any person duly licensed by the government of Canada to carry on the business or trade of a distiller, where the intoxicating liquor so imported is imported solely for the purpose of being used for blending with or flavouring the products of the business or trade of a distiller carried on by him in the province and while kept by him in the province is kept in a place or warehouse which conforms in all respects to the requirements of the law governing such places or warehouses and is used solely for blending with or flavouring the products of his said business or trade as a distiller; or

(d) The importation of intoxicating liquor into a province by a person engaged in and carrying on the business of exporting intoxicating liquor from that province, where the intoxicating liquor so imported is imported solely for the purpose of his export business and while kept by him in the province, is kept in a liquor warehouse which conforms in all respects to the requirements of the law governing such warehouses, and when sold or disposed of by him is actually exported from that province:

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): The bill before the committee consists of a single section the adoption of which carries the bill; and the amendment that has been moved will in effect put into force in British Columbia what is known as the Doherty Act without consulting the electors of the province. The provisions of that act will affect everybody in British Columbia except the liquor commission, or as that body is more properly described, in British Columbia the Liquor Control Board—control is the main object out there. Subsection (1) of section 1 is a "bone-dry" section except so far as the Liquor Control Board is concerned, and as a resident of British Columbia I protest against this legislation, as I am sure the great majority of the people of that province would protest against it if the question were submitted to them. Public opinion in British Columbia is decidedly against this legislation; I believe it is as totally averse to depriving individuals of the right to import for their own use, as it is to allowing private individuals to sell liquor in the province. And that opinion against any attempt to deprive private persons of the right to import liquor into the province is all the stronger after the people have observed the administration of the act under the Liquor Control Board during the past few years. I think that right of private individuals should be more jealously guarded. The Liquor Control Board is virtually the Attorney General of the province. The members of the board are mere figureheads; the Attorney General pulls the strings and they dance to his music. This legislation, is an infringement of public and private rights, rights which the people have never voted to have taken from them. It is not necessary in the interests of temperance, it is not necessary in the interests of moderation, to deprive the individual in British Columbia of the right to import liquor; nor is it needed to prevent that illicit sale, known as "bootlegging." This legislation is absolutely unnecessary for that purpose. To pretend that it is needed is merely to say what cannot be substantiated; any assertion of the kind is sheer pretence, a sham, a camouflage. I say, therefore, that if it is wise or fair or good legislation to allow the Attorney General of British Columbia by order in

council to abolish the existing subsections (c) and (d), which constitute an exception to the bone-dry section 1, and to do so without consulting the wishes of the people of British Columbia, it is just as fair and wise to allow him to nullify the two other exceptions which allow the distillers to import for purposes of their business, and common carriers to convey liquor through the province. This legislation does not allow the Attorney General to nullify these two provisions, but it gives him power by order in council to do away with the provisions of paragraphs (c) and (d). It is just as reasonable to clothe the Attorney General with the same power in regard to all four exceptions as it is to allow him to exercise the power with reference to two of them without consulting the wishes of the people. To be consistent, why not give him power to alter the whole liquor system of the province of British Columbia by order in council? Why not allow him to nullify provisions (a) and (b), one of which allows importation into the province by the provincial government, while the other provides for the carriage of liquor through the province by common carriers? Why not give him the right to abolish these provisions at his will? It is manifestly unfair to let him interfere with either set of these provisions by order in council. This parliament has no mandate to confer any such power on the Attorney General of British Columbia. The provincial government and the Attorney General of the province have no mandate from the electors of the province to legislate them out of their present rights. Why therefore should this parliament at this time infringe upon those rights? What is the excuse, what is the necessity for it? Why clothe the attorney general with this extraordinary power?

In a prohibition province there must be a plebiscite before the Dominion government will apply the provisions of the Doherty Act. So why not a plebiscite for British Columbia, where there is much less likelihood of the people desiring what is virtually the Doherty Act than there is in the bone dry provinces. The Prohibition Act of British Columbia, which was administered most unsatisfactorily for a number of years, recognized the right of the private individual to import for export under license and for personal use. The Liquor Control Act under which we are now operating in British Columbia recognizes that right. The provincial government has never gone to the country either by plebiscite or referendum seeking the powers proposed to be conferred on them by this bill In effect the Minister of Justice is asking parliament to take away from the people of British Columbia rights which they did not give up and which there is no good reason why they should be deprived of at this time. Why not consult the people of British Columbia on this proposal, as was done when the plebiscite was taken in 1920, before depriving them of their undoubted constitutional rights?

To illustrate what I have said, in the 1920 plebiscite the questions put to the electors were two, and I do not think anyone can read into those questions and the answers to them any excuse for this legislation. The first question was: Are you in favour of continuing the present prohibition act? The second question was: Are you in favour of government control and sale of liquor in sealed packages? The answer to the first question was overwhelmingly "no", they did not want to continue the prohibition act; the answer to the second question was overwhelmingly "yes"; and the legislature legislated accordingly. There is absolutely nothing in these questions and answers authorizing the enactment of the legislation which the Minister of Justice now asks this House to pass.

I think it is an admitted fact that in a great measure the dissatisfaction prevailing in the United States to-day with regard to prohibition is because of the unfair way in which prohibition was put upon the people. They were not consulted, their rights were legislated away from them. And that is what we are trying to do to-day—to take away from the people of Britsh Columbia rights which they have never asked to be divested of. I cannot bring myself to believe that the Minister of Justice understood the conditions in British Columbia when he introduced this legislation or he would not seek to treat the people there so unfairly. There is no intimation from the people of British Columbia that they want this legislation. Why not be fair to them, why not give them a chance to say whether or not they want it? Are the people of British Columbia not to be trusted in regard to this question? Is their wish to be thrust aside to suit the whim of the Attorney General of that province to enhance his power? For that is all it amounts to. The Attorney General of British Columbia in asking for this legislation does not want moderation, he does not want prohibition; he simply wants power—power which the electorate of that province have never signified they wish him to be clothed with, and he has come to this parliament in this roundabout way to get this power over the heads of the people.

Hon. members opposite, particularly the right hon. Prime Minister, not so very long ago were prone to declaim against what they

termed "government by order in council". When they were in opposition, less than two years ago, we heard a great deal against so-called government by order in council. Was there ever a more flagrant case of government by order in council than that sought to be created by this bill? The situation is this: There is legislation in operation in British Columbia regulating the liquor traffic, legislation passed and put in operation at the instance of the people of that province. Now, without consulting the people of the province, it is sought by this bill to empower the Attorney General of British Columbia by order in council, to completely change the effect of the liquor legislation now in operation in that province. If that is not government by order in council, then there never was an instance of it. It is government by order in council not only of the province but of the federal government; it is distinctly order in council government. I say we should not do it. I say the Minister of Justice should not ask the House to do it. I go further, I say it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to oppose the passage of legislation of this character. It is his duty to prevent it. It is not democratic, it is not fair to the people affected.

Now, what is the excuse for this extraordinary act on the part of the government? The ordinary excuse for government by order in council of recent times has been that there was a war on, or that the government was under the stress of re-establishment. Why this extraordinary measure now with no extraordinary circumstances to excuse it? It may be said there is a war on —a war against the bootleggers of British Columbia. But I tell this House that it is only a sham fight; there is no real war on there; and it is not necessary to enforce the present liquor law of British Columbia that this bill should be enacted.

Is the Attorney General of British Columbia, is the Liquor Control Board of that province, encouraging moderation in the use of liquor? I say, no—notoriously no. As the member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) said yesterday, so far as temperance goes in British Columbia "There is nothing doing in that quarter;" that is, in the vicinity of the Liquor Control Board and the Attorney General's office. What is happening? The Attorney General and the Liquor Control Board of British Columbia are actually booming the liquor trade, they are urging people to buy liquor and to drink it. Then they talk about wanting to enforce the liquor law! It was expected when this act was put in force in British Columbia that the government there would encourage moderation in the consumption of liquor. The old crusade against the bar had its merits and had its success in the fact that the bars tempted people to drink. The idea of the true moderationists in dealing with the bar was to remove this temptation, and they expected that by the government taking over the control and sale of liquor good liquor would be made available to the people in moderate quantities at moderate prices. They never contemplated that the Lipuor Control Board should by a campaign of liquor advertising flaunt their favoured brands in flaring advertisements before the public throughout that province as they are doing to-day. Why, you would think there was a Victory bond sale going on out there, from the way the Liquor Control Board are advertising different brands of liquor. Every billboard in the country is filled up with that kind of advertising, to say nothing of newspapers—and yet they talk about moderation. The moderationists of British Columbia never supposed that there would be competition between Government liquor shops as there actually is to-day. Can you imagine competition for trade between vendors in the respective government liquor shops? Can you imagine them persuading people to buy at their particular shop so that they would make records for big sales and in that way curry favour with their employers? Is that moderation? That is the sort of liquor board that this House is asked to encourage and give more power to. I say they are not fit to be entrusted with that power, but apart altogether from that, I say the people of British Columbia do not want it. The people never expected this when they voted for what was called the moderation act in British Columbia. They never expected that when reputable, old, established distilling concerns from the Old Country offered their goods for sale to the British Columbia Control Board they would find it necessary, in order to make a sale, to appoint as their agents ward officers of city Liberal associations, thereby greatly increasing the price to the public. The moderationists of British Columbia, I say, did not expect that, but that is what has been done and is being done to-day, and that is one reason why this House should not force the people of British Columbia to buy liquor from such vendors exclusively.

Now, let me say a word about the price of liquor in British Columbia. The Whiskey Association of Great Britain comprises practically all the largest and best distillers in the

United Kingdom. They have a minimum price for export of 55 shillings per case. They will not ship for less; anything cheaper is green whiskey and not fit for use. Fifty-five shillings at 23 cents would amount to 12.65 f.o.b. United Kingdom. Freight, insurance and charges to Vancouver would amount to $1; duty on whiskey, $10 per proof gallon, 2 gallons per case at 25 under proof; duty on whiskey; duty on glass, and Dominion sales tax adds $21 per case, which makes the landed cost of the whiskey in Vancouver $34.65 a case. What does the government charge the public for that whiskey? They charge $54 a case, making a profit of $19.35 a case. Is it any wonder that the bootlegger can do business successfully in competition with prices like that? I ask the government and I ask this committee, is it fair to prevent individuals from importing for their own use when they can bring the goods in at $34.65 a case and the government charges $54? That is another sample of the way the liquor business is handled in British Columbia. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) yesterday, and the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), referred to a local wine company there, known as the California Wine Company. There is a fine old port, product of Spain, called Convido port, black label, white letters. This local wine company copied the label and called it "Bonvido Fine Old Port." They sold it over the counter in the government shops as fine old port, and it was proved that the material in these bottles was nothing but loganberry juice and some truck brought up in mats and casks from California. In one instance an order went in to the wine company for 55 cases and the answer was, "We have not any on hand, but we will make some up for the morning,"—"fine old port" made overnight! These are the people that this House would force the consumers of British Columbia to deal with. But that is not all. Let me tell the committee something about the method employed by the Liquor Control Board in handling whiskey in British Columbia. The board purchased 1,690 cases of Roderick Dhu whiskey, 1,350 cases of Royal Stuart Scotch, 1,900 cases of Balmoral Scotch and 2,000 cases of Milburn Scotch—all cheap, inferior whiskey—and other odds and ends, amounting to something over 7,000 cases. What was done with that stuff? It was so bad that they did not dare to put it on the government shelves for sale; nobody would buy it. Well, the corks were drawn and the whole was mixed with prune juice and other ingredients in a big vat. A high voltage electrical device was employed and the stuff "aged" on the spot, was rebottled and sold at $3.50 a quart, at the government shops labelled, "L. C. B."—Liquor Control Board. That is the sort of stuff this legislation would compel the people of British Columbia to buy. I am sure the Minister of Justice did not realize what he was doing when he introduced this legislation. These facts were brought out before the public accounts committee of the Legislature of British Columbia. The stuff the Liquor Control Board of British Columbia sells reminds me of a story told of a certain saloon in Dawson City in the old days. It had a sawdust floor; many of them had, but in this saloon when they sold a man a glass of whiskey they handed him a whisk broom—that was to brush the sawdust off himself when he came to. Well, the Liquor Control Board of British Columbia does not even supply a whisk broom. If the Liquor Control Board handles wine and whiskey like that while people who know enough or have money enough to do so import for their own use, what will they not do when you give them the monopoly this legislation creates and force people to buy from them exclusively?

Under the law as it is at present in British Columbia the individual who imports for his own use is taxed by the British Columbia government the amount of profit the government would have made had the government sold him the liquor, so the government loses nothing on the transaction. It is not in competition with the government, but by importing it personally the importer is sure of the quality and does not take the fearful risk of having the liquor doctored up as I have described. Do you think it is fair to prevent him from importing his own liquor when he would otherwise have to buy stuff like that? There is no bootlegging in British Columbia by private importers. Any bootlegging that is done there can easily be controlled by the Attorney General of the province with the legal machinery he already has. I leave it to the Minister of Justice or to any member of the committee: would he want to buy liquor from a dealer who does as I have described? Would he feel safe? The Minister of Justice said yesterday that the reason for this legislation was a desire to stop bootlegging. I can tell him and tell the House that this legislation is not needed to stop bootlegging in British Columbia; bootlegging can be stopped by the bona fide prosecution of the bootlegger and lawbreaker and by discontinuing the present practice of playing politics with the liquor business. Just as soon as they stop that they can stop bootlegging, but you cannot mix up politics

and the selling of liquor and have good law or good liquor. Bootlegging could be stopped by the government in this way, by importing and selling only good liquors at a fair price. What bootlegger could successfully compete with the government, buying on the wholesale scale that the government does and with the facilities it has for handling the goods? You might find an odd tramp walking about the streets with a flask in his hip pocket and selling a drink here and there for twenty-five cents, but that is a mere drop in the bucket. The Attorney General could stop the real bootlegging if he wanted to.

As I said at the outset, the design of this legislation is not to stop bootlegging or to further moderation or temperance in the consumption of liquor. It is merely designed to give the Attorney General of British Columbia more power. The export warehouses are absolutely under the control of the government and can be checked up for every quart of liquor they handle. They can easily be put out of business by prosecution if they violate the law. It is alleged, I understand, by the Attorney General of British Columbia that these export and import warehouses are the cause of bootlegging. Well, he has them right under his hand at the present time and does not need this legislation to control them. The object of this legislation, I repeat, is to give the Control Board more power to force their spurious liquors upon the people of British Columbia. I must oppose this bill and I ask the government and the House not to force this legislation on the people of British Columbia without first consulting their wishes in the regular and constitutional way. Surely it is not too much to ask them whether they want it or not. The House has nothing to indicate that they want it except the word of the Attorney General who gives a reason that is not sound at all. If the bill had the sanction of the people of British Columbia or of the majority I would not question it for one moment; but it has not; it is unfair to them, and in my opinion should not go through.

I would like the House to observe that the effect of this bill when it is passed is to leave things just exactly as they are so far as the state of law and the administration of the law is concerned, but it does this; it gives the Attorney General of British Columbia the power to change it at his will. He need not necessarily change it, but he has the power there for control. If the bill came out-and-out in a manly way and said, this will be the law or that will be the law, the House might very well pass judgment upon it, but why give the Attorney General of British Columbia this discretionary power to squeeze these people or not as he sees fit. I say that it is not wise legislation, and I hope that the government will not force it through.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have gathered from the remarks of the hon. members who spoke yesterday and the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Black) that there is opposition to the licenses granted to exporters in British Columbia,—they all seem to agree on that point; and further that there is really some bootlegging going on in British Columbia, and they all seem to be of opinion that a stop should be put to that traffic. The objection was offered yesterday by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that the bill as we have introduced it was not in conformity with the resolution adopted by the legislature of British Columbia, and he added that it was not necessary to legislate to prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquors because already the province had the right to do so. He cited the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice to that effect. Hon members will remember that yesterday in closing my remarks I said that if it was the wish of the hon. members for British Columbia that we should drop subsection (d), that is to say, make no exception in favour of the exporters, I was disposed to discuss that point. I would like to make my position in this matter as clear as possible. My predecessor, that is to say the hon. ex-Solicitor General, Mr. McKenzie, who drafted this bill and introduced it, had in his hands at the time a resolution which was adopted by the legislature of British Columbia in the month of December, 1922. That resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas a plebiscite was taken in the province of British Columbia in October, 1920, on the following question:—
>
> Which do you Prefer?
>
> (1) The present "Prohibition Act", or
>
> (2) An Act to provide for government control and sale in sealed packages of spirituous and malt liquors?
>
> And whereas the vote was strongly in favour of government control and sale:
>
> And whereas as a result of the said plebiscite there was passed by the legislature of this province the "Government Liquor Act";
>
> And whereas eighteen months of administration under that act has demonstrated the necessity for the prohibition of the importation of liquor into this province by other than the provincial government in order to accomplish the effective working of the said Act;
>
> And whereas federal legislation to that end was sought at the meeting of the federal parliament in the spring of 1922, and the said proposed legislation met with the unanimous approval of the House of

Commons, but was defeated in the Senate at the close of its session when many Senators were not present;

And whereas it is desirable that this province again seek the enactment of the proposed legislation;

Therefore be it resolved, that the federal parliament be requested at its next sittings to enact legislation providing for the prohibition of the importation of intoxicating liquor into British Columbia for use therein except by the provincial government; such legislation to be for the purpose of supplementing and giving effect to the aforementioned "Government Liquor Act" and to be contingent upon and to exist only during its continuance;

And be it further resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he will cause a copy of the preamble and resolution hereinbefore set out to be transmitted to the Hon. the Secretary of State at Ottawa.

So, there was a plebiscite held in the province of British Columbia through which the electors by a very large majority declared themselves in favour of the sale of liquor by the government. Last year the government of British Columbia came to this parliament and asked that we should legislate to prohibit the importation of liquor. This bill of ours was passed unanimously by this House, but defeated by the Senate. It is after that refusal of the Senate to accept such legislation that the legislature of British Columbia unanimously, I understand, by a large majority anyhow—

Mr. STEVENS: By a majority.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: —requested the government to legislate so that in the future importation of liquor into British Columbia should not be allowed except by the government of the province. The hon. Solicitor General has introduced the bill that you have before you, Mr. Chairman. By that bill it is provided that in principle the importation of intoxicating liquors is prohibited. An exception is made for the government. Another exception was made for the exporters for their trade. They were allowed to import only for their trade of exportation. Since the second reading of the bill was adopted by this House I proposed myself that an addition should be made to the exception, to the effect that this should not apply to distillers in the province of British Columbia. Now, I gather from this debate that the hon. members for British Columbia object to exporters being allowed to continue their trade. Hon. members are very much opposed and rightly so, to the bootlegging that is going on in that province. There is a proviso by virtue of which the government would have power to permit such exporters to continue their trade, or to refuse such authorization, and the great objection is that we should not give to a province such a right to legislate, as they say, by order in council.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister permit me to interrupt him. To make complete the objections he is reciting, we object and we claim that the Attorney General in conjunction with the proper officer of this government has that power now just as completely as this bill gives it to him. Secondly we claim that by this bill this parliament is foregoing its rights, transferring its rights into the hands of the Attorney General, without definitely stating that the importation will cease.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I was going to say to the hon. member that we do not intend to transfer that right to the Attorney General. The hon. member concluded his remarks yesterday by saying: "Well, I will not oppose the legislation" I understood that he was disposed to vote in its favour; but even with that declaration of his I want to try and satisfy all my hon. friends opposite and the people of British Columbia in this matter. I come here in all sincerity and I want to make the legislation I offer workable. There was a plebiscite in the province of British Columbia when the people, by a large majority, declared that they favoured a system of control by the government. This was supplemented by a resolution in the legislature of that province by which it is asked that we should now proceed to prohibit the importation of liquors and allow it only in favour of the government. The legislation which is before you, Mr. Chairman, is to that effect but I want to try to make its purpose as clear as possible. My hon. friends opposite object to the proviso that they found in the first, and second draughts. I am prepared to drop it. My hon. friends object also to licenses to exporters. Well, I am prepared to drop that. Now, my hon. friends cannot refuse to vote in support of the prohibition of importation except in favour of the government, because the people have already voted on the plebiscite and the legislature has requested this government to legislate in that direction. We make an exception for the manufacturers—that is to say the distillers and the brewers—and this exception is nothing but the general law for the provinces where you have prohibition. As all will remember, in the provinces where prohibition was adopted by the people and ratified by the executive, there is an exception in favour of manufacturers and brewers. The exception that you will find in the amendment that you have to consider is about

what you find in that proviso of the law of 1919. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with your permission and the permission of hon. members, I would ask to be permitted to strike out from the amendment that I have suggested the last part of that amendment. My amendment would read as follows:

That paragraph (c) of subsection 2 of section 163 be struck out and replaced by the following:

(c) The importation of intoxicating liquor into the province by any person duly licensed by the government of Canada to carry on the business or trade of a distiller or brewer where the intoxicating liquor so imported is imported solely for the purpose of blending with or flavouring the products of the business or trade of a distiller or brewer carried on by him in the province and while kept by him in the province is kept in a place or warehouse which conforms in all respects to the requirements of the law governing such places or warehouses and is used solely for blending with or flavouring the products of his said business or trade as a distiller or brewer.

That will be the only exception and without any discretion to the Attorney General or to the executive. With this amendment it seems to me that the measure should be accepted by hon. members.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand from the minister that it is the proviso he is dropping?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The proviso in the second paragraph of page 2, but still sub-section 5 applies.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: And when it is applied there will be two exceptions, one in favour of the government and one in favour of the distillers. As long as it is applied under the disposition of subsection 5 it is the law of the day, and under such law the distillers and brewers have this right. So that whenever you apply this bill you can do it only by preserving the exception in favour of the distillers and brewers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the whole act goes into effect by the will of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. In that regard I would like to impress an argument on the minister and see whether it has any effect upon him or not. I approach it this way: Constitutionally there are certain important powers that are exclusively the possession of the provinces. There are other important powers exclusively the possession of the Dominion. It is admitted that the sovereign jurisdiction of the provinces in respect of theirs is on a level with the sovereign jurisdiction of the Dominion in respect of ours. It is also admitted that there can be no assignment from one to the other; from the Dominion to a province, or from the province to a Dominion, of any powers. That either must act, not only in spirit but in letter, up to those requirements, those constitutional requirements. The Doherty Act provided another method, if I may so describe it, of giving what are Dominion powers to a province. It

4 p.m.

gives the Dominion powers to a province in this way and subject to these precautions: The Doherty Act says that in every province which has a law living up to certain definite requirements of prohibition there shall be certain provisions of a federal act applied, the provisions being the prevention of importation with certain exceptions. The precautions are these: That first of all a majority of the legislature shall petition to have the federal act applied thereby bringing into effect within the province alone a federal law arising out of exclusively federal jurisdiction. That is the first precaution that the Doherty Act provides. Now, it provides a second precaution of very great importance: That notwithstanding the fact that a majority of the legislature petitions—what the legislature petitions for, indeed, is the plebiscite indicating the will first of the legislature — notwithstanding that, and in addition to that, the people of the province themselves shall vote and, by a majority, shall declare their will that such federal law arising out of federal jurisdiction shall apply. Those precautions are very great safeguards. Undoubtedly it would never be sound and never be for the public good that the Dominion parliament should consent to bestow upon a province the right to call into effect federal law, except with such safeguards. The minister goes much further than that in this bill, and it seems to me, though he may argue that it is not of vital or sweeping consequences, that he establishes a precedent that may be dangerous. He seeks now to bring into effect in a province a federal measure with none of these precautions, none of those safeguards at all. This is a federal measure, and its provisions may be called into effect in a province by the mere fiat of a lieutenant governor in council. I ask hon. members to remember that this bill is general and applies everywhere. The minister speaks of British Columbia; but whenever another province comes into the position of British Columbia, the bill will apply in that province. The minister says that in British Columbia the legislature has voted a resolution asking for such a bill. Very good. Another legislature may not do so; but the lieutenant governor in council at that time may nevertheless call this bill into effect or call it out of effect. Therefore, while the minister can plead the resolution of

a legislature in this case, he can plead it only as applicable to the individual instance, and it in no way justifies the generality of his bill.

Next, he has not the safeguard that the majority of the people in that province must want this legislation. The legislature need take no responsibility as it has to in the case of legislation within its powers. It is not necessary, as a safeguard to this legislation going into effect, that the people must want this measure. A mere lieutenant governor in council may call this bill in effect in any province which has given to it government control over the sale of liquor, a power to sell liquor in that province. Surely the minister is going a very grave length from the constitutional standpoint, and a length that, it seems to me, is going to get this parliament into difficulties later on. Even in the present case he cannot plead the plebiscite in British Columbia. But if he could plead it, that would not answer to the charge I make against his bill, because his bill is general and it will apply in the future just as well as now, when possibly British Columbia will not want at all what it voted for two or three years ago. It may not want now what it voted for two or three years ago; but it will have to take it, if the Lieutenant Governor in Council says so, and the legislature will have no power to veto it.

I started out a moment ago to say that even in this case, the minister cannot plead the plebiscite of British Columbia. British Columbia never by any vote voted for such legislation to be in effect, as the Lieutenant Governor in Council can put it into effect if this bill passes. What did the people of British Columbia vote for? Presumably knowing the jurisdiction of their legislature, the limits of that jurisdiction, they voted to endow that legislature with control of the sale of liquor, that is, with power to sell liquor through a government institution. When they voted for that, they knew that if the legislature followed the vote of the majority, nevertheless there would be the right to import for private use. They knew that, so presumably they voted that the power of the legislature and its exercise should be concurrent with the right of importation. The minister could not say nay to that contention.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: What about the resolution of the legislature?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am dealing with the people now. The minister should have interrupted me when I was dealing with the resolution. I will come to the resolution later if the minister wants me to refer to it again.

[Mr. Meighen.]

He cannot plead the vote of the people. The people voted just the other way; they voted that the legislature might establish, and they willed that it should establish, a board for the sale of liquor within the province. They voted, knowing that such institution and the operation of that institution would be concurrent with the right of private importation for private use. The minister is putting it within the power of their government, without recourse to the people at all, to impose upon the people something which they did not vote for, and which presumably they voted against.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I cannot accept the "presumably," because the question was only whether they were in favour of prohibition or in favour of control by the government. There was no question of importation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was the question of importation, for this reason. They voted for control by the government, for the government having the right itself to sell liquor in sealed packages; that is to say, government control, government monopoly within the province over the sale of liquor in sealed packages. But they voted, presumably knowing—and that is why I used the word "presumably"—that while such legislation was going into effect, they would have the right, not to sell, but to import for private use. Consequently the people must be presumed to have voted against the prevention of importation for private use. The minister is putting it within the power of the government of that province to put precisely the opposite into effect, that precisely opposite law being a law that can derive force only from enactment by the parliament of Canada.

I have covered both phases of the argument. The minister sweeps aside the safeguards that all along have been provided, where what is exclusively federal power is put into the hands of a province, and he passes a general law which will enable the lieutenant governor of any province, under certain conditions, to put into effect in that province legislation which is federal legislation, irrespective wholly of the will of the people of that province. The minister says that he is justified because of the resolution. I answer him again that he can plead that for the present the Legislature of British Columbia wants this bill. I may be making too sweeping a statement in his favour, because I have not heard the whole of the debate; but so far as I have heard it, he can plead for the present that the legislature of British Columbia wants this bill. He cannot plead that the people do; he has not the slightest ground to argue that the people do. Every circumstance, every

fact we know argues that the people do not want it. He can, however, argue that the legislature at the present time wants this bill, or it did last December. But I tell the minister again that he is passing a law that will enable the provincial government, no matter what the people may want, to bring into effect a federal law wholly against the will of the legislature and of the people.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: They have the power to change it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But is it right, sound, or for the public good, that a federal law, a law that derives force wholly from enactment by this parliament, should be allowed to be put into effect by order in council in a province irrespective altogether of the will of the people or of the legislature, and to say in effect, for four years or until some other lieutenant governor, notwithstanding any vote of the people, may choose to wipe it away? I am presenting the case from the constitutional standpoint to the minister, and I venture to say, if the minister had taken it into his own hands and reviewed this phase of it, then, as a result of conditions that I have presented to him now, and that would have arisen to his mind he would have never made himself the party chiefly responsible for legislation of this character.

Mr. McBRIDE: In rising to say a few words on the question before the committee, I should like to assure the Minister of Justice that British Columbia is not entirely represented in the section of the House, to my right. We members here do not want to occupy the time of the House for hours talking politics, nor to influence the vote that will be taken in Manitoba this summer. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has been referring to British Columbia and telling the House what the people want out there. I want that hon. gentleman to understand that I represent over one-third of British Columbia, and was sent here by a majority of over 3,200 in excess of the man who ran to support the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I say that the people of the province of British Columbia do want the act that is proposed, and say it without hesitation. It has been repeatedly stated here that the whiskey in British Columbia is no good, and hon. gentlemen refer to it as "prune juice". Two hon. members yesterday afternoon said that they had not known the taste of whiskey for quite a long time. Well, I do know the taste of whiskey, and I am here to say that since the act passed in British Columbia I have got no bad whiskey from the Liquor Control Board of the province. I have never had a drink of poor whiskey from that source yet, and I have taken enough of it to know the difference between good and bad. I can assure the committee that the government in British Columbia is asking for the act; the government desires to get this control. A plebiscite was voted upon by the people of the province and was carried by a majority of nearly 35,000. The people of that province requested the present government to take control of the liquor of British Columbia, and that same government is in power yet. The government feel that they cannot control the liquor situation properly under the present act and they come to this parliament and ask to be given further power. Is that unreasonable? I think that the government of British Columbia are entitled to it.

A great deal of insinuation has been cast at the Attorney General of the province of British Columbia, as well as other members of the local government. I think it should be beneath any member of this House to say a word or cast any insinuation against any member of another legislative body, nor do I think that it becomes any of us to speak disparagingly of those persons who represent the people of the province of British Columbia.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is a good lesson.

Mr. McBRIDE: Those gentlemen are not here to defend themselves, and hon. gentlemen in this chamber should bear in mind that if they are to carry the dignity of members of parliament it behooves them to let others alone. Let hon. gentlemen here look after their own affairs. Now, a great deal has been said about the influence that government control is having in British Columbia. One hon. gentleman yesterday wanted to read a whole front page of a newspaper in regard to the matter. I am not going to do that, but I desire to make a few statements in reference to the effect that prohibition has had and is having on some people; it may be interesting for us to know the facts. There is one district in the United States, not a very large district either, where in twelve months 9,401 illicit stills were seized. To carry the whiskey from these stills to the consumers there were in use 309 automobiles, 60 rigs and 93 horses, all of which were seized. These conveyances were carrying the product of these stills around the country. With what effect? In twelve days 103 persons lost their lives through this moonshine that came from these stills, and there were 37 cold-blooded murders in one city on the other side of the international line.

One prominent public man, speaking in reference to prohibition had this to say:

It is making law-breakers of a large portion of the population, and is helping to create a nation of liars, sneaks and hypocrites.

I think the government is to be congratulated on bringing this bill forward, and I, as one member representing British Columbia here, trust that the Minister of Justice will see that it is carried out as he has submitted it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: We have been dealing with bootlegging in British Columbia. As I understand it, the decapitated bill will be directed against bootleggers there. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether there is any bootlegging in the province of Quebec?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not think the question is relevant.

Mr. GAUVREAU: What has Quebec to do with you? Stick to your own province; we have had enough of you.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQparrie) that subsection 5 be struck out and the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

5a. Upon receipt by the Secretary of State of Canada of a duly certified copy of an order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province in which there is at any time in force a law vesting in His Majesty or the executive government of the province authority for the control and sale of intoxicating liquor in the province or in any board, commission, officer, or other governmental agency, the right of selling intoxicating liquor in the province requesting that the votes of the electors may be taken for or against the following prohibition, that is to say:

"That the importation and the bringing of intoxicating liquors into such province may be forbidden."

The Governor in Council shall proceed to take a vote on such question in the manner provided in section 152, and the provisions of sections 152 and 152A and 153 shall as far as applicable mutatis mutandis apply to the taking of such vote.

5b. If the prohibition is declared to be in force, the Governor in Council may by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette declare the prohibitions of subsection 1 of this section in that province, and the same shall thereupon be and continue in force therein.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Chairman, before the bill is reported I would call the minister's attention to the wording of clause (b) of subsection 2:

The carriage or transportation of intoxicating liquor into and through a province by means only of a common carrier by water or by railway, if, during the time the intoxicating liquor is being so carried or transported, the package or vessel containing the intoxicating liquor is not opened or broken or any of the intoxicating liquor drunk or used therefrom; or,

Why cut out the motor truck? Is it intended?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is intended.

Bill as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved the second reading of Bill No. 136, to amend the Immigration Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Enemy aliens:

Mr. JACOBS: Will the minister give us an explanation of this clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is simply to conform with our regulations.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Deported conspirators:

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister explain the significance of this clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is simply striking out the addition that was made to the act during the war period. It seems superfluous to retain the addition now.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Certain persons to be deemed to belong to the prohibited or undesirable classes:

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Old section 41 was amended in 1919 by adding a new clause embodying numerous reasons why people could be apprehended and sent out of the country by the Minister of Immigration. It has been taken exception to by a great many people and I thought it well to revert to the old section. Therefore section 3 follows the wording of section 41 prior to amendment at that time.

Mr. CARROLL: Has any outside influence been brought to bear upon the minister to have this amendment made?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I would not say that; but it does seem to give rather drastic power to the minister, a power that I think in most cases could very well be exercised by the courts. Of course, it may be said that an individual who has not estab-

lished his domicile in Canada should be absolutely under the control of the Department of Immigration by reason of anything he may have done prior to his entry here, but the department still has very considerable power over such an individual and it was felt that perhaps the courts could deal with cases of this kind.

Mr. ARTHURS: In view of the fact that section 2 is repealed, which dealt with persons who were or might be regarded as dangerous or hostile to the Allied cause during the war, why should section 3 be continued? For instance, if a soap box orator is arrested he may be deported next day.

Mr. McMURRAY: Apparently section 3 is a mere repetition of the provisions contained in the old section, which enumerates in detail those who are deemed to belong to the prohibited classes. Why does the minister re-enact this section?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend will notice that some of the more rigid clauses of section 41 of chapter 26 are not contained in the section as it stood before the amendment of 1919. For example:

> Every person who by word or act in Canada seeks to overthrow by force or violence the government of or constituted law and authority in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or Canada, or any of the provinces of Canada, or the government of any other of His Majesty's dominions, colonies, possessions or dependencies, or advocates the assassination of any official of any of the said governments or of any foreign government, or who in Canada defends or suggests the unlawful destruction of property or by word or act creates or attempts to create any riot or public disorder in Canada, or who without lawful authority assumes any powers of government in Canada or in any part thereof, or who by common repute belongs to or is suspected of belonging to any secret society or organization.

That comes out; it is not in section 41 of the amended act. Then, coming down to the last part of the old section, these words are omitted:

> Provided that this section shall not apply to any person who is a British subject, either by reason of birth in Canada, or by reason of naturalization in Canada.

Otherwise the new section 41 is practically the same as the old one. It looked like rather a wide power to put in the hands of any individual, to deport a man on the ground of common repute. I think all the power that any minister requires is contained in the new section 41.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why are the words "Canadian citizen" used in this bill? According to the Naturalization Act we are all British citizens, are we not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I presume my hon. friend is right, but I simply copied section 41 as it stood prior to the amendment.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why copy it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Because I think it covers every contingency that might arise in connection with which the minister would desire to have authority for the purposes of deportation.

Mr. JACOBS: I can foresee a case, if it were made wider, where a British citizen from India might advocate the overthrow of the Empire, and so on, and we would not be able to have him deported.

Mr. McMURRAY: I cannot let this clause pass without challenging at least a portion of it. Sections 40 and 41 set forth those who are not desirable as Canadian citizens and who can be deported on account of their misdemeanors, and so on. Section 41 as set out in the bill distinctly provides that—

> Any person. . . . who shall by word or act create or attempt to create riot or public disorder in Canada—

shall be classed as undesirable. In the enforcement of this act, therefore, a British citizen who has been in Canada for less than five years can be deported by an immigration official. The definition of "Canadian citizen" as set forth in the act is as follows:

> "Canadian citizen" means—
> I. A person born in Canada who has not become an alien;
> II. A British subject who has Canadian domicile.

In order to get Canadian domicile he must be here five years.

Mr. JACOBS: Oh, no.

Mr. McMURRAY: That is what the act says:

> Canadian domicile can only be acquired, for the purposes of this act, by a person having his domicile for at least five years in Canada after having been landed therein within the meaning of this act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That applies to persons from foreign countries, not to British subjects.

Mr. McMURRAY: It says, "having been landed therein within the meaning of this act." If I am right in my contention, and I think I am, this simply provides that a British citizen who has lived four years in Canada and who becomes mixed up in some way with a riot is deprived of his ordinary right of trial by jury and can be deported by a mere immigration agent. I think that is putting too great a power in the hands of the immigration offi-

cial. There is a provision in the act dealing with cases where deportation may be had on the ground of moral turpitude, but here is a case where a man gets mixed up, intentionally or unintentionally, in a riot, and for that he can be deported without trial. I really think that is going too far.

Mr. ARTHURS: I wish to ask the Minister of Justice whether a British citizen is required to be in Canada five years before he acquires Canadian citizenship or British citizenship within Canada?

Sr LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. BAXTER: The only reason why we confine it to Canadian citizenship is that we cannot turn a Canadian citizen out of his own country; there is no place to which he can be deported. But if a man has come here and got the benefit of naturalization and then misbehaved himself along the lines prohibited by this act, I think his naturalization should be forfeited and he should be turned out of the country.

Mr. JACOBS: He would then be a citizen without a country, because, when he becomes a British citizen, he abjures the citizenship of the country from which he came.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So far as I understand the section, I favour it. It merely declares that anyone not a British subject resident in Canada—that is really what "Canadian citizen" means—may be classed as an undesirable citizen. What, then, is he subject to? I understand, it is deportation within three years after arrival. And what else?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my right hon. friend refer to a British citizen in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I refer to an undesirable citizen.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If he were an alien we could deport him during any period up to five years, or until he became naturalized. Of course, the question of domicile, and domicile can be obtained in five years, would have some bearing on the matter. It is very doubtful whether under section 41 as we are amending it we could deport a British subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I assume that the old act goes, and I favour that, as we are now some distance from the extraordinary circumstances that justified its enactment. But what is the use of declaring that a man is an undesirable citizen unless some consequence is to follow? The minister says that if that undesirable citizen happens to be an alien he may be deported up to—well, really up to the time he becomes naturalized.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. After five years' residence he becomes domiciled. That has some bearing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then he cannot be deported.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is doubtful if he could.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I understood. We will assume that is correct. If he is not a British subject, then within five years of his arrival he may be deported, providing he is undesirable. Consequently, it is worth while declaring what will make him an undesirable citizen; I admit that, but that refers only to the alien. What is the use of declaring that some other person, not an alien, is an undesirable citizen if no result can possibly follow from that declaration? What I am getting at is this: The minister is confining it to Canadian citizens. Supposing a British citizen, not a Canadian citzen, arrives here. What is the use of declaring how he may become an undesirable citizen? —there would be no power to visit anything upon him.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We could deport him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, certainly. He may make false representations on entering Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would not be covered by this bill.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of course not, but my hon. friend asks what is the use of declaring what makes him undesirable. Pardon me, I get my hon. friend's point—why put him in the undesirable class as covered by section 41?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have doubts about that. Even in the clause as it stands to-day, which was enacted during the troublous times, it is provided that:

> It shall be the duty of any officer becoming cognizant thereof and of the clerk, secretary or other official of any municipality in Canada wherein any such person may be, forthwith to send a written complaint to the minister, giving full particulars: Provided, that this section shall not apply to any person who is a British subject—

So that even in the most strenuous times it did not apply to the British subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil) (Reading):

—either by reason of birth in Canada or by reason of naturalization in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It applied to the British subject.

Mr. McMURRAY: That was the only one it did apply to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was the reason of the great roar against it. The alien may now be deported if undesirable, and it is worth while declaring what makes him undesirable. But what is the use of declaring what makes this other man undesirable? He may not be a Canadian citizen within the meaning of our law, but the minister is defining what makes him undesirable, and after he is through with that we are where we began because he can visit nothing on him.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend has just argued that the minister may deport him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. You could under the old law.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Under this act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You cannot deport him under this act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The provision of section 41 applies. I am limited between the argument of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the argument of my hon. friend for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray).

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will take the three classes. There is first of all the Canadian citizen, secondly there is the alien, thirdly there is the British subject who is not a Canadian citizen;—now we have everybody. Coming to the alien, it is worth while declaring what makes him undesirable because he may be deported after this passes. Coming, though, to the British subject who is not a Canadian citizen, what is the use of declaring what makes him undesirable, because after this passes he cannot be deported—he might have been under the old law. What I mean is, this should only apply to aliens.

Mr. McMURRAY: He could not be deported under the old act, I submit, unless section 42 in the old act is struck out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY: Section 42 refers back to section 41 specifically and gives power to a board of inquiry, or any officer acting as such, to deport the particular persons named therein, who are British subjects.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the old law.

Mr. McMURRAY: Yes. And section 42 is not repealed, it still stands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, I thought it was the minister's intention to repeal every phase of that law.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, only section 41.

Mr. McMURRAY: So that stands now and the provisions in section 3 here apply only to those who are not Canadian citizens, that is, it applies to British subjects and aliens, and under section 42, which is still in the Act, a British subject can be deported from this country upon a mere inquiry by an immigration agent, which I say is an exceedingly dangerous thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not intend to repeal that? I understood that was his intention and the main purpose of this legislation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not had representations made to me except in regard to the provisions contained in section 41.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is not the hon. member for North Winnipeg right?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The really objectionable feature brought to my attention was the apprehension, on report, of some person belonging to a secret society. I therefore just took the provisions of section 1 as it existed and inserted the amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I want the minister and the House to understand is this, that if the minister is going to leave section 42 in effect he leaves the whole substance of the previous legislation there. It is not, perhaps, very becoming of me to argue against it because I was responsible for its passing.

Mr. McMURRAY: And you have repented since.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all, not at all.

Mr. McMURRAY: I am sorry to hear it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sections 41 and 42 were passed unanimously by this House, so that if there is anything meet for repentance on my part it will be meet for repentance on the part of every hon. member who was in the House at that time.

Mr. JACOBS: Was it unanimous?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. It was unanimously passed by the House, and rightly passed by the House. I was one of those who, having supported it stood by it and defended it, did not seek to get votes by pretended opposition to it after I had supported it.

Mr. JACOBS: See where it landed you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I know; and many another good thing we did lost us votes as well—things the present government is doing now after securing all the votes they could get by opposing them. And apparently this is in the same category as the rest. But when that period passed—and no one should know better than the hon. member for North Winnipeg that the period existed and it did pass; every hon. member of this House knows that we had very serious times in this country for a short time after the war, as they had in every country in the world—but when that time passed the government of the day itself introduced legislation repealing sections 41 and 42, introduced it by a member of the government.

Mr. McMURRAY: Then there was repentance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No repentance at all. What does the hon. member want to put that word in for all the time? Because we passed legislation for a particular time, and stated it to be so, and the period passing we come and move the House to repeal it, we are only acting in accordance with the dictates of common sense. But the Senate voted it down. I feel safe in saying that a majority of those against it were of the Liberal party.

Mr. JACOBS: I think not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do, and I think I am correct. Of those for the legislation naturally a majority adhered to the government's view. Not all, I know many were opposed to it; but the majority, I think, of those opposed were of the Liberal party. Consequently, the legislation failed to pass. I speak now subject to correction but I think this government introduced legislation repealing it, or was it the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg, (Mr. Woodsworth)?

Mr. JACOBS: It did not get through the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Apparently under the government supported by my hon. friend.

Mr. JACOBS: The committee reported against it.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The committee reported against it? Very well, that is the situation. And the government appointed the committee. So, apparently, there was no very great sincerity in all the roar there was against the legislation. Let me put that before the mind of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray). Apparently the essential part, the heart, of that legislation is still to remain. I am making no particular complaint. Personally I would rather have it go; I do not think there is reason for it now. I am thoroughly convinced that there was necessity for it, thoroughly convinced that it rendered good service, that it helped to tide over a very serious situation, and that under it no specific injustice was done. I do not know whether there was one deported under it or not but it served as a deterrent. If there was any there was none save one whose deportation was recommended by an investigator, a member of the bench of Manitoba. But there was no abuse of the legislation whatever. The antagonism to it was purely political, antagonism for votes. That is now demonstrated by the subsequent repeal of the section.

Mr. McMURRAY: My right hon. friend is in error.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what?

Mr. McMURRAY: That this section applied only to one man. Under my right hon. friend's government it was applied solely to British subjects.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes?

Mr. McMURRAY: To Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I was right in my statement.

Mr. McMURRAY: My right hon. friend approved, and still approves, of the passing of an act that would deport British subjects from this country without trial by a jury.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not deport British subjects, if undesirable, from this country just as much as aliens? I would be in favour of deporting any person who was undesirable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I stated was that I did not think there was any deportation under it but that if there was a deportation there was only one recommended by an investigator, a member of the bench of Manitoba. The hon. member says there was none at all deported.

Mr. McMURRAY: Not then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly what I said.

Mr. McMURRAY: I think the real ground for not doing it was the protest made by the people of Winnipeg. What absolutely prohibited it from being done was the feeling aroused in that city. I ask my right hon. friend if there were not strong representations from all over Canada to change that policy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And very strong recommendations not to make any change.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I can hardly understand what the minister means when he says there were no representations made to him with regard to the further amendment of this act. Last year I introduced a bill which was pretty thoroughly discussed in committee and came before this House looking not merely at the emendation of section 41 but to the radical reconstruction of the act. The recommendation of the committee was that the entire act should be redrafted at the coming session. That recommendation to the House last year is not in any sense carried out by the present amendments, but simply a slight modification of one or two clauses. Again this year I had the privilege of spending some time with the acting minister over some of these clauses, and urged as strongly as I could—and I had a considerable body of opinion be-
5 p.m. hind me—that there should be changes not merely in respect of one or two clauses but of the whole principle of the bill.

It does seem to me that we are here faced very clearly with a large issue, the issue, as to whether citizens or residents of this country shall have the right to a fair trial. I was very much interested to hear the leader of the Opposition say that the time had gone by when this kind of legislation is necessary. We would differ as to whether it was ever necessary, as I take it that the time when we most need the safeguards of the law is when there is some extraordinary excitement. There was a time of hysteria several years ago and it was during that time we needed the law to safeguard men from those who were caught up by the hysteria. It was at that time this law was passed—a law which took away all safeguards and deprived men who had been in this country for years, whether of British or of foreign birth, of the right to a trial by jury. I think it was little less than a plot which was organized at that time that placed on the statute book legislation by which men were to be deported from Canada without trial by jury. However, that is past and if there is a reflection on the Conservative government—the government in power in 1919—for having passed legislation of that kind at that time I would say that the leader of the Opposition is right when he says that the reflection is even greater on the present government when two or three years after that trouble, they refuse to repeal an obnoxious act of this nature. It ought to be known to every British subject of this country born outside Canada that today he has absolutely no right to trial by jury. That has not seemed to enter the consciousness of a good many men who were born outside of Canada. I say "British born" because, speaking frankly, that is a good basis on which to appeal. I do not want to stress that unduly. I think the hon. member across the way is right when he says that everyone —whether British born or alien born—ought to have the protection of the laws in this country. But it does seem to me that the British born should be stirred up a little bit when they reflect that when they crossed the ocean to this country they forfeited this right which we have all been told has belonged to Britishers ever since the time of the Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights.

Now coming to particular clauses I would say that the key to the whole situation lies in the definitions. According to sub-section (i) of section 2—this is chapter 25 "An Act to amend the Immigration Act":

> (i) Canadian domicile can only be acquired, for the purposes of this act, by a person having his domicile for at least five years in Canada after having been landed therein within the meaning of this act.

That would seem to show that any immigrant to this country, whether an alien or a British born person, may acquire Canadian domicile in five years and that having acquired Canadian domicile he is protected. But that is not so because a little further down we find this clause:

> —and provided further that no person who belongs to the prohibited or undesirable classes within the meaning of section forty-one of this act shall be capable of acquiring Canadian domicile.

There is where the difficulty lies. It is all very well to say that a man who has been five years in this country acquired Canadian domicile; but if for reasons thereinafter enumerated he is considered to be undesirable within the meaning of the act he becomes incapable of acquiring Canadian domicile whether he has been here five years or twenty years. The safeguards which he ought to have are taken away.

Now if we turn to the other sections, we find that there are a variety of reasons under which people may be considered as being

undesirable. It is quite true that slight modifications are being proposed in section 41; but the other sections are not being modified, and they will still leave anybody born outside of this country liable to deportation. For instance, there are these three clauses:

(n) Persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the government of Canada or of constituted law and authority, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property.

I do not think any one in this House is going to advocate the things which this section seeks to prohibit. But that is not the point. The point is that a man may be accused of doing these things, and if he is accused of doing these things, he may be deported without opportunity of being heard by a court. What we are arguing for is that he should have a fair trial and be judged as to whether he is guilty of these things or not. I know the attitude of some of us has been absolutely misrepresented in this regard, and that because we were trying to safeguard the individual, it has been said that we are advocating all these things that are being prohibited in this legislation. That is not the case. We are advocating the safeguarding of every man, by insisting that he shall be given the right of trial by jury. The next paragraph reads:

(o) Persons who are members of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or advocating or teaching the duty, necessity or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the government of Canada or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or advocating or teaching the unlawful destruction of property;

Here again, these things that are mentioned are doubtless unsocial in their character; but the question is one of interpretation. For example, the first clause reads:

Persons who are members of or affilated with any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government.

That may easily be interpreted as applying to anyone who criticizes the government. As regards the last clause:

Or advocating or teaching the unlawful destruction of property.

Supposing a strike occurred, as, for instance, was the case last year in the Cape Breton district, and the men who were in charge of the property or working on the property quit work. It might be said that there was danger of flooding of the mines, and that possibly destruction of property might be caused thereby.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

This clause might be interpreted to mean that any man who advocated that the men should quit work under such circumstances, and possibly bring about a loss of property, would thereby under this clause be regarded as undesirable and liable to deportation without trial. I am not advocating the destruction of property; I am not here defending the man who seeks to destroy property. That is not the point. I urge that a man accused of such things ought to be tried before his peers, given a fair chance to present his case, and not shuffled out of the country without a trial. There is a similar objection to paragraph (p), the next following:

(p) Enemy aliens or persons who have been alien enemies and who were or may be interned on or after the 11th day of November, 1918, in any part of His Majesty's dominions or by any of His Majesty's allies.

I think that is one of the clauses that, it is suggested, should be changed, and I am very glad that change is being made, because here again certain men, many thousands of them in western Canada who are technically alien enemies feel very bitterly the injustice of being brought under this act. An Austrian friend of mine said to me during the war: "Austria was an enemy of ours"—he was a Galician, a Ukrainian—"long before she was an enemy of Great Britain's. We came to this country in order to get away from Austrian control." This man was technically an alien enemy and, coming under this clause, he was liable to deportation as an undesirable. It became absolutely impossible for him ever to acquire Canadian citizenship, though he might have been five years or twenty-five years in Canada. This question of domicile is to me the most serious part of the act, and one that is not being touched by the amendments which the minister has introduced. It seems to me that we ought to have such a thorough-going revision of this act that it would not be possible for any man who has been resident five years in Canada to be deported without trial. I think that is clear, and a great responsibility is put on the Liberal government of this country if they will allow it to be said, when there is no trouble in Canada at all, that they refuse to repeal legislation under which it is quite possible to deport British-born subjects without trial.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I desire to have this clause stand, because I was not aware that we were not doing just exactly what my hon. friend is referring to. I have no desire to deport a British subject, even if

he could come under the operation of this clause. I will take it back and redraft it.

As regards foreigners coming to Canada, I do not agree with my hon. friend. I do not see why Canada should not decide for herself who shall become citizens of this country. I do not see that the mere fact that a foreigner may have been in Canada for five years, or whatever the period may be until he becomes naturalized and domiciled, should prevent him from being subject to deportation by order of the minister. I see no hardship in that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Even after five years?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not after five years, because it is his privilege then to become a citizen of Canada if he can qualify. But if he cannot qualify, he must remain in the same position.

Section 3 stands.

On section 7—Discharging crew without examination:

Mr. BAXTER: What is the change in this clause?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is increasing the fine.

Mr. BAXTER: He pays it into the department really.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Deposit as security for return of deserters:

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have noticed a number of telegrams in the hands of hon. members, and I have one myself from the Shipping Federation of Montreal protesting against section 8 which provides for fines to be imposed. But inasmuch as the bill is to remain in committee I am prepared to hear representations which, if they are reasonable, I shall be glad to consider. I would point out, however, that we experience considerable difficulty in connection with this very matter. Ship-masters come into a port and are careless about the care of their crew some of whom perhaps desert, and we have great trouble apprehending them at times. The worst feature of this is that very frequently a man who gets into the country in this way is a person who would not be able to pass the immigration officer. We know of a case in point at the moment. A seaman deserted and afterwards became ill; he is now a public charge of Canada and has been for the past year. I am convinced therefore that we need this section, and I do not think it will create any hardship on shipowners. It will, of course, create a hardship if they allow seamen to desert without duly presenting them to the immigration officer for inspection before entering.

Mr. JACOBS: I have received the following telegram from the secretary of the Shipping Federation; he says:

> Seventy-two thousand seamen passed through this port last season and accounted for under the shipping acts controlled by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Immigration Act gradually usurping control from proper officers under shipping acts causing duplication of work. Each seaman is provided with continuous discharge book with his record as to conduct and ability which is checked up by proper officers at this port at beginning and end of voyage Seamen are regarded as specially privileged class and any intereference with them liable cause retaliation by other nations. Respectfully ask before any action taken that the Shipping Federation of Canada be given opportunity being heard before committee of House.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is absolutely no attempt on the part of the department to interfere with the Shipping Federation, but we do desire to protect ourselves and I think we are right in doing so. Why should the people of Canada through the negligence of a shipmaster be called upon to pay for the care of a mariner who deserts and becomes a public charge? We are simply taking steps to protect ourselves, and if that is an injury to shipping, then I am afraid we shall have to insist on its being done.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that the bill is to remain in committee until a delegation waits upon the minister?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. BAXTER: The position of the master of a vessel is a very difficult one. It is rather hard to tell whether any particular member of a crew intends to desert. During the very short experience I had with the Customs department I know that there were cases that came before the department that were quite painful, where vessels were liable for a fine because of the improper acts of some members of the crew—acts that could scarcely be detected even by the greatest vigilance on the part of the officers. When you find seamen practically conspiring to leave a vessel, it seems to me you are putting a very heavy burden upon the master or the shipowner if you impose penalties for the acts of members of the crew. Generally they are in a state of antagonism, and certainly the master is not at all likely to be in the confidence of the seamen. That is one point

I would stress. I know that the minister wants his law to be fair above all things. While I do not ordinarily take the position, yet I feel that the stress of the war period having passed, it might not be out of place to consider with regard to deportation whether, if not a jury, which is not always the best way of determining questions, at least some form of tribunal of the department, if not a judicial body, could not be instituted to hear both sides of the case before a man is deported. It is usually very easy for an official getting information from one side only to form a prejudice against a particular individual. I admit that he is not likely to be prejudiced; I admit that in all probability, if there is a complaint, the person complained against will be found to deserve deportation. But still there is always the chance that a false story may be given credence and a man may be unjustly used. I think we all agree, irrespective of any shade of party in the House, that the best recommendation for our Canadian institutions is the ability and the willingness to do clear and full justice in every instance. I should like to see an opportunity given every man to be heard in his own behalf before sentence of deportation is pronounced against him.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The fullest opportunity is given the individual.

Mr. BAXTER: That may be, but not under the act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That opportunity is always given even in cases where we reject people who endeavour to enter the country. There is no hasty taking hold of an individual and bundling him out of the country. I agree with much that my hon. friend has said. So far I have not had to deal with a single case of the kind, so that I have no personal experience in regard to seamen. But I am dealing daily with cases of entry into Canada, where the individual has no claim on earth upon the country but is simply seeking to get into Canada. In every such case we give the fullest opportunity for him to present his case. Not only that; he is kept for a period in which he may substantiate any claims he makes in order that he may establish his fitness to enter the country. It is not likely therefore that we shall be harsh on any person who has any sort of claim upon us. My hon. friends from British Columbia, I might say here will protest most strenuously against any latitude in this matter. They will say that this is one of the methods employed by shipping people to get orientals into the country without the knowledge of the Department of Immigration. It is obvious that we must be fairly drastic with shipping coming into the ports of the country. What is the incentive for the mariner to avoid the immigration officer? He would be admitted into the country the same as any other individual if he passed through the proper channel, and it is quite evident therefore, in nine cases out of ten, that he avoids the immigration officer simply because he anticipates trouble in being passed. So that the only recourse we have is to be fairly drastic with the shipmaster.

Mr. BAXTER: The minister will find, I think, that he has power enough under what we might call the Chinese exclusion act—because that is practically what it is—to deal with Chinese; and by similar means he will be able to cope with Japanese. But the general Immigration Act must deal with people who are not within the prescribed Asiatic classes. I am not finding the least fault with anything the department deems it best to do; I have no criticism to offer because I have no particular knowledge of the subject. One likes, however, to see the law always provide an opportunity for the under dog to be heard, and I think that is only fair. The minister, I am sure, agrees with the sentiment; the only question is as to how far we go respectively in practice.

Mr. LEWIS: I would make a suggestion to the minister when he is reconsidering section 3. There seems to be some doubt and difference of opinion as to when a British subject becomes a Canadian citizen. It is fully understood that the alien has the advantage in knowing the specific time when he becomes a Canadian citizen by reason of his being naturalized. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) says it requires five years' domicile for a British subject to become a Canadian citizen; other members on the government side do not agree with him. It seems to me that a clause might well be inserted whereby a British subject living in this country would know definitely when he becomes a Canadian citizen.

Progress reported.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. JAMES A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the third reading of Bill No. 24 to amend the Copyright Act 1921.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has my hon. friend any objection to the Italian treaty being given third reading?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was to give the member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) some information on the third reading. The hon. member is not in the chamber. I have no objection to the third reading, myself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then No. 25 on the order paper.

NATURALIZATION ACTS AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 85 to amend the Naturalization Acts, 1914 and 1920, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 4—Repeals:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How does this matter now stand? I rather understood that the minister was making inquiries regarding certain suggestions as to consolidation of the law.

Mr. COPP: Consideration of this bill stood over last week on the application of my hon. friend for St. John (Mr. Baxter) that a memorandum be made with regard to consolidating these acts. Such a memorandum was prepared and forwarded to him.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not know whether it will be effectual or not, but the substance of this memorandum in itself constitutes, I think, the very strongest argument in favour of the position which I took that it would be well to consolidate the law. I have gone over the pamphlet with great care and find there are what I might call detached portions of legislation that really have no relation to anything and I think can do no possible good. Then again I find in this pamphlet, which I might call the Red Book, a most absolute misinterpretation of the law. It is really astonishing to me that reputable officers of the Civil Service should send out a document so misleading. I have gone very carefully into the question debated by my right hon. leader and I am satisfied that the statement in the red pamphlet that the Secretary of State can grant naturalization even against an adverse report is absolutely untenable from a legal standpoint. Those who have contended that it was necessary first that there should be a favourable report, and that then the minister might refuse, are absolutely right. No lawyer could possibly give a different opinion.

Now, I should like to call the minister's attention to this white pamphlet. If he compared it with the Dominion act he would find that the words at about line 23, "Provided that the child of a British subject" should go up after line 4. The whole thing here as reprinted is a jumble and does not reflect any credit whatever on those who compiled it. I have gone through the pamphlet section by section and must say that the whole is a very fair almost a literal, reproduction of the Imperial legislation. Some slight alterations are made, as for instance in section 7, where in England they have a committee instead of a commission to investigate the standing of an alien, and the Secretary of State acts directly, while here it is done by the Governor in Council. I cannot see any objection to this; it is pretty much a matter of formality.

The really substantial objection to the bill, however, is in the repeal of pactically sections 19 to 24 and allowing section 25 to stand as the vital part. This committee, I think, will have to pass upon the question of whether naturalization should be the sole prerogative of the Secretary of State working through any agencies which he may prescribe by regulations, which will be unknown to the people to be affected and to the rest of the public until those regulations are promulgated; or whether we shall have some system, not necessarily a county court judge, but some tribunal which will be local in its character causing as little expense and labour to the person seeking to be naturalized as well may be, and yet providing some efficient inquiry into his standing and character. The bill would be better if the Secretary of State would insert in it that a prerequisite for naturalization should be a favourable report by the secret police of Canada—if such a body exists, and I think there is something answering to that description—or by the mounted police, or if he would prescribe something other than the mere unrestrained will of an officer of the government. As the office is occupied at present I would not be doing any honour to my own province and I would not be doing justice to the personal friendship which has always existed between the hon. Secretary of State and myself if I made any reflections upon what he might do in his official capacity. I am quite willing to trust him individually, but if I contracted to trust him as Secretary of State I do not know to what that might commit me in the line of succession.

Mr. PUTNAM: You might come into power.

Mr. BAXTER: And then things might be a thousand times worse than my hon. friend imagines, because I fancy he has spent the greater part of his life in painting pictures of what one might call imaginary Toryism. As the witches in Macbeth put into their caldron everything nauseous and noxious, so he in his picture has imagined everything evil and labelled it "Toryism". But he has painted it conversely from a reflection in his memory of the virtues as he considers them, of the party with which he is associated.

Mr. PUTNAM: The picture I was not painting, and one it would be useless to try to paint, was my hon. friend's imagination.

Mr. BAXTER: Do not attempt to gild refined gold, or paint the lily, or commit any of these other excesses. But really, apart from all politics—because this question of the right of citizenship is deserving of a higher type of discussion than the ordinary hustings style—do we not need some tribunal that will be known to the people, that will be readily accessible, and that will pass upon a man's qualifications for citizenship? I do not think that the county courts were bad so far as their dealings with this matter were concerned. I agree that the reports very often were not worth much, but that was due not to any want of care on the part of the judges but to the fact that they had no officer and no money that they could employ for the making of investigations. They have had to deal simply with affidavits or with the persons who were presented to them or came before them. They had to make the best investigation they could under the circumstances, and naturally it fell far short of completeness. I know cases where county court judges have been assiduous in shutting out the class of people whom they looked upon as undesirable, and I give them credit for doing the best they could. The mounted police, however, do not extend to all parts of Canada, and I do not know how you could get a report in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island—that is the part of the universe I know most about. You might get it from a member of parliament, but perhaps he would not know anything more about a man than whether or not he was likely to be a friendly voter, and that is not what we want. The mounted police do not go down there unless they are sent for in a case of emergency. There is a branch of the Dominion police—I do not know what you call it—which assists the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue in the enforcement of the narcotic drug law and that sort of thing, and it is possible that an investigation under this act might be made by that branch. But that would be a matter of regulation under this act. Why not make it possible to read the statute through and be informed by it what particular officer would investigate a man's character? I should be willing if the minister would provide that what I would call unofficially the secret police of Canada should make a report upon each case and submit it to the county court judge. There you have effective machinery; you are sure of an investigation. These police know pretty well the malefactors throughout the Dominion, and their work would not be partisan or political. I admit frankly that the section that the Secretary of State desires to preserve is practically an exact reproduction of the British section, and it may be said that if it is good enough for Great Britain it should be good enough here. Well, there is all the difference in the world between the settled, steady and orderly administration of the British official departments and the political interference which has so often occurred in this country.

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend suggest that there are no politics in Great Britain?

Mr. BAXTER: Great Britain is rampant with politics, but there is not very much immigration into Great Britain.

Mr. JACOBS: Not much immigration?

Mr. BAXTER: If there is much immigration into Great Britain, the failure of this regulative system is demonstrated by the millions of pounds that Great Britain had to pay in order to extirpate in time of war the German spies who had got in in time of peace under this very set of regulations, without proper inquiry into their characters. And that is the system that my hon. friend, by inference, supports and wants to have introduced into this country.

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend not think that these Germans could have got into England notwithstanding any such system?

Mr. BAXTER: If Great Britain had realized how dangerous these people were and had determined to exclude them, I am confident they would not have got in. My hon. friend will agree that immigration laws can be enforced.

Mr. JACOBS: Now that Great Britain is legislating in the light of her experience in the late war, why is it that no change has been made with respect to the naturalization of Germans and their entry into the country?

Mr. BAXTER: My hon. friend will have to ask the statesmen of Great Britain for an answer to that question. If I may again, at my own peril, exercise my imagination, I presume the reason is that Great Britain is to-day, as she always has been in the past, too magnanimous to traitors. I only repeat that in point of form it would be much better to bring down a consolidated measure, even if that necessitated a delay until next year. I would like the Secretary of State to consider the re-establishment or the continuance of some form of local tribunal such as we are accustomed to, aiding it in any way he likes by reports from any investigators, police or others who can give that assistance. But let us have the investigation in the community where the proposed British subject lives and moves and has his being, where a fair inquiry can be made. Do not let us test the fitness of a man simply by long range correspondence with Ottawa.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): This bill as introduced is a rather innocent looking bill, but it deals wth one of the most important matters that can possibly come before this parliament, namely, our citizenship. The two questions involved are, first, as to the procedure in connection with naturalization, and, secondly,—this is the more important one, it seems to me—whether we are to cheapen or depreciate the value of British citizenship. Some confusion existed in the minds of many hon. members when this bill was introduced because of the contention then made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) to the effect that under section 2 there rested in him an absolute discretion as to the granting of a certificate of naturalization and that this provision was entirely apart from and independent of the provisions contained in sections 19 to 24 inclusive. I submit that a careful reading of the statute would convince the minister that the application referred to in section 2 is really the application that is referred to in sections 19 to 24. Whatever doubt there may be as to the law as it has heretofore existed, there can be no doubt as to the effect of this amendment, which is to place entirely in the discretion of the minister the granting in any and every case of a certificate of naturalization.

If this amendment is accepted by the House then there will be no provision in the statute for investigation. There will be no publicity in connection with the application. There will be no lapse of time necessary, as now exists, between the filing of the application and the granting of the certificate. The minister pointed out that in some cases the notice of the application might be posted inconspicuously or might not be seen. I submit that if the notice of application is posted in the office of the Clerk of the Peace and remains there for three months, and the application is then brought to the court and is there dealt with with all the regularity, with all the solemnity and with all the publicity that undoubtedly attends these applications, being read at the opening of the court in the presence of the jurors, the witnesses and the whole attendance at the court, there is a large measure of publicity involved in that. What does the minister propose to substitute for that publicity? Absolutely nothing is provided in this bill. What safeguards are provided? None do we find in this bill.

Why are these changes proposed? Who is asking for them? And what is the reason that they are brought forward at this time? It seems to me that the possibilities of the manipulation of naturalization certificates are very dangerous indeed if this bill goes through. If it is passed, what will be its effect and what will be the procedure? We can easily imagine some ambitious political candidate ascertaining the names of all those who are available for naturalization in his constituency, getting a set of forms filled out and coming down to the minister and urging speed and haste in determining these applications, and then going back with a bunch of naturalization certificates and passing them out to these people. I do not suggest that the minister has anything of that kind in mind, but I submit that it is all possible under the provisions of this bill. I do not think the minister ought to allow himself to be led into any such temptation as that.

Mr. COPP: I am safe.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): He may be able to resist it but "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

Mr. COPP: I would not be tempted even if my hon. friend came and asked me to do this thing for him.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I would not expect to be troubled with it because there are not many aliens in the part of the province from which I come. The minister's successor may not be as capable of resistance to temptation as the minister imagines himself to be in this particular respect. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is possible that these certificates might be peddled for political party purposes, and I do not think the House should pass any legislation that would make that possible. We should safeguard our citizenship, which we appreciate very highly. Our

neighbours to the south have had a rather sorrowful experience I think in connection with matters of this kind. Their citizenship has been depreciated and treated as of little value. We do not desire that in Canada. The alien who comes to reside with us should be impressed with the importance and value of British citizenship, and the responsibility which it imposes. The procedure provided by this bill is not calculated to bring that result.

The minister in the course of his address when the bill was introduced made some reflections upon the way in which the judges conduct these investigations. Speaking from my own knowledge in the province of Ontario I do not think there is any ground for any such complaint. These applications are dealt with in the same manner as any other item of court business, and the judges give the matter the careful and proper attention which it deserves.

I am opposed therefore to this bill in its present form because it is calculated, I think, to increase the expense in connection with the naturalization of aliens. It leaves the matter entirely at the discretion of the Secretary of State or other minister to whom the matter may be referred, and really creates him an autocrat in this matter. It leads to centralization. It removes the safeguards that at present exist in connection with the granting of these certificates, and does not provide for any reasonable or proper investigation before certificates are granted. It is capable of manipulation for political party purposes, and worse than all the most serious objection to the bill is that it tends to cheapen and depreciate the value of British citizenship.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At the last sitting the minister argued that he had power no matter what may have been the report of the judge, under section 23, to grant naturalization, that his power in this respect was absolute, that he did not need any favourable report. I contended at the time, he will remember, that he did under the law as it stands to-day require first a favourable report from the judge before he could exercise his discretion at all, and I suggested that he procure the opinion of the Justice department on the point. May I ask the minister if he has procured it.

Mr. COPP: I may say to my hon. friend that I did not understand him to ask me to get an opinion from the Justice department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggested it and expressed considerable confidence as to what it would be.

[Mr. H. A Stewart.]

Mr. COPP: It has not been referred to the Justice department particularly, but it has been looked into very carefully by the legal officers of my department, and they are very strongly of the opinion that the statement I made is correct and that the administration as carried out is correctly in line with the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really cannot hedp but say that the contention in my judgment is absurd. It is so manifest it is absurd, and I suggested at the last sitting that the opinion of the Justice department be procured. There must be some other clause or some other section that has not been drawn to my attention, that the minister has not referred to at all, if that can be the law. I do not think the minister should ask to go on with this legislation till he has produced the opinion of the Justice department on this point. Why, it is the whole point before the House. The minister would surely hardly dare to come to this House and ask that it confer on himself the whole jurisdiction in naturalization without any restraint whatever. Surely he would not. He says that has been the case before. I dispute it. It has not been the case before. Now then if he says I am wrong in that, I would like him to get the opinion of the Justice department of this government. Surely I am not asking for anything unreasonable. Even if the Justice department so rules, while it would be very strong in his support, I take the other view. But he should not come to this House unarmed with the opinion of that department and say to the House that the law as it stood before gave him unrestrained jurisdiction, that he is not asking now for any more unless he has the opinion of the Justice department at least to back him up.

I think this bill is audacious. It is an arrogant request to be brought forward particularly by those who have been ranting against autocracy and order in council government to seek to place in the hands of one of their own number the sole, unqualified control of the citizenship of Canada from this day on, naturalize whom they like and not naturalize whom they do not like, inquire where they like and not inquire where they do not like, ask whom they like and refuse to ask whom they do not like, get information if they want to or do without it if they so prefer—all that put into the power of the minister in connection with naturalization in a country like Canada.

Canada is a country into which, in the past, we have had large waves of immigration. Our citizenship to-day is a citizenship that has come from immigration, in very large measure from the naturalization of aliens, and to place

that vast power in the hands of a minister without any restraint or without any necessary preparation at all, is, I say, an audacious and arrogant request and I do not think it should be done. It never was intended before, I do not think it ever was the law before; in fact I feel entirely convinced it was not. I must say that I have observed with pleasure very considerable hesitancy on the part of lawyers sitting around my hon. friend against staking their professional reputations on asserting that under the law as it stood the minister could naturalize without first having received the favourable report of the investigating judge; there seems to be no possible reading of the legislation that will bring that result. So if the minister argues for this at all he should not do so on the authority of the law officers. I do not know who the law officer of his department is, but the law officer upon whom ministers should rely is the Department of Justice. Let the minister bring an opinion from the Department of Justice at least before he asks to go on with this legislation.

Mr. COPP: When my right hon. friend asks for information respecting any legislation emanating from the government it is only fair that it should be given to him; but when he suggests that in proposing the present bill I am acting arrogantly I do not think he is treating me with fairness. When this bill was up before I stated that the matter was one which had given the department a great deal of concern, and that I was bringing the measure forward for the sole purpose of improving the Naturalization Act which was placed upon the statute book by my right hon. friend. If the proposed legislation is not right I am perfectly willing that any defect should be remedied. If it is wrong to leave discretion in this matter entirely in the hands of the Secretary of State I, for one, am quite prepared to have that wrong righted. But I do say this to my right hon. friend: During the time I have had the administration of this act, I have found that the inquiry provided for under the statute, from the reports of the county court judges that have come to me, has been of no avail or value. Now I am quite willing to accept the suggestion—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister make that as a general assertion? He may have cases where the reports do not appear to be of value, but surely he does not ask us to believe that the statement is true generally? I have seen the judges in action—

Mr. COPP: So have I.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. The fact that what my hon. friend says is true in certain cases would not justify the sweeping assertion he has made. I have not seen any cases except those where the duties were carefully discharged.

Mr. COPP: If my right hon. friend will refer to the debates which took place during the passage of the acts of 1914 and of 1919, as well as the act of 1920, he will find that the Minister of Justice of that day and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) took exactly the opposite view and that the investigation, in regard to naturalization, was regarded as a huge joke.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister read the observations which establish that?

Mr. COPP: I shall be glad to do so after dinner.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BROWN: I should like to say a few words on this question of Canadian citizenship. To my mind this is one of the most important things we have discussed in this House, and it is time now we were beginning to correct some of the mistakes we made in the past. The mistake we made in the past seems to be that we regarded Canadian citizenship too lightly. Canadian citizenship, and the privileges that go with it, is something that is not to be lightly given or lightly taken away once it has been given. These are two mistakes that were made in the past. Canadian citizenship ought to be a privilege valued very highly by the Canadians, just as Roman citizenship was highly valued. I remember reading of one who said: "With a great price I obtained this freedom." But the man to whom he was speaking was able to retort: "But I was free born." We who are free born are very proud of the fact; but we ought to urge upon those who acquire Canadian citizenship by a price, that they should also be proud of it. Therefore, it is something that ought not to be too easy of attainment. While I would not like to put any unnecessary obstacles in the way of those who have fulfilled the conditions of Canadian citizenship, neither would I like to make it so easy of attainment that they would consider it as of but little value. Unfortunately, in the past the method by which large bunches

of foreigners have been given Canadian citizenship has not reflected credit upon us, nor has this been done in such a manner as to make those people esteem the privilege very highly.

I would sincerely regret if the bestowal of or the refusal to bestow Canadian citizenship should rest entirely in the hands of one man, no matter how good a man he might be. It would be presumptuous for a layman to undertake to express an opinion as to the interpretation of the law as it stands, although I have an opinion of what that interpretation should be, and I certainly have a clear idea as to what I think the law ought to be. I do not know whether the courts have functioned satisfactorily in the past. That is a matter with which I have had very little, indeed practically nothing to do; but if the courts have not functioned satisfactorily in the past, would it not be better to try to secure such amendments and arrangements as would assure that they do function satisfactorily, and thus make it perfectly certain that the proper inquiry should be made, that the proper steps should be taken, not necessarily with the absolute holding up of the proceedings, but so to delay them as to ensure that everything was done, calmly, deliberately and judiciously? Thus when the time comes for one of these foreigners who have come amongst us, to make his home here and to be naturalized, it should be impressed upon him that it is no small privilege that is being bestowed upon him; that it is something he might look forward to. In this we have again failed in our duty. We might have made it a great part of our educational system to instil into the minds of the children of these people, that it was a day to be looked forward to when their parents and they, through their parents, might enter into the privileges of Canadian citizenship. We sometimes think our friends across the line have gone too far in the matter of flag-waving; but they have laid a great deal of emphasis upon the privilege of American citizenship, whereas we have failed in some degree in the past in not laying sufficient emphasis upon Canadian citizenship and the privileges that go with it. I would wish that this parliament at this time would take such steps in such deliberate manner as would ensure that the next act that appears upon our statute books shall be such as to fulfil all the conditions of fairness and justice to those that come amongst us to make their homes in Canada, and at the same time such as to ensure that those whom we take into our family, shall be fully impressed with our ideals and institutions, and with the desire to help us to make Canada what we would like it to be.

[Mr. Brown.]

Mr. NEILL: I presume this is the proper place for me to move an amendment which would take the place of section 4. I would move to insert after section 3 a new section to be known as section 4, reading as follows:

> Subsection (e) of subsection (2) of section 7 of the Naturalization Acts, 1914 and 1920, is hereby amended by striking out the first two lines and substituting therefor the following:
>
> (e) Remains, according to the law of any foreign state, a subject of that state.

The original clause reads as follows. This is amongst the list of people whom the minister can de-naturalize, if I may use such a word. I am putting in the words "those who":

> Those who remain, according to the law of a state at war with His Majesty, a subject of that state.

In other words, I am applying to peace time conditions that were formerly inserted in case of war. The object of my amendment is to prevent a man from being a citizen of more than one country at the same time. While my remarks apply more particularly to those of the Japanese race in British Columbia, I wish to emphasize the point that I do not want to draw the debate along the lines of the necessity, or advisability, or lack of advisability of oriental immigration, because that has nothing whatever to do with the matter. Neither do I wish to make a plea for or against naturalization of orientals. I may have views on that subject but that is not the point at issue. I wish to confine this debate on the amendment purely to this point: Is it desirable that a man shall be a citizen of two countries at the same time? I might also say that it is about as feasible and reasonable to expect a man to be loyal to two countries at the same time, as it is to suggest that a woman should be faithful to two men at the same time. The propositions are somewhat allied.

We know when a man is naturalized, especially if he is of mature age before being naturalized, he will always retain a certain sympathy for the country of his origin. We expect that even under most favourable conditions. All we ask of him is that he dissociate himself from his country of origin, and show a genuine desire to affiliate himself with the country of his adoption. I propose to show that in the case of this particular race, the Japanese, the Japanese government maintains the closest jurisdiction, —for that is the proper word—control and, I think I can say, practically government over its nationals in a case like this. They

do not pretend to expatriate them or allow them to be expatriated. I maintain therefore that under these conditions this supposed naturalization of Japanese as British subjects is more or less, and a good deal more than less, a farce.

It is a well-known fact throughout the civilized world that the British Crown stands behind British subjects, and no trouble or expense is too great to right the wrongs of those subjects or to vindicate their wrongful death. But once a citizen of the British Empire has forfeited his rights under the British Crown, once he has alienated himself by adopting the nationality of another country, the British government has nothing more to do with him; it takes no more interest in him, but regards him entirely as an alien; which is an absolutely proper course to pursue. I am subject to correction, of course, but I do not believe there is another country in the world which to-day allows a man to be a citizen of two countries at the same time. It may be said that the United States does that, but the case is not parallel. The United States does not naturalize orientals at all, therefore the question cannot arise in that regard. In the United States they have a problem which is somewhat allied inasmuch as there are in that country a large number of Japanese born in America who claim the right to vote there, and are still Japanese subjects; and there is a strong agitation going on now to deal with the matter. But the case is not exactly parallel to this.

Now, I am going to be very brief and I shall not go into any long quotations from pamphlets or other documents I want to quote however three sentences of the evidence given before the Fisheries Commission in British Columbia last year. There appeared before the commission a naturalized Japanese named Hoyuma Yonemura, who had been naturalized ten years, and these questions were asked him:

Q. Have you ever become expatriated from Japan?—A. No.

Q. And you never made application for expatriation?—A. I did, but could not succeed. That expatriation is in question now in the House of Commons in Japan.

Q. Are all naturalized Japanese in this country still citizens of Japan according to the law of Japan?—A. Yes.

That is the sworn evidence of a Japanese naturalized British subject. Let me now quote from a book called "Facts," the pamphlet alluded to by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) who described it as propaganda. It is got out by the Japanese Consul General in Canada and I shall not express any opinion as to the merits of it or its good taste, or as to whether or not it is propaganda. I want to quote it, being assured that what I quote is at least as favourable to Japan as it possibly can be made. I cannot be charged with exaggeration in order to prove my case when I quote from this source. I am quoting now from page 34:

The Japanese law concerning nationality. Article 20. In the case of a Japanese subject who has acquired foreign nationality by reason of birth in a foreign country and domicile in that country, he or she may be expatriated with the permission of the Minister of State for Home Affairs.

That is, they can be expatriated from Japan with the consent of the Japanese government. That seems reasonable; all they have to do is to ask permission. Well, there are two objections to that, and the first is that they do not do it. It is never, or hardly ever, done, and that is a fairly good reason for objecting to it. In the United States, which has always been a good example to take in this matter, because they are further along the line in the Japanese question than we are, there are some 90,000 American-born Japanese in Hawaii and continental America entitled to all the rights of American citizenship, and according to a statement made by the Foreign Office—that is to say, the United States Foreign Office, at Tokyo, in September, 1920, there had been only 73 applications from these 90,000 American-born Japanese for expatriation, and permission had been granted by the Japanese government in 64 cases. So that out of 90,000 men claiming to be citizens of the United States with the right to vote there at that time, two and a half years ago, only 73 applications had been made for permission to be expatriated, and of these only 64 had been granted. Does that fact not back up the evidence given by the Japanese during the Fisheries Commission which I have already quoted? I said there were two reasons. That is one of them. As regards the second, I will quote again from this pamphlet "Facts." Article 24 says:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding five articles—

One of which I have already read.

A male person of the age of 17 and upwards can lose Japanese nationality only if he has already performed his service in the army or navy or if he is not bound to perform such service.

And there are very few of them who come under the category of not being bound to perform such service. As a matter of fact, they are so strict in that regard that any Japanese going home to Japan who stays there

more than 30 days is likely to be corralled and made do his service. There is one exception. If he goes to get a wife for importation into the United States he is allowed 90 days. But if they did expatriate any of their nationals these Japanese would in all these cases be trained soldiers or sailors. Everyone would be a man who had gone through their course of training with all that it implies, not only military training but the essential Japanese education with all the high ideals they inculcate in their people about devotion to the emperor, who is their god, and to their nation.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does that regulation with regard to military training apply even to Japanese born in the United States?

Mr. NEILL: Certainly it applies. Article 20 provides that a Japanese subject who has acquired nationality in a foreign country by reason of his birth and domicile there may be expatriated with the permission of the Minister of State. But if he is over 17 he must undergo the military training of the Japanese, which is not the very best preparation for citizenship as a British or an American subject. In case that is not enough to prevent the Japanese being expatriated, there is another clause:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding six articles, a person who actually holds a civil or military position can lose his Japanese nationality only after he has lost his position.

That might be considered to apply only to diplomatic positions; but it can also very readily be applied to military positions, in this sense. Those of us who come from the Old Country know that there was a system under the militia there under which a man trained for a certain length of time. After he had put in so many years of service he was placed on the permanent reserve of the country. I do not know, but it is likely that some such system exists in Japan, because every nation that has compulsory military training invariably place its soldiers, after their term of service, on the reserve force. A man in Japan will be registered when in military service as No. so-and-so in such-and-such a regiment of infantry, and after he has completed his training it is very reasonable to suppose that he still remains on the books of the corps and therefore occupies a military position. Whether that is so or not, however, it certainly lends itself to such suggestion and is borne out by the fact I have already cited, that out of 90,000 Japanese born in America only 74 have applied for expatriation, of which number 64 were allowed to be expatriated.

So much for that phase of the question. I might also refer to the evidence prepared by the American Legion, which is a reliable and reputable body in the United States, which evidence was collected to be placed before congress. I won't quote it; I will merely give a summary of it. It appears from the evidence that there practically exists in the United States to-day, more particularly in California, government of the Japanese nation over their nationals in that state of the American union, which is above and superior or at least, extra to the laws of the United States. They have something practically corresponding to a state legislature which meets annually. The work is done by means of organizations. There is a big organization, and there are smaller ones that are tributary or subject to it in various districts, and certain elected members of these bodies meet once a year and pass regulations and so on. Then there is a higher body, something like the state Senate, which also meets annually in the same way. Under this system they levy a form of taxation upon their nationals. They do not call it by that term; they describe the tax as fees; but they have a regular system of taxing their nationals, who by means of membership fees are obliged to pay a certain sum to this Japanese government—for it cannot otherwise be described—which controls the Japanese nationals in the state of California. The nationals are also compelled by the laws which this governing body enacts to register all births, deaths and marriages, and even the movements of individual Japanese. If they move from one section of the state of California to another they are required to record the fact, not with the American authorities but with their own authorities in the state. They also have a precise system of education. The Japanese may go to all the white schools they choose, and as a matter of fact they do. But after hours they must attend their own Japanese school, where they are drilled in the very highest ideals of Japanese nationalism, certainly an excellent education for Japanese in Japan, but by no means a good preparation for either an American or a Canadian citizen.

Now, Sir, I should like to sum up this matter in two questions. Is it possible for a man to be loyal to two countries at once? And, secondly, is it right that he should be given an opportunity even to pretend to do so? It comes back to the old saying in the Bible, "Ye cannot serve two masters". It has been tried often enough, but it has never been successful.

Mr. EULER: I think the hon. member's amendment calls for the prohibition of dual nationality. Would he make that dependent

on the desire and choice of the individual himself, or upon the laws of the country of his origin? For example, take a Japanese? Say he comes to Canada and applies for naturalization. In the course of his application he forswears or disavows entirely any allegiance he formerly held to the government of Japan. Would the hon. member accept that profession as sufficient? Would he accept the individual's desire and choice or would he be guided by the law of the country from which the national came, and over which he has not and never had any control?

Mr. NEILL: I certainly would not accept the statement of the Japanese that he was forswearing his country because I do not believe he would be doing so. And another thing, our naturalization law does not require that. All our naturalization law requires is that the person becoming naturalized shall adhere to the country in which he is seeking adoption.

Mr. EULER: My question was this: If our law were such, would the hon. member accept the desire of the national rather than be bound by the laws of the country from which he came. If that were in our Naturalization Act, would he not think we should accept it? Over the other he has absolutely no control whatever.

Mr. NEILL: Of course, this particular amendment does not deal with the naturalization of the Jap. It deals with cases where the minister can say, "Here is a man who is a subject of two nations at once. We will de-naturalize him." That question would have to be raised in the section of the act which naturalizes such a man, and it would be rather difficult to do because the position mentioned by the hon. gentleman would crop up. A Japanese would say "Yes, I have de-naturalized myself," and you would have no way of proving whether he had or had not. But this amendment only deals with those cases where a Jap, as an example, has pledged himself to be a subject true to Canada, and it is afterwards found that he is still adhering to the laws and jurisdiction of Japan. If he wishes under this to get out of that position, all he has to do is to apply to the government of his native country for a certificate of expatriation, which is the form required by the Japanese government. They call it a "declaration of losing nationality" or something of that kind. Let him produce that form showing his government had expatriated him, and then he would—

Mr. EULER: Is it not conceivable that the Japanese government might refuse him that certificate despite his earnest desire to de-naturalize himself so far as his country of origin is concerned?

Mr. NEILL: Yes, the Japanese government have been denying it at the rate of 60 to 90,000; but I never yet met a Jap who would want to quarrel with his country over such denial—he would still be a Japanese. I would not worry myself as to his relations or his conscience all I would ask is: "Your government says; 'You cannot be a Canadian citizen unless you are expatriated by permission from us. Very well go and get that permission from your government, else you cannot remain a Canadian subject.'" That is the position I would take.

Going back to my original argument, which I had about completed, when it comes to a showdown under these conditions which I have outlined, where they are absolutely under the jurisdiction of their native country apparently of their own free will, I would say: There can be only one question as to which country they will adhere to; they will adhere to their own country, and naturalization, so far as Canada is concerned, will be a farce, and it is highly undesirable to perpetuate such a condition of things.

Mr. PUTNAM: I may have misunderstood the hon. member, but I think he dropped the remark that we would not know whether the Jap had forsworn Japan or not. Of course, that forswearing could take place on Canadian soil.

Mr. NEILL: If he forswore himself until he was black in the face he would still be a subject of Japan because he had not taken the only means of becoming expatriated and obtained a certificate of such expatriation from his native country. He might not be willing to remain a Japanese subject, but he would remain one nevertheless.

Mr. PUTNAM: I understand that, but two courses were put forward by my hon. friend: whether we would exact a certificate of expatriation from the Jap's native government, or whether we would be satisfied by his swearing away his allegiance to Japan in Canada. I understood the hon. member to say that we would not know whether the Jap had forsworn his allegiance to his country of origin or not. Of course we would know.

Mr. COPP: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister rises to reply I should like to refer him to what he said before six o'clock. He will recall that I challenged his right to make the statement that the work of the judges under the legislation now in effect—

Mr. COPP: I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not said anything yet.

Mr. COPP: In effect, that is not what I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What! The minister has argued in two sessions of this House that the work of the judges under the legislation now in effect is not of any value. The minister cannot possibly disavow those words. He said, "The work of the judges is not of any value," and I stated that he should not say it in such general terms, that while there might be individual instances of failure to do the work rightly and carefully, I know myself, and many hon. members know, of judges who have done their work most faithfully and usefully. The minister rose then to state that he could quote the Minister of Justice, speaking in 1914, in support of what he says, as stating "that the work of the judges was a joke." I asked him to be good enough after eight o'clock to make that assertion good.

Mr. COPP: Mr. Chairman, I want to put my right hon. friend right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am right, all right.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend will wait a moment. In the first place I did not say that the Minister of Justice said a single word about the work of the judges being a joke.

Mr. McMASTER: May I rise to a point of order? I do not know whether it is because we have so many distinguished physicians in this House, but more and more the leaders of the opposition and members of the government are adopting the gentle bedside manner of speaking, and those of us in the more remote corners of the chamber are quite unable to hear what is going on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the hon. gentleman hear me?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. McMASTER: No. We generally hear the right hon. leader of the Opposition, especially when he is directing his acid criticism, but to-night, although the criticism is somewhat of that nature, it has not been altogether as audible as it usually is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I spoke pretty clearly. I stated that the minister before six o'clock had referred to the work of the judges under the existing law as having not been of any value. I had challenged his right to make that general assertion. Admitting that there might be instances of inefficient or careless work, there were also instances, and very many—probably in general—of the careful work that judges usually do. The minister replied to me that he could quote the former Minister of Justice, Mr. Doherty, in 1914, in support of his assertion. I challenged him to do so, and I ask him now to make that assertion good.

Mr. COPP: I want to put my right hon. friend right in regard to the statement I made before dinner. I did not say that the Minister of Justice, in connection with the passage of the act of 1914, made any reference to the judges or their work. I did say, however, that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who was Acting Minister of Justice in 1919—I think I am right in saying that he was Acting Minister of Justice—in connection with the passing of the Naturalization Act in that year made reference to the judges along the lines that I have mentioned. I shall be very glad to cite his remarks in that connection, as my right hon. friend has asked me to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the minister said that. If he said it—

Mr. COPP: I leave it to the judgment of the committee as to what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he said it, it is not what I heard him say.

Mr. COPP: I said the member for South Wellington.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The member for South Wellington and the Minister of Justice in 1914.

Mr. COPP: I beg my right hon. friend's pardon; I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And I remarked at the time that the member for South Wellington was in opposition in 1914; he was not in 1919. I am not saying the minister did not say it, but certainly if that is what he said—

Mr. COPP: The right hon. gentleman misunderstood me, that is all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —that was not the sound that came across the Table to me. Now, will he tell us what was said in 1919?

Mr. COPP: I will, and I will give what was said in 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have all of that.

Mr. COPP: My right hon. friend asked me to state what was said, and I propose to do so. I realize that my right hon. friend has had a wide experience in putting legislation

through this House and has occupied honourable and responsible positions. If he has any suggestions to make, suggestions that are offered with the object of bettering any legislation that comes before this House, I shall be only too glad to consider them. But the question is whether his criticisms have been constructive in their character or whether he is trying to sow the seed of discord by intimating that I am trying to surround myself with more power and authority than I or any other member of the government should have. I think it is the latter course that my right hon. friend is taking, and in that respect he is not doing justice to himself or to the other members of this committee. I could understand it if a private member who had had no experience as a minister of the Crown was suspicious that some minister might be trying to clothe himself with power with the idea of bringing advantage to his own party, but I cannot understand any suspicion of that kind on the part of hon. members who have occupied cabinet positions. Surely it is not because they had the same thing in their minds when they sat on the treasury benches? I hope not. I am desirous of hearing the suggestions that any hon. members wish to offer in connection with this bill.

I say again that the only reason that I have asked for these amendments is to make the Naturalization Act passed by the government of my right hon. friend as workable as possible, to clothe it with as many safeguards as possible, and to facilitate the issue, without confusion or delay, of naturalization certificates to those entitled to them. I was not at all surprised when the suggestion was made that this is a very large power to place in one individual's hands; I grant it. The Naturalization Act and measures relating to immigration are always the subject of a great deal of controversy in this House. The matter of citizenship is a very important one, not only to those who apply for naturalization, but to those of us who are natural-born or naturalized British subjects. It is a question that should be very carefully studied, and it is my desire that the fullest consideration be given to the proposed amendments. This is not the first time that amendments to the Naturalization Act have been asked in this parliament. At the Imperial conferences of 1902, 1908 and 1911 the question was considered of adopting a uniform system of naturalization so that a man naturalized as a British subject in Canada or in the Old Country would be a British subject in any part of the Empire, and finally that was arranged. I was not a member of this House in 1914, but I was a member here in 1919 when amendments were brought down to the Naturalization Act, and I remember that a great deal of discussion took place on that occasion. In 1914, as will be seen by referring to Hansard, there was also a very long discussion of this question. At that time the Right Hon. C. J. Doherty was Minister of Justice and my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition was a colleague of his. I am bound to say that in this case as well as in a great many others you will find upon consulting Hansard that the attitude hon. gentlemen may take on any particular question depends very largely upon which side of the House they happen to be occupying. A number of those who are now my friends occupied seats in this Chamber in 1914 and opposed the legislation that was then brought down by Mr. Doherty for his daring to put into the statutes the very clause that is there now giving entire and absolute discretion to the Secretary of State in deciding whether a man shall be naturalized in this country or not. The legislation had a rough and stormy passage and occupied many days and nights before it finally became law. The House divided frequently, I understand, on the different sections of the bill.

On the question whether it is right or wrong, proper or improper, dangerous or otherwise to place absolute discretion in the hands of a responsible minister of the Crown in deciding whether or not a man shall become naturalized I want to read to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, as I promised I would do, a few extracts from the debate that took place on that occasion. I do so with some degree of hesitancy because I do not want to take up too much of the time of this committee, but inasmuch as the then Minister of Justice, the Right Hon. Mr. Doherty, stood high not only in the opinion of members of this parliament when he was here but in his native province and in the mind of the public generally, and is also a distinguished lawyer of very high standing and recognized as such throughout the whole Dominion, I should like to present his attitude when the question was before the House as to whether or not it was a proper thing to place this discretion in the hands of any one particular minister. In reply to some criticism that had been made by the leader of the Opposition of that day Mr. Doherty said at page 4146 of Hansard, of 1914:

> I do not question that this power might be liable to abuse. Almost any power may be liable to abuse. It may be said that discretionary powers are particularly liable to abuse, but you cannot enumerate all the things that may be good reasons why a man should not become a British subject. If we were legislating in order to create a right in somebody's

favour it would be proper that a judge should determine it and that the matter should be ended. But we are not. We do not contemplate that a man, because he does certain things, is to have the right to be a British subject. After all, it is a matter of grant by the state. We must either allow somebody to have discretion or we must undertake to specify here and now, and put in the statute, every reason conceivable why it is desirable that a man should not be a British subject. Then our legislation will assume such a shape that we will have created conditions under which a man shall have the right to say: I must have a certificate of naturalization; I have a right to it—no matter what strong reasons may be in existence at the time, which were not known before, why he should not be a British subject. It is true that we will do our best under the section to see that he shall be of good character, and to make him prove it, but it is obvious that in a country of this size a man who may not be of good character, is not going to the centre, to the place where people are likely to have information concerning his past life, to apply for a certificate of naturalization. The character of this man has been built up and acquired outside of this country very possibly. He is not going to go where people know all about him and his character. That is the kind of men we do not want. He may be a refugee and he may go to some remote corner of the country and because there are no witnesses in that remote corner of the country he may be able to convince the judge that he is a man of good character. The Secretary of State may have information that that man is an anarchist or that for any other good reason he is an undesirable. Shall we compel the Secretary of State to say: This man went to the remotest corner of the Yukon and applied for naturalization; there was no evidence brought before the judge to show that he was of bad character, therefore, I, the Secretary of State, have no alternative but to grant him a certificate. If we want to create that sort of a situation there is nothing more to be said. But in the drafting of this act we did not conceive that that would be desired. In the United Kingdom the Secretary of State has exercised this discretionary power from the outset.

That was the statement made by Mr. Doherty when this matter was before the House in 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A very excellent statement too.

Mr. COPP: It was a very excellent statement defending his action in placing discretionary power in the hands of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The discretionary power that he placed there.

Mr. COPP: And he placed full power there. The debate was continued later on, and speaking of the application to the court Mr. Doherty said at page 4829 of Hansard, of 1914:

But the court cannot go any further and declare that the party has a right to be naturalized. It still rests with the country, through its responsible government —after all, the Secretary of State is only one of a government that is responsible for what he does—to determine whether or not it will grant to that individual his naturalization. If you take that clause out, then you create a situation where each one of the dominions will be absolutely bound, because a man meets certain requirements which are agreed to be essential, to give him naturalization, even though, for reasons outside of the possession of these particular qualifications, the government of that particular dominion or possession might consider that it was not in the public interest for that man or that class of men to be naturalized. In reality the idea was, as far as the dominions are concerned, to reserve to them freedom of action, even when a man met those requirements which the mother country and the dominions generally agreed were essential—but not necessarily sufficient—to fit a man for naturalization. The purpose is to keep within the hands of each of the dominions control ever over people who may meet these requirements, to place these dominions in a position where they may be enabled, for reasons that they may consider sufficient, to declare that a person, though meeting these requirements, is not a desirable subject, in their judgment, and to exclude him. While it is true that the Secretary of State is not called upon to give reasons why he takes a certain course under this provision, it should be remembered that he always acts as a member of a responsible government. and the circumstances under which he acts, if he does act in the exercise of that power, will always be before the public either for condemnation or for approval. He will act upon his own responsibility and the responsibility of the government behind him, and I think that that is sufficient protection against arbitrary action on his part. As I look at it, this is a power that will seldom, if ever, be exercised; but it is a power held in reserve which may prove most invaluable to this country.

And he continues along the same line to the end, defending the legislation that he brought down placing in the Secretary of State absolute discretion to withhold or grant naturalization. That is a part of the act today. It is that part on which we are acting at the present time, administering the law under the Department of the Secretary of State. But that is not all. In 1919 amendments were brought down to the Naturalization Act, and if I remember correctly, my hon. friend for South Wellington was then Acting Minister of Justice and had charge of the bill in committee. The question came up as to how far we should continue to leave discretion in the hands of the Secretary of State to grant naturalization or to refuse it and my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) made this statement which is to be found at page 4267 of Hansard of 1919. Criticisms were then being offered from the opposite side of the House as they are being offered now and the hon. member for South Wellington said:

In answer to my hon. friend's criticism, all I have to say is that nationality and citizenship are questions which should come within the authority of the parliament and the government of the country, and if they have at any time in the past been delegated to the judges, that in my judgment was an improper delegation of the rights of parliament. Parliament should control the nationality of citizens and the question of their franchise. It is just as able to do so as the judges, if indeed it is not better able. It is true that this section vests in the Secretary of State an absolute discretion. The language is absolute in form, but in reality it is just a judicial discretion to be exercised as that of a judge would be because it must be exercised in accordance with the

plain meaning and intent of the act. Those of us who happen to be members of the bar well know that wills, trusts, settlements, etc., where trustees are appointed, case after case comes up in which absolute discretion to do this, that, and the other thing, is granted to the trustee. "Absolute and unfettered discretion" is a commonly used expression, which the courts interpret to be discretion that must be reasonably exercised in accordance with the clear meaning of the document. So it is with an act of parliament. Under this section, the Secretary of State cannot act upon any mere whim, fancy or caprice of his own—

Apparently my hon. friend has changed his mind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. COPP (reading):

—he is bound to act in accordance with the meaning of the act. He is not by any means unaccountable or irresponsible. As a matter of fact, he is far more accountable and responsible than is any judge in the Dominion—

The Secretary of State, he said, is far more accountable and responsible than is any judge in the Dominion.

—because, if he does not act reasonably—if his action in granting or refusing a certificate is at variance with plain reason, or if he acts without good faith or goes beyond the letter of the law, he will be amenable to this parliament at the very first session after his action is called into question.

Going on further he says:

I do not know of any greater safeguard that can be employed. My hon. friend suggested that the reply could be made that this had been the custom for the last five years.

He is referring to the old system.

It has been the law of the land for the last five years, and I will say that for twenty or twenty-five years preceding that, these certificates were granted by the judges. I want to impress this upon the committee that, knowing as I do the method which was adopted in Ontario during those twenty-five or thirty years in the granting of these certificates, the whole practice became a joke and a by-word.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was prior to 1914.

Mr. COPP: I say to my right hon. friend, just as I said before that it was prior to 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. COPP: My right hon. friend says "hear, hear." I would ask him now by what method can he argue—fertile though his imagination may be—that the investigations held by the judge now are any better than they were prior to 1914? The same judges were acting then in the province of Ontario that are acting now, or a number of them. For that reason I say that it does not lie in the mouth of my hon. friend for South Wellington, or in the mouth of the leader of the Opposition, to criticize the legislation I have brought down to this House and ask them to consider. I trust I have satisfied my right hon. friend in giving him the information for which he asked just before the House rose for recess.

Now with reference to the act—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. COPP: My right hon. friend says "hear, hear," and indulges in a laugh. I have seen that old trick played before; it does not affect me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman through with his argument?

Mr. COPP: If my right hon. friend will wait I will give him—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the minister was going to refer to something else.

Mr. COPP: In reference to the amendment before the committee I want to say, that personally I am not particularly wedded to the system which has been proposed to the committee. I have given the matter the very best consideration I could. I have conferred with my officials who had charge of this branch of the public business under the control of my right hon. friend and his colleagues. I am told and I am assured by those officials that the system is carried on now in exactly the same way as before. My right hon. friend well knows that the minister knows nothing about these naturalization cases unless some particular question arises and is referred to him. I am informed that has been the practice ever since this Naturalization Act has been in force in Canada. I have tried to follow in the same course, taking the recommendations from my officials in regard to naturalization just as other ministers take recommendations from the officials in their departments. I do not care whether the committee places this responsibility on me, or on some other public official, but I do say this—and I am as certain of its accuracy as I am that I am standing here to-night—that if any other hon. gentleman within the sound of my voice had charge of the administration of the act as it is to-day he would find that it is not being carried out in the best manner possible. I have no fault to find with the judges; I have no quarrel with them. My right hon. friend says that he has been in court and heard the judges in these cases. So have I, and I want to say to him that in the eastern section of Canada, where we have not a great number of applications for naturalization, the procedure is not so cumbersome or so unwieldy as in some other places. Is it the desire of my hon. friends

that persons who come to Canada, and remain here for the length of time prescribed by the act, should be given the opportunity to become British subjects? If so, I say that their applications should be given the very best consideration, and it should be made as easy as possible for such persons, if qualified, to obtain naturalization.

During this debate a number of hon. gentlemen have declared that a man should prize British citizenship very highly. So he should, but I do not see that we should put any unnecessary stumbling blocks in the way of his acquiring that citizenship. I grant that an application for naturalization should be surrounded by every safeguard, and if any hon. member can suggest a greater safeguard than is provided in this bill I shall be glad to give that suggestion consideration, and if possible accept it. But I maintain that if it is the desire of the people of Canada to grant naturalization certificates to those who, after careful inquiry and examination, are found to be entitled to them, you must have some other arrangement than exists at 9 p.m. the present time. At present a man who has lived for ten years in Canada—under the bill the period of residence is five years—and is a law-abiding citizen who wants to become naturalized has to make application at the county clerk's office at some central point in a province. That application has to be posted for three months in the office of the clerk. Now, that system may be a proper one but so far as I can study and understand the question, I do not think the notice is worth the paper it is written upon. No one goes into the clerk's office and examines it. In the act of 1919, I think, provision is made that, besides being posted in the office of the clerk of the county court in the respective sections throughout the country, it should be posted in the post office. When people go down to the post office, how many read the notices posted up? Nobody reads them, so that this is an absolute waste of time. When the time arrives that a man is entitled to naturalization, he should be given that naturalization with the least possible trouble to himself, although he should value and, I have no doubt, values the citizenship very highly.

Only the other day the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) rushed to the defence of the judges whom, according to him, I had so maligned, because I said their investigation was not of a very definite character. He said: "Well, I have sat in court and listened to judges interrogating witnesses and they are very careful in making the inquiries. One judge asked a man whom he had voted for at the last election and how he would vote at the next election." Of what interest would it be to a judge making an inquiry in regard to naturalization to ask a man how we would vote. That is just a sample. I have practised law myself at times, and I have a very fraternal feeling for my brother barrister; but I know this is true in my section of the country and I am informed that it is true in the West, that a man applying for naturalization, besides going to the clerk of the court and paying $5 on his application, must also employ a lawyer to plead his case before the judge. If that is so, then that is one of many reasons why applicants for naturalization should not be compelled to employ legal assistance and counsel to present their case before the judge. At the present time there are in this country, and particularly in the West, many cases where people have to travel 50, 100 and in some cases 200 miles to get to the courts. If that investigation were of any advantage, it might be continued; but I may tell the committee in all sincerity that in nine cases out of ten the investigation is of no particular advantage to the department, and the department makes its own inquiry and decides the question on the inquiry which it makes. I am not here to say that every judge before whom an applicant goes to present his case for naturalization, does not give the matter some inquiry and attention. Many returns and reports that come from judges are fairly full and acceptable; but in many instances that is not the case, and the department has to carry on its private investigation in regard to the qualifications of an applicant for naturalization. The department is responsible for the naturalization, and for that reason it takes great care to see that every applicant is properly qualified before a naturalization certificate is granted to him.

I am not very particular in regard to this matter; it is of no special concern to me, or, indeed, to any person in the East, because in the East the country is pretty well settled and the courts are handy. The situation in the East is different from that of the far western country where the facilities are not so good. In the second place, we have few applications made for naturalization in the East and, therefore, I have no personal interest in the matter. As regards the insinuations made concerning this power being vested in the Secretary of State who, at the moment, happens to be myself, I am sure no hon. member on either side of the House thinks

that one of us would stoop to any such conduct as to try to bring in hundreds of naturalization papers, as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) said this afternoon, and have those people naturalized just before an election for the sake of getting their votes. My hon. friend, I am sure, does not practise that in the model province of Ontario from which he comes, and we do not practise it in New Brunswick, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) will bear me out. That is not how elections are won. If hon. members who are more particularly interested in this subject, are not satisfied to vest that power in the Secretary of State who, for the moment is myself, I ask them to consider whether or not it should be vested in some responsible head, who should be given power to grant certificates of naturalization as soon as by sufficient inquiry he is satisfied that applicants are entitled to naturalization.

Before I sit down, I want to refer for a moment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). As my hon. friend well knows, the whole question of naturalization is interwoven with the Imperial statutes, and agreements made with the intention of getting our naturalization laws as uniform as possible in the Old Country as well as in the colonies. I have a number of other matters to consider, and before this amendment is finally dealt with, I should like to consider it according to the agreements and laws regarding naturalization throughout the British Empire. I shall be glad to consider the amendment; but before accepting it I would have to consider it a little more fully, and, therefore, if no other member wants to address the committee on the subject, I am prepared to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister, after such a triumphant demolition of all his enemies wants to cut short the discussion—

Mr. COPP: No. If my right hon. friend wishes to speak, he can go ahead.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know he considers it a matter of considerable temerity on my part to dare to reply—

Mr. COPP: I would not be sarcastic if I were the right hon. member. That does not get him anywhere.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will try to get somewhere. The only thing I despair of is to get the minister to admit it after I do get somewhere. I have not the least doubt where the intellects of hon. members will stand on the points at issue. I do not expect for a moment that I will convince them that they should vote against the minister's bill; but I will convince them that the minister has made no case whatever in executing the pledge which he gave before six o'clock. He stated before six o'clock that he would be able to show out of the mouths of the former Minister of Justice and the former Acting Minister of Justice, that the work of the judges under the present law—

Mr. COPP: I said no such thing about "out of the mouth of the former Minister of Justice."

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member did not, his remarks at the time had not the slightest reference to what I had said just before, to which he offered them in answer.

I am going to deal with the minister's remarks. He directed them, instead of to the point at issue, to an endeavour to show out of the mouths of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and the former Minister of Justice that his view of the law is correct and that my view of the law is wrong.

Now, I ask the House to understand first of all what the two views are. I think the minister understands what they are, but he did not seek to make it clear to the House at all, because had he done so the quotations that he made from both hon. gentlemen would have shown him clearly to everybody's mind to be wrong. The two views are these. I state that the law is and has been this since 1914, that to secure naturalization a man must apply, under section 20, through the court; and he must under sections 21, 22 and 23 make good before a judge his right to naturalization. He must secure from the judge a certificate favourable to his naturalization, which certificate must be transmitted to the Secretary of State. All these requirements must first be complied with as matters of procedure; and when he has secured that favourable certificate from the judge and it has been forwarded to the Secretary of State, then the Secretary of State has absolute discretion to say yes or no on the question of naturalization; but until he does secure that favourable certificate the Secretary of State has no discretion whatsoever. I hope that is quite clear.

The Minister, on the other hand, says that this is not the law at all. Under the law, he states, as it has stood since 1914, the Secretary of State, no matter whether that man has gone to a court and got a favourable certificate or not, can grant naturalization or

refuse it. The House sees the difference. The old law provided that a favourable certificate should be given by a judge, and from that moment the minister's discretion was absolute; the act declares the matter to be in his absolute discretion from that point on. But until that point is reached the moment for the exercise of discretion on the part of the Secretary of State never arises.

To show the appropriateness of the two quotations the minister submitted, a little history of our law is necessary. Up until 1914, with the passing of the act of that year, the consolidation, which is our present law, the way a man secured naturalization was to make an affidavit of his qualifications and file it with the clerk of the court, where it remained for a time, I think three weeks,—a definite period at any rate. At the expiration of that three weeks, without the man going to the judge at all or even to the clerk of the court, somebody for him, an agent even, could go and secure from the judge, and I think from the clerk of the court—at least from the judge,—a certificate of naturalization. I have briefly stated the law that prevailed up to that time. In a word, there was no necessity for personal appearance at all, and the judge could grant the certificate to an agent of the person seeking naturalization. The Secretary of State had nothing to do with it at all; and all that the judge needed to have under the act was simply an affidavit filed by the man. In 1914, the statute was passed which, in all its essentials, is the law to-day. It provided that the applicant should file with the clerk of the court—he did not need to go there to do it, he could send it by an agent—an application requesting naturalization. That application, with whatever is required to accompany it, is posted up for three months in the court-room. At the end of three months that man must appear before a judge, and he must appear in person, unless for one reason and one reason only, which I shall read just as it is in the statute:

> Unless it is established to the satisfaction of the court that he is prevented from so appearing by some good and sufficient cause.

So that in general the applicant must appear himself, and if he does not appear it can only be for some cogent reason. On the evidence given before the judge his fate as to naturalization is decided. If the judge is satisfied he forwards a favourable report. But he does not grant naturalization at all; he simply forwards a favourable report to the Secretary of State, and it is for the Secretary of State to say yes or no. He can further investigate if he wishes, and he is absolutely empowered to grant application or refuse it once he has received that report. Such has been the law since 1914.

Now we come to the quotations the hon. member made. He could not have read better or more apt expressions of opinion than those which he read from the former Minister of Justice. The former Minister of Justice clearly showed that all that the Secretary of State could do, everything that came within his power to do, was only by virtue of the report from the judge; and the only thing that the Secretary of State was in a position to do as against the recommendation of the judge was to refuse the application. But if the judge was opposed to the application the Secretary of State had no power at all to grant naturalization; and as a matter of fact the matter never came before him in the absence of a report from the judge. The language used by the former Minister of Justice, let me repeat,—and I should like the hon. member to read it again—

Mr. COPP: I have read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But read it to the House so that its meaning will be clear. I say, he could not have used language which made it more apparent that the Secretary of State is wholly in the wrong and has no power under the present law, in the absence of a report from the judge, to grant naturalization. The language of the acting Minister of Justice of 1919 was just the same; he did not deal with the point at which absolute discretion arose. It is true he used the words "absolute discretion." Why? Because it is in the act. The procedure sections are there; the absolute discretion arises when the procedure sections are complied with; then and not till then. This surely must be clear to every hon. member.

Now, I ask hon. members to consider this point: It is one thing to give the Secretary of State power, if he has the information Judge Doherty referred to in that very language quoted, information from the land from which the immigrant came against the character of the immigrant, and which information could not have come to the knowledge of the judge, to deny the applicant his naturalization. It is another thing to allow the minister, no matter what the judge's report may say against the man, though it may clearly advise that he be not granted naturalization, to naturalize notwithstanding, and thus get rid of the judge altogether. In a word, the discretion on the part of the Secretary of State to refuse naturalization even in the face of a favourable report is one

thing; that guards the gates to naturalization. But to give the Secretary of State, without any report at all, without a judge having anything to do with the matter whatever, power to naturalize an applicant is simply to permit the minister to go around the country with the oil of naturalization anointing whomsoever he likes into the citizenship of Canada. That is what the minister is asking us to allow him to do. He says he is absolutely innocent in doing so. I am not charging him with any criminal guilt at all, and I never did. But the thing is wholly unsound. No one on the government side, no member of the government ever suggested to the House that the minister should have power to grant naturalization save only when the right to naturalization was certified to by a judge of the land. I know it was opposed by the Secretary of State. Whether he spoke personally or not I do not know; I have not the least doubt he voted against it, because he says there was a vote on the question.

Mr. COPP: I was not here in 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well then, a certain embarrassment that otherwise would likely have been his he has escaped. It was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite—I thought unreasonably opposed—but the same hon. gentlemen now are asking not only to let that discretion be in the hands of the minister but to give him a positive right to make citizens at his will.

Now, the two cases are clear before the House. I do ask this House to affirm that we never ought to place in the unrestrained hands of any minister of any government the right to make citizens in a country like this where we have waves of immigrants coming from all parts of the earth and where the right to citizenship involves the franchise. It is a right that no minister should ask to exercise, and I think no House should grant. But I am quite prepared to leave with the minister the power that has been his all along to say, even after a judge reports in favour of an applicant, "We have information which probably was not before the judge, and although he reports in the applicant's favour, we deny him the franchise for the present at least or for good." I am quite prepared that the minister shall have that power, but not more than that, because I think that is the utmost discretion he should enjoy.

Mr. COPP: Is my right hon. friend aware that this procedure is followed in the Old Country and also in Australia and Newfoundland?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what is done in Australia and I am not certain of what is done in Newfoundland. I do know the system was sometimes followed in the government of the Old Country, with what results I am not aware. But the Old Land is different from our country. How many immigrants have they over there in relation to their population?

Mr. COPP: They have a large number of immigrants entering Australia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have a lot more than we have and they will probably change their law. I do not know what the law in Australia is. I would not like to take the minister's word for it because I do not think he can be accepted as an authority on Australian law before he is a better authority on the law of his own country.

Mr. COPP: I am not quoting the Australian law from my own personal knowledge, but I have had it looked into and I think I am safe in saying that that is the law there.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I have the feeling that the right hon. leader of the Opposition should be the last one in this country to offer the language of reproach in regard to naturalization. He accuses the minister of a desire to obtain the right and power of going around with the oil of anointment to anoint people into British citizenship. When the right hon leader of the Opposition was instrumental in taking away the right of naturalization, of voting, from people, did he hold any preliminary inquiries in regard to those from whom it should be taken away? I do not think so. My recollection is that vast numbers of respectable Canadian citizens were a very few years ago bereft of their right to vote in a very drastic and summary manner. However, if there is one thing I dislike in the world it is the tu quoque argument—the pot applying to the kettle the term black.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not ask for power to decide who should vote. Parliament enacted general legislation determining who should have the franchise. There was no discretion in the hands of anybody.

Mr. McMASTER: That is an example of the method in which the learned and honourable gentleman excels—fendre un cheveu en quatre; he cuts a hair into quarters—because of course the right of being a British subject was the fundamental essential for having the right to vote. But I did not rise especially to make this remark; rather to express, I trust, a quite disinterested opinion on the

subject. I have not examined it carefully and I am not sure that we have the best method now, but I do not like the idea of placing all the powers of naturalization in a central office. I do not like it. It does not appear to me to be consistent or consonant with our mentality, with our procedure in the past, nor with our traditions. I am not going to bring forward any new plan, I have not examined the question sufficiently, but I have absolute faith in the fair-mindedness of the minister, in his desire to look at things in a broad, generous, fair and proper fashion, and if the present system imposes hardships on those who desire naturalization, if it is not functioning properly, I would ask him to look into it; but I would also ask him not to press the method of having all the naturalization come out of one central office.

How is this central office to make investigations? It must make investigations with a personnel that is wholly dependent on that office or on the government. It seems to me that the fitness for naturalization, if it is to be the subject of inquiry—and it has to be—should be the subject of judicial inquiry, of inquiry which is unconnected with the executive. I think it is a sound principle that the executive and the judicial functions should be separate. I rise in the hope that what I have said may have some influence on the minister. I do not like the scheme. I am quite prepared to say that the present method may not be functioning properly in certain parts of the country. Well, if that is so, let us set to work and amend it; but it seems to me to be rushing from one extreme to another to centralize our naturalization work and place power in the hands of one office.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, listening to this debate I cannot help thinking that it is an advantage sometimes to have no past, and it is also an advantage because you can at least approach the subject without any preconceived ideas or prejudices. I have listened to the rather lengthy explanation of the Secretary of State to-night respecting this matter. I had not the privilege before dinner of hearing the debate. However, so far I see no reason to change my ideas. I recognize that there are members in the House whose constituencies cover a very extensive territory and they may see difficulties in the way of getting applicants before a judge to be naturalized. At the same time I still believe that British citizenship is something so valuable, so much to be prized, that anyone who wants it ought to go to the trouble of getting it in the right way. I do not know that there is any such particular hurry to naturalize those who come to our shores from foreign countries, more especially when they are unable to speak or read English.

Mr. COPP: You cannot naturalize them unless they can speak or read English.

Mr. GUTHRIE: English or French.

Mr. COPP: They must speak one language or the other.

Mr. FORKE: The minister referred to the incident of a judge asking an applicant how he voted at the last election. I do not know that that was such a ridiculous question after all because he would probably find that the applicant did not know which side he was voting for. I am not saying this in a derogatory sense of our foreign-born citizens because they are just as intelligent perhaps as our native-born in many ways. At the same time our politics are sometimes so difficult to understand even by native-born Canadians that I do not wonder at some of our immigrants experiencing a great deal of difficulty in understanding the political situation.

The hon. Secretary of State read a long extract from Hansard, and following his example I am going to read a short extract from the Manitoba Free Press, which has perhaps as large a circulation as any newspaper in western Canada and whose editorial staff should be in a position to understand the condions in that western country where the great bulk of our naturalization takes place. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read this extract:

> Hon. A. B. Copp, Secretary of State, says that at present the judicial investigations are often so perfunctory and unsatisfactory that the department is obliged to make another investigation on its own account. If that is the case the remedy is not to abolish the investigation before a judge but to take steps to see that an adequate investigation is made and all the necessary evidence produced so that the judge's recommendation will always have real value. Mr. Copp also says the government has no desire to gain the right to say who shall be admitted to the franchise, but that it should be made easy to secure naturalization and that annoying restrictions should be removed. The minister can hardly be so innocent, however, as not to recognize that the public hearing before a judge is a safeguard for those who have qualified for naturalization and that the abolition of the judicial investigation would leave an opening for serious political abuses. Under the proposed plan the investigation would be made, presumably, by an official of the department. In theory it would be a strictly impartial investigation and the minister would decide each case on its merits alone. But past political experience has shown that it is not wise to depend too much on theories. In those parts of the country where the majority of the electors were friendly to the party in office there would be a very great temptation to the more zealous party supporters of the party

—particularly if an election were in prospect—to endeavour to influence the investigation or the action of the minister so as to deny, or postpone, the naturalization of persons who were believed to be not in favour of the government. Without the safeguard of a public, judicial investigation it would be possible for such corrupt efforts to meet with a considerable measure of success.

It is not necessary to suspect the motives of the government in making the proposal in question, but it is obviously ill-advised. Canadians just now are too desirous of getting rid of some of the old political abuses to welcome the opening of opportunities for new ones.

That expresses my views more concisely and in better language than I am able to express them. I do not object to this proposal of the Secretary of State merely in a spirit of opposition; I do so because I honestly believe that it will be dangerous and not in accordance with what is right to place the power of naturalizing foreign-born subjects in the hands of any one minister, either now or at any future time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) suggested a little time ago that it was very largely in the West that this matter had any considerable application. I think we ought to get away from the merely legal or technical side of the measure and consider the effect of the proposal on the large number of immigrants who are already in this country and others whom the government is seeking to bring here. There has been a tendency in the course of this discussion to regard the immigrants as being of a lower type intellectually than we are and as having lesser attainments along political lines than we have.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think I heard that statement made in the House, this afternoon, anyway.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Further than that, there has been, at least on the part of some, a feeling that some of these immigrants may be possible criminals and that a very careful investigation ought to be made before they are granted citizenship. I would remind hon. members that a large number of our immigrants come to us from northern Europe and from the United States; that they are self-respecting, intelligent citizens, accustomed to a high standing of political life in their own country, and that they come here expecting to be granted similar rights and privileges in the country which they hope to make the land of their adoption. Under our existing law we ask them to wait for five years before they can be granted the full privileges of citizenship. I think that in regard to a very considerable number of immigrants that provision works a good deal of hardship. Five years is a long time in our young and rapidly developing country for a man to be engaged in agriculture or in any other industry without having the privilege of a voice in the affairs of the country and in the making of its laws through the sending of their representatives to parliament. I would not say that those people who are more backward, who have no knowledge of our parliamentary institutions and perhaps but a slight knowledge of our language, should not be required to wait that length of time, but I would emphasize that five years is a long time to keep a great many prospective citizens waiting. Then, when they reach the end of that five years they find it extremely difficult, in some instances at least, to obtain their citizenship. I think of one particular case of a gentleman in whose history I have been a little bit interested—and I am sure the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) will bear me out; we were discussing this matter not very long ago—a gentleman who is a graduate of a Canadian university, who is spoken of in the very highest terms by the professors in that institution, and yet who is unable to obtain his papers, because of the arbitrary decision of the Secretary of State. The gentleman to whom I refer occupies a position of responsibility with a reputable organization, yet, after a good many years in this country, after qualifying himself for a first class position by attendance at a university, he is unable to obtain the citizenship which Canada ought to grant to him. The Secretary of State suggests that he is responsible to this House in regard to his action, yet I take it that in practice it is extremely difficult for those of us who want to see that justice is done to these immigrants to have the decision changed when it comes to a particular case of this kind.

I would further like to call the attention of the committee to the relationship of this naturalization law to other laws on our statute books. For instance, we have an Immigration Act; and we are told that we do not need to worry very much about men who are liable to deportation, because if they stay in this country for five years they may become naturalized. They may; but on the other hand, if they are naturalized under present regulations which have existed for a considerable number of years, they may be denaturalized at the will of the Secretary of State. We talk about British citizenship being held in high repute, and I think we all in this House hope that that may be case. But the alien who is coming in here and is anxious to obtain Canadian citizenship cannot hold it as a very valuable thing when at the instance of one

man he may be denaturalized and thereby lose all the rights and privileges which ought to come through the obtaining of Canadian citizenship. That is one of the points that comes up in connection with the Immigration Act; these two acts dovetail one into the other. So I would emphasize that the non-Canadian-born immigrant who comes in here not only has no rights during the first five years of his residence, but may, even after he has been naturalized, have his rights taken away from him by arbitrary action.

Up to the present the arbitrary powers of the Secretary of State have been largely confined to the taking away of naturalization, but by this proposed amendment he will have it in his power to refuse naturalization. Surely if we are really living in a democracy the friends and neighbours of the immigrants, those people of the same community ought to have the right to decide whether or not a man should obtain citizenship. In some debates on the floor of this House we have had the rights of the provinces very jealously guarded. I would like to think that the communities ought to be guarded so that people out in my own province, for instance, would have a perfect right to take into their fellowship those whom they think suitable for that citizenship. It might very readily be that the ideas of the people in my own city of Winnipeg or in my own province of Manitoba might differ from those of the people in Ottawa. I think then that we in Manitoba ought to decide who are the right and proper persons to be taken into the citizenship of Manitoba. I think it can be readily seen that some of the opinions at least of the residents of the province of British Columbia differ from those of the peoples in eastern Canada. Although I cannot agree with all the positions of the people of British Columbia I would say that to a very large extent the people of British Columbia ought to decide who are the right and proper persons to be taken into their citizenship. The whole thing ought not to be left to the arbitrary power of the Secretary of State.

We have had a good deal said there with regard to the necessity of keeping out undesirables, of being very careful to safeguard the rights of citizenship. I agree with a good deal of that. On the other hand I would like to point out to you that we ought to be eager to admit to citizenship every worthy resident of Canada. We have had a good deal of talk in recent years about the necessity of bringing about reforms through constitutional means. I would suggest that if you do not enfranchise the people they have no opportunity of bringing about the reforms which they desire through constitutional means. I have been trying as best I can to represent one considerable section of this community, the Labour people, and I have found as I have gone in and out of a good many camps in northern Ontario, in Nova Scotia and away out in British Columbia that a very considerable proportion of the people who are engaged in the work of this country are without the opportunity of really doing anything through what we term constitutional means. The same thing is true of a very considerable number of people in the agricultural districts of the three prairie provinces. We say to them: Use the parliamentary machine; elect your members to parliament. I have been trying to say that to them, and they retort: We are without the vote; we do not find it possible for us to obtain the vote. Thus we are rapidly coming to the position where if this political franchise is not given men will be driven to take action along other lines. I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that whilst we try to safeguard the franchise, whilst we try to exercise reasonable precautions in admitting people to the citizenship of this country, there is another danger, and that is that we make a very considerable number of the people of this country feel that it is hardly worth while. By making it too difficult we almost compel them to attempt to bring about what they desire in this country through means other than those which we call parliamentary.

I am not going to speak at length with regard to the centralization of the whole of this authority. I would join with others who have spoken on that and ask that the Secretary of State reconsider this whole matter. I think it is for him to work out a scheme whereby people in the local districts would have a right to admit or reject people to their citizenship: We have the responsibility here of protesting against the centralization of all authority in the hands of one man. In Canada we are a great people of between eight and nine millions. We are throwing open our doors and saying that we hope to have hundreds of thousands of people take up their residence among us and ultimately become citizens of Canada. It seems absolutely absurd that we should say that one man out of the eight or nine millions of people in Canada is to have the absolute decision as to how many people and what people shall come in through the gate of citizenship and whether or not when they do come in they may be ejected at his will.

Mr. PUTNAM: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the proposed change does not enlarge the power of the Secretary of State to deny naturalization?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As I understand it, he has the power to denaturalize.

Mr. PUTNAM: The hon. member dropped some remarks which would imply that the power of the Secretary of State to deny naturalization was enlarged by this act. That of course is not so.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As a matter of procedure, is he not seeking to secure more power?

Mr. PUTNAM: To refuse naturalization?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Not to refuse, but to say whether a man shall be admitted to naturalization.

Mr. PUTNAM: It is the same thing. There is no proposal here to enlarge that power of denial.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: My point was that he already has the power. At least upon his recommendation a man may be denaturalized. Here is the clause to which I referred:

> Without prejudice to the foregoing provisions the Governor in Council shall by order revoke a certificate of naturalization granted by the Secretary of State of Canada under this act, or granted under any Naturalization Act heretofore in force in Canada in any case in which he is, upon the report of the Secretary of State of Canada, satisfied that the person to whom the certificate was granted, was

Among a number of other things,

> not of good character at the date of the grant of the certificate.

There is nothing specific as to what is intended by good character. It simply means that if any man is obnoxious to the Secretary of State or indeed to the party in power at any particular time he may be declared to have been not of good character at the date of the granting of the certificate, and without any trial whatever the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Secretary of State may cancel his certificate of naturalization.

Mr. PUTNAM: I rather took it that the major burden of the hon. gentleman's remarks was a complaint about the ungenerosity of our naturalization laws, and, perhaps inadvertently, he dropped remarks which could only mean that the power of the Secretary of State of denying naturalization had been enlarged by this change. If there is no misunderstanding it is entirely all right.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not intend to say that the power technically or legally had been enlarged, but I do insist that by granting the Secretary of State such absolute arbitrary power the situation is materially affected. If he chooses so to do he can without any reference to the people of the community deny to large numbers of people the right to become citizens.

Mr. MILLAR: I had not intended to take any part in this discussion, but some remarks dropped by the Secretary of State cause me to do so. I think he is under a little misapprehension in regard to the difficulties of the process of securing citizenship. I have the honour to represent a constituency where there are a goodly number of foreigners and I would just like to point out this: Each one does not have to travel fifty or one hundred miles to lay his case before a district court judge. What is usually done is that an application is made by a number of foreigners. They usually live in groups in the country and they make application to the district court judge to hold a sitting in their midst. I am not so closely in touch with the working out of this plan that I am prepared to say that in no case has the judge refused, but I know of many cases where the judge has acceded to the request and has held the sitting in their midst. That enables them to reach the judge by travelling a distance of ten, twelve or fifteen miles or perhaps less. Such a procedure is comparatively easy. I was glad to hear the minister state that he did not think it wise to place unnecessary obstacles in the way of applicants for naturalization. I cannot conceive of the reasoning which seeks to prove that a man is likely to become a better citizen if he is made to drive one hundred miles rather than ten or fifteen miles. I cannot see that an applicant is likely to experience a change of heart in the right direction by having to drive a longer distance. To have to drive a distance of one hundred miles and probably remain a couple of days from home is a handicap that should not be placed in the way of those endeavouring to obtain citizenship. I thoroughly approve of an examination to see that applicants are properly qualified, that they are inspired by high ideals, and that they are anxious to become good citizens.

The remarks of the minister touching the present system did not impress themselves strongly upon me. I have heard no objection to the present plan. It seems to me that an inquiry by a competent official comparatively near to the home of the applicant is a proper

thing. The Canadian neighbours of applicants who have known them day in and day out perhaps for five years, perhaps for a longer period, are the proper persons to give information to the judge as to the kind of citizens they are likely to make.

I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Woodsworth) when he speaks of all these foreigners as coming to Canada with very high ideals of citizenship. From my experience—and I have come into contact with many of them—they have been imbued in their homeland with a fixed hatred of government control and of government institutions. They are ready to oppose anything in the form of government, and it takes some little time for their minds to be disabused of that idea; it takes some little time for them to realize that they are living in a country where they can enjoy greater freedom than they did in the countries from which they came. I do not think that a residence of five years in Canada is too long to insist upon. I would be very sorry to see the present arrangement changed because I fear there might be abuses just before election time. I would cast no reflection whatever upon the motives of the minister. I do not for a moment think that he would take advantage of the change that is proposed in the law in order to naturalize a goodly number of foreigners on the eve of an election. Nevertheless, I submit that at a time like this, when people are worked up to a white heat of excitement, there are persons, anxious to roll up as big a vote as possible, who would not hesitate at any means in order to get these foreigners naturalized. That might be done possibly without the minister's knowledge. I think that to require applications to be posted in the office of the clerk of the court for three months is a splendid safeguard and would prevent a great number of foreigners being naturalized just in time to cast their votes. I think we are far more likely to get a good class of citizens naturalized, and far more likely to weed out undesirables, when the naturalization proceedings take place some months before an election.

I have listened carefully to the discussion and I must say that I am in sympathy with the present system with, perhaps, some little modification. Personally I have not been able readily to see the difficulties complained of, but if there are such I would be willing to agree to some slight modification to bring about an improvement; but the idea of centralizing these proceedings and giving so much power to one man does not meet with my sympathy.

[Mr. Millar.]

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I think the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) has about the right idea with regard to the Naturalization Act. I say that as one having had considerable experience under the old Naturalization Act, and under the present Naturalization Act passed in 1914. I was very glad indeed to hear the Secretary of State say that he was open to receive suggestions and to consider them. Such an attitude on the part of a minister leads to that serious consideration which a bill of this character merits, and I feel quite sure that he meant what he said in that respect. In view of the minister's statement I will try to add something to the suggestions already advanced. It is true that in 1914, when the present Naturalization Act was introduced members sitting on the same side of the House as the Secretary of State strongly opposed giving the minister the discretionary powers which he exercises under the act. Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself doubted the wisdom of giving so much discretion to the Secretary of State. In reply to his remarks Mr. Doherty, then Minister of Justice, said:

> Of course if our position is that in Canada we can never produce any man to fill any position to whom discretion can be confined, then this is too wide a power to give to the Secretary of State, but, if it is a useful thing to this country that there should be a discretionary power, I would have to admit that we could not do it, because we never can get a Secretary of State who can be trusted to exercise his discretion about a matter of this sort.

I think Mr. Doherty was quite correct in his view. As I understand it, what is objected to now is not that the present discretionary power of the Secretary of State should be continued but that the discretionary power vested in the judges should be wiped out. I think that the provision of the act of 1914 requiring the applicant to appear personally before a judge for examination is a very necessary precaution. As was pointed out by the leader of the Opposition it does not follow, that because the judge gives a favourable certificate of recommendation the Secretary of State must of necessity grant the applicant naturalization; he does not have to do anything of the kind. There must, however, be a favourable report from the judge before the applicant can be naturalized. I think it would be a mistake to wipe out the necessity of an examination before a judge. I may be mistaken, but I venture to say that the desire on the part of the department to make this change at the present time has arisen out of a course pursued by a certain judge in the province of British Columbia who in his wisdom—and very properly I think; I entirely

10 p.m.

commend him for what he did in the matter—in almost every instance refused to give a certificate of recommendation to Japanese applying to be naturalized as British subjects. The judge in question saw through their subterfuges, and notwithstanding the strong pressure which was brought to bear on him absolutely declined to recommend that Japanese be naturalized as British subjects. I do not think that altogether suited the officials of the Department of the Secretary of State. Consequently it may be for that reason they wish to obviate the necessity for the judicial examination. I think in most cases where the judges refuse to recommend naturalization they are acting on reasonable grounds and according to their best judgment.

I do not think that the delay of three months prescribed by the act is undesirable. A person must live in Canada for a considerable number of years before he is eligible to be naturalized. It is better that there should be a delay of three months in these naturalization cases rather than that naturalization proceedings should be rushed through on the eve of an election. They should not want this citizenship merely to vote at a particular election. Citizenship carries with it a great deal more than that. They have been considering the matter and qualifying themselves for some years, so I do not think a period of three months is too long for the procedure.

I was struck with the remark made by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), when he said that he regretted seeing large bunches of naturalization certificates go through. Perhaps he has had the same experience as I have had in seeing large bunches of naturalization certificates go through. I have seen them go through by the hundreds up in the very territory that the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) referred to, the Yukon territory. In 1902, on the eve of an election, I have seen them go through by the hundreds, go through so fast that they did not take time to register them. I have seen them go through on the same date as the notices of application, whereas three weeks' notice was required. It was just a case of one, two, three, and out. I say in the light of experience that the necessity for centralization of this power to naturalize is great, and that you should not distribute it over the country at large. If that centralization had been required in those days, that abuse could never have been perpetrated. At that time people were naturalized or allegedly naturalized, who, as a matter of fact, never became British subjects, and for years they did not find out that they had been duped. That was due to a slipshod Naturalization Act, taken advantage of by officials who knew better.

The Secretary of State would be well advised to consider the matter carefully before he wipes out the provision requiring that an applicant shall get a favourable recommendation from a county judge before he can have a certificate of naturalization. I for one do not object to having the final discretion vested in the Secretary of State; I think that is the proper official to exercise that discretion and to give final judgment; but great care should be taken in bringing the application up for his final decision. It would be a mistake to do away with the present necessity for a favourable certificate by a judge.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I do not wish to reiterate arguments that have been advanced; but I want to state to the minister that I am one of those ordinary members to whom he refers, and whom he could excuse for having suspicions of his bill. The reasons I have suspicions of the power which this bill would confer on the Secretary of State are the same as those enunciated by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black). He referred to the year 1902. A little later than that, similar cases came under my observation in a district that I know very well, where naturalization certificates were issued, I am sure, by the score, and I think I would be safe in using the same expression the hon. member did in his case, that hundreds were issued. I am not stating that the people who so secured their naturalization papers, were not, in the majority of cases, entitled to them. Probably they were; but I know in that rush a goodly number were not entitled to them, and the whole effect of that procedure was to cheapen, to lessen the intrinsic value of the citizenship so acquired.

I am in favour of some action being taken towards the end which, I think, the Secretary of State had in view when he prepared this bill, that is, to place this valuable acquirement of citizenship within the reach of those to whom it is due. It has been pointed out—and I think it should be emphasized—that a goodly number, probably the majority of those who will be applying for citizenship in this country in the next few years, will be those immigrants who have come to our shores, and who in the years prior to their application for citizenship, have been pioneers in our frontier settlements. The conditions which surround them should be taken into consideration, because the majority that this legislation will provide for will be such as those. If the conditions, the regulations, which are to surround our immigration policy are properly carried

out, those who come to our country in the next few years will be placed in what may be termed our frontier settlements; they will be pursuing agriculture. I have in mind at the present time a settlement within my constituency where there are, or were last fall, many people living who are entitled to citizenship so far as I understand the matter; that is, they have performed the necessary residence duties and other requirements. But because this would take at least four days, and that, providing that the court was prepared to receive and consider their applications immediately on their arrival at the court, and because it would cost them a very considerable sum of money, they were unable to secure their citizenship papers. They had made application to have an officer or the judge himself come to them. I was glad to hear my colleague the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) state that he knew of cases where judges, by coming to settlements like that, had made it possible for such people to secure their citizenship papers. I do not know of any such case, and it was stated to me by a judge of my province that he had no authority to hold sittings outside of those places appointed in the calendar, and that he could not come to those who so requested. The people in the settlement to which I refer were willing to pay all the expenses of the judge or any deputy or officer he would appoint to come to them. That would be a small thing compared with the combined expenses of the whole settlement in going for their naturalization papers. That is only one instance in many, and in a case like that some action is necessary along the line which the minister, I think, had in mind when he drafted this bill.

But I am afraid in the terms of the bill as he has presented it to us, he did not properly safeguard the giving of citizenship rights. I feel that that should be safeguarded, and there are ways of doing so. The Secretary of State, in making his remarks to-night, rather discredited or discounted the value of posting in post offices notices of application for citizenship. I can fully understand, in the example he gave and similar examples, where that is of little value. In a post office in a city or a large town, that probably would not be a good way of giving publicity to the fact that individuals were applying for citizenship rights. But, perhaps, the minister and many hon. members can understand that in rural post offices these notices do receive attention, for the very reason that I argued just a moment ago that that is where most of these would and should be posted under the cases that this legislation would be providing for in the next few years, I want to give a concrete instance of this. Just a few years ago, a short time ago, in a rural post office, notices of application for citizenship were posted by a number of persons who, under the law which at present exists, were not entitled to apply for citizenship. They were of enemy alien extraction in nationality; but by giving a wrong birthplace on their application to the clerk of the court, they thought to overcome that difficulty and to secure the right of citizenship. Their applications were posted in the rural post office, and because they came from a settlement where many others knew them intimately, having come from the old country with them, this point received attention; notice was given to the clerk of the court, and those persons who so made application did not wrongfully receive their citizenship rights at that time.

In all cases where rural conditions exist, those who know best the qualifications of applicants for citizenship are the people of the district and those who are or have been neighbours of the persons applying. I would suggest then that this provision should not be done away with. Whether it should go to the judge of the court or whether the Secretary of State should have the privileges and judicial rights of the judge in that respect, I am not at all particular.

But I do say that at least sufficient notice should be given in the district or the municipality in which the application is made, so that those who know intimately the history and the immediate past of the persons so applying may have an opportunity, just as is provided in the old act, of filing in the court opposition to the application, stating the ground on which they base that opposition. If that provision had been embodied in the bill I think I would have supported the minister and favoured the bill as he brought it down. But because I feel he has not placed sufficient safeguards around the granting of naturalization I am opposed to the measure. I believe that if this bill were to be made law and to be put into force the conditions would be very similar to those that existed previous to 1914, and I am sure that a number of hon. members in this House know what those conditions were in certain districts at that time, at least in the West.

Mr. STORK: I want to say a few words in support of the minister and I shall do so for the reason that as I have observed the process of our naturalization law in the province of British Columbia, it has not functioned properly. I do not agree with the

suggestion that has been made that the minister is seeking to have this bill passed in order to use it in any arbitrary or partisan way. I disagree entirely with the remarks of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) in which he suggests that the minister is more or less anxious to have the bill passed so that he may be able to facilitate the granting of naturalization to orientals. It is in regard to the naturalization of orientals that I desire to speak briefly. I have found, in my experience in British Columbia, that there has never yet been any objection to any application for naturalization. What is everybody's business is apparently nobody's business. The application forms are posted up at the usual place, but no one takes any notice of them. They go through a certain process and are finally approved of; but I never yet knew of anyone protesting their acceptance. Some time ago in British Columbia in connection with the fishing regulations legislation was passed providing that no fishing licenses should be issued to any man who was not a British subject either by birth or by naturalization. That was believed to be the proper means of preventing orientals from taking part in the fishing industry. But we found almost instantly that orientals were being naturalized wholesale. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the minister's bill, for this reason, that we shall be able to fix the responsibility in this matter. Up to the present time we have never been able to determine just who was responsible for the wholsale granting of naturalization papers to orientals. I was present at a meeting in the city of Prince Rupert at which a man directly interested in the fishing industry made a significant remark. He said, "You expect to prohibit, from fishing, people, who are not British subjects. Let me tell you that all the fishermen on the Skeena river are British subjects; and I will tell you more than that. There were 75 of them naturalized in your own town last summer and no one knew anything about it". The member for Yukon makes the suggestion that the minister is endeavouring to override the expressed opinion of one of the judges in the city of Vancouver. Well, I am supporting the minister in this bill because I want to determine just who is responsible for the issuing of papers, and I shall be able under this legislation to know who is responsible for granting naturalization to people who should not be naturalized. There is one other point. I find that when any man desires to become naturalized the usual method is to appear before a lawyer, at least in British Columbia; and the standard fee in the section of the country from which I come is $25 for the legal work in connection therewith.

I do not regard this bill as an autocratic move on the part of the government or an attempt to secure autocratic powers by the minister. Rather, I consider it to be the embodiment of the principle of responsible government. Someone has to be responsible for the granting of naturalization papers, and if you are going to have responsible government you must make the proper minister answerable for his actions. If we do that we shall be able to determine just exactly where the fault lies when papers are issued to persons who are not entitled to them.

Mr. JACOBS: I have to approach this question rather cautiously—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. JACOBS: —because it is not so very long ago that I sat with my party in the cold shade of opposition; and I find on referring to Hansard that my argument addressed to the committee at that time was identically the same as the argument made to-day by the present opposition.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You were wrong.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know whether I was wrong, but certain changes have taken place in the complexion of the House which incline me to take another view, because when I was then talking against the same question now before the House the Secretary of State was an entirely different person from the Secretary of State to-day. So that conditions are not quite the same. I remember trying to wax eloquent when I pointed out the danger to which the public might be exposed were we to put into the hands of the Secretary of State this power of granting or withholding certificates of naturalization, involving as it did the franchise, particularly on the eve of a general election. But it was stated at the time, I think by the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who was in charge of the bill on that occasion, that the Secretary of State or some person representing the government would have to be a party to the granting of naturalization certificates, inasmuch as the bill came to us from England. The bill had to be fashioned on the English act, and it was indicated that the administration had to be a party to legislation of this kind, and to the granting of certificates of imperial naturalization. We were therefore limited to the discussion of the entire question. The government said at the time, "Unless you take this you cannot have Imperial naturalization."

I do not know whether it is generally known to this committee that previous to 1914 we had a naturalization law which conferred upon the applicant merely a limited form of na-

turalization, or one that declared that the applicant was to be a British subject within the Dominion of Canada and not elsewhere. By the new act of 1914 and its amendments, Imperial naturalization was granted to applicants and we abolished the restricted or purely Canadian form of naturalization. Consequently we had to conform to the rules insisted upon by the British government. I understand that under the British system it is not necessary that the judicial authorities should in any way be parties to the granting of certificates of naturalization. It is purely a matter of state, for the administration. Involving citizenship and franchise, it was declared to be a matter not within the purview of the judicial authorities but merely one for the Secretary of State or some other member of the administration.

At present we have dual systems working together; we have the judicial and we have the executive. As was very well pointed out to-day, the Secretary of State has some responsibility; if any abuses arise under his department in regard to granting naturalization they can be brought before the House and before the country, they can be made the subject of discussion on the hustings, and consequently the Secretary of State, no matter how favourable he may be to his own party would have to go rather gingerly and refrain from doing anything which the law declared he should not do. The Under Secretary of State, who has charge of these matters reports that the present system is altogether unworkable, that it is cumbersome and useless, and he asks for a change. Now, the Secretary of State himself says he is not particularly wedded to this proposed section.

Mr. CARROLL: Is it not absolutely necessary in order to carry out the convention between the Imperial government and the colonies—

Mr. LAPOINTE: The dominions.

Mr. CARROLL: —and the dominions, yes, that we follow the lead given us in the Imperial legislation which takes away the power of granting naturalization from the judiciary and gives it to the executive?

Mr. JACOBS: That, I understand, is the rule in England. But we have attempted to be more careful and surrounded naturalization with more safeguards. Consequently we introduced the judiciary into the question. It seems to me that the Department of State can make exactly the same investigations as the judge does under the present system. I know something about how these petitions for naturalization are granted. Application is made by an attorney on behalf of the person desiring naturalization. Before decision is given by the judge an investigation is conducted—in the city of Montreal it is conducted by the Mounted Police, why I do not know, except that I suppose being a federal police force it is their duty to do that class of work. After the Mounted Police have investigated and reported that the applicant is a fit and proper person to be granted a certificate of naturalization, the judge in turn reports to the Department of State. Now, the Mounted Police might just as well report to the Department of State direct without the intervention of the court at all, and inasmuch as it is stated that the system at present is, as I said before, cumbersome and unworkable I would agree to the change suggested by the Secretary of State. Of course, if any other easier and more workable system can be suggested I am prepared to consider it and perhaps to vote for it. The Secretary of State has said that he is open to suggestions.

Mr. BAXTER: In the hon. member's opinion, whatever procedure is to be followed, whether a judicial, a police or any other sort of investigation, ought it not be set out in the act instead of being a matter of regulation?

Mr. JACOBS: I fancy the proposed bill is based pretty much upon the English practice.

Mr. BAXTER: It is an exact copy in section 25.

Mr. JACOBS: If it works well in England why should it not work equally well here? My hon. friend should be the very last person to oppose any English system, because he insists that nothing good can come out of any place except England.

Mr. BAXTER: Who?

Mr. JACOBS: And perhaps I ought to add New Brunswick.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not take that view. Very many good things come out of Quebec, you know, including my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. JACOBS: And very many good things go in from Quebec. I would point out to the committee that we must be careful in making changes in this law because we may find ourselves outside the privilege given us by the British government on Imperial naturalization. We have to follow certain well defined rules to secure such naturalization.

Mr. BAXTER: Then at that rate we must have been outside for some years.

Mr. JACOBS: No, I am referring to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). I venture to say that his amendment would not be acceptable to the British government, and if passed it would probably result in the denial to us of Imperial naturalization, which we value so highly. It will be remembered that in 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier brought this matter up at the Imperial Conference at London. There had been an agitation for Imperial naturalization. It was the subject of discussion on many occasions, but in 1911 we were told that such naturalization would be granted on our conforming to certain rules. Previous to that time three years was the time prescribed by us for naturalization. The Imperial government insisted upon five years' domicile. We conformed to that requirement. We conformed also in the matter of having the certificate issued by the Secretary of State. Now, as I understand it, under the English system we do not require the intervention of courts of justice at all, and inasmuch as there is practically no danger so long as a good Liberal administration is in power that the act will be in any way abused by the Secretary of State, I would be in favour of seeing that the Secretary of State obtained the powers asked for, with the proviso of course of voting to amend the bill as soon as the opposition comes into power.

Mr. McMURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that I do not find myself in full accord with the minister with regard to section 4 of his bill. I think the question can be considered from two points of view: first, that of protection of the country; second, that of the applicant for naturalization. As the Naturalization Act stands at present the country has twofold protection: the person desiring naturalization is required to apply personally to a judge, and the minister acting as an appellate court must review the decision of the judge. In that way the country is amply protected.

Now, naturalization is a very valuable right. It has long been settled in civilized countries that the judicial function should be kept entirely separate from the executive. And in dealing with the rights of citizenship the judicial function should exercise a very large and paramount jurisdiction. In this case we have now a court of appeal. We have many judges deciding upon applications for naturalization, and in this way we have a general view of the many judicial minds. There is a marked danger of turning this wide judicial operation into a perfunctory act by a mere department of the state. What does the proposed change involve? It is to be an inquiry by the police forces into the character of the applicant, and a report by them direct to the minister. The minister, sitting in appeal, does not see the applicant and has no opportunity of personally examining the policeman. He does not know the mental calibre of the man who is reporting; he knows nothing, except by letter or affidavit, of the man who is making the application. He proposes to extend that very unsatisfactory condition to first hand ab initio examination of all those who report. We can take the case of the average policeman, untrained in investigation, perhaps more or less prejudiced, reporting adversely in respect to the application of an individual possessed of splendid qualifications for citizenship. Like the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) I think the judge who is familiar with the local situation, familiar with the calibre and character of the applicants in that locality, is by all means best qualified to decide in the matter. I do not like to see a matter of such vital importance to the individual dealt with merely by a department of the state, it is a question that should come within the scope of judicial inquiry, and I think it ought so to remain.

Mr. JACOBS: Surely an administration that nominates the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada ought to be trusted to grant a certificate of naturalization of an applicant?

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the judges after that cannot vote, while the man after he is naturalized, can.

Mr. JACOBS: Therefore the man who can vote has more power than a judge who is on the bench.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not more power, no.

Mr. McMURRAY: The difference is this: In the one case there is no interest in the matter at all but that of doing what is right. In my opinion it is better, rather than to put it under the control of one person, to have the benefit of a variety of views, those of the judges all over the land. I say that the matter is too vital and of too much importance to become a mere matter of departmental administration.

Mr. PUTNAM: It is evident from this discussion itself, and it should be reassuring, that the Secretary of State will, if this pro-

posal is adopted, exercise merely the same powers and the same functions he is exercising now. We have the evidence that the work of the judges has been, not universally but in a substantial number of cases, so unsatisfactory that the department has ignored the report of the judges. I am not at all certain, with due respect to what I would call the eminent authority on the other side—and I say "eminent authority" in all sincerity—that the Secretary of State has not power affirmatively to naturalize a man against whom a judge has reported on regular application. I see some reason why he should have that power. I will suppose, if he had that power, that it was to cover what I might call emergent cases or special circumstances. For instance, a judge might in all honesty make a report against an applicant, and it might turn out within a short time that only those appeared against him who were malicious and spiteful and who had fabricated evidence to do him harm. That judge might die; there might be no circuit there for months. Would it not be feasible to get the facts before the Secretary of State, to show that there had been that miscarriage of justice, and let him exercise his own discretion in the matter? One could cite cases indefinitely where it might well be the prerogative of the Secretary of State to step in and grant naturalization to a man against whom the judge had technically shut the door. He might be a man who had been here five years, who was known to be an outstanding friend of Canada, yet the court might not meet in time to grant his naturalization before the occurrence of some event in connection with which he could be of some great national service. For instance, we might want to make him a delegate to some international convention. These are conceivable cases, and they are not to be sneered at merely because the man of my illustration has not up to that time been a naturalized Canadian citizen.

I could multiply illustrations well within the realm of reason to show that it is only just and sensible that the Secretary of State should have that supreme power. The right hon. leader of the Opposition rather thought that the Secretary of State should have come here armed with an opinion from the Justice department one way or the other. I would rather say that the burden was the other way. There is a clause in the act which on its face does seem to give the Secretary of State that power, and I should say that the man who disputes it should himself come here armed with an authoritative deliverance to convince us that the clause does not mean what it seems to say.

Hon. gentlemen opposite practically admit that a substantial proportion of the judges have been doing their work in a slipshod way, and the moment they admit that they admit that the present system falls down. Simply because some judges do their work in a painstaking and a thorough manner does not enable us to say that the system is a success; I would say that if three per cent of the judges go wrong the system is a failure, particularly if naturalization is as sacred a thing as hon. members opposite in both groups have insisted this afternoon and this evening. If we give the Secretary of State these powers we give him work to do to which his department greatly to its credit, is already enured. The evidence is that the judges were not doing the work; the department has had the power to grant a certificate when the judge reported adversely to the application—and they have been using an emergent power as a general power, due to the lack of thoroughness and the lack of painstaking care on the part of the judges. My own experience in this matter is limited, but it is sufficient to give you an illustration of how slipshod the method is in my experience. The application is filed and the notice is posted. Nobody reads it. I consider that a former speaker to-night was happy in the expression: "What is everybody's business is nobody's business." The judge perfunctorily says, "I will leave this until the last day of the term." and if no objection is registered it then goes through as a matter of course. I do not for a moment impugn the integrity of the judge, but I do say he was not properly vigilant, and it is evident that a large proportion of the judges have not exercised the vigilance that they should. And when a considerable number of the judges were slack in their work, the minister very naturally took it for granted that he could not depend upon the reports of any of these judges in so critical a matter as that of naturalization.

Mr. EULER: I do not propose to delay the committee at any length but I would like very briefly to refer at the outset to the amendment of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), which has not been discussed. The amendment, as I understand it, calls for the prohibition of the granting of naturalization to any alien whose nationality in the country of origin is not revoked by that country itself. If the hon. member had included in his amendment a provision that such an applicant should be granted naturalization if he were himself willing to forswear his former allegiance I think I could support it, but I do not think that this House should

accept any suggestion to keep fastened the shackles of a foreign country upon any man who has lived in this land for five years, has proved himself a worthy citizen and desires to obtain naturalization. That is all I have to say on that. I do not think the committee should have very much difficulty in rejecting the amendment of the hon. member in the way in which it is framed.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would the hon. gentleman object to my correcting him as to what the amendment is?

Mr. EULER: I would prefer to get the correction from the hon. gentleman who moved it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: As I understand it, the amendment does not apply to the case of application for naturalization at all, but applies later on, giving the Secretary of State power to denaturalize a person who has obtained naturalization under certain circumstances.

Mr. EULER: As I understand it, the amendment calls for the denial of naturalization to men who have naturalization in other countries. Is that correct?

Mr. NEILL: No, that is not the purpose of the amendment at all. The amendment is to deal with the case where a man has been naturalized in Canada, and as the hon. member says probably put in three years perhaps five or ten years ago and it is found to-day that he is still a subject of Japan obeying its laws, carrying out its customs, and giving adherence to Japan, when all he has to do to purge himself of that obligation is to apply to Japan to obtain a certificate of expatriation. If he cannot get that certificate of expatriation he is still a Japanese subject. He may want to get it; perhaps he is unfortunate, I do not know about that; but if he fails to get it or fails to apply for it he is certainly still a Japanese subject as well as being a Canadian subject, and if the hon. gentleman wants a test of the sincerity and the genuineness of these denaturalized Japanese in seeking to affiliate themselves to Japan he has only to look to the United States where out of 90,000 eligible only 74 applied for the certificate of expatriation from their native country, and only 64 applications were granted. But of 90,000 only 74 or 75 ever sought for it.

As the hon. member for New Westminster has said, this has nothing to do whatever with the merit or demerit of granting or refusing naturalization to a Jap or anybody else. It deals with the case where a man has been pretending to be a subject of Canada and it is found years and years afterwards that he has been giving the most definite form of adherence to a foreign state.

Mr. EULER: If he is still giving definite adherence to his former state I am quite in sympathy with what the hon. member says. I think the result of the amendment if adopted would be exactly as I have indicated. It would rob a man who has obtained naturalization of his British citizenship. If the man himself cannot obtain release from the country of his former allegiance, even though he may be entirely willing and desirous of being a British subject only, he is deprived of his British citizenship. I object to that.

Mr. NEILL: I have given an instance of their willingness to debar themselves by citing the United States where out of 90,000 eligible to do so only 74 applied for expatriation.

Mr. EULER: Would the hon. gentleman answer this? If the man in question who has already been naturalized in Canada asks from the country of his former allegiance a release from his former obligation and is refused, and if he is willing to disavow himself of allegiance to his former country, would the hon. member deprive him of Canadian citizenship?

Mr. NEILL: No.

Mr. EULER: No, I would object to that. I wish to speak for a few moments on a matter that has been the subject of more serious debate, the matter of the mode of procedure for the obtaining of naturalization in this country. We have the two views. We have the present method whereby the application for naturalization goes to the judge and if approved by him, to the Secretary of State, who again may reject or approve as he sees fit. We have on the other hand, the suggestion made in the present bill that the application instead of going to the judge should go direct to the Secretary of State and be decided there without any intervention by the judge. I am free to say that when the suggestion was first made that the method of procedure should be changed I felt that it was not a step in the right direction. I thought that the judge should perhaps be the best judge as to the qualifications of the applicant for naturalization, he being on the spot, perhaps being personally acquainted with the applicant and having a more intimate knowledge than would be possible to the officials at Ottawa or even to anyone they might send out to make the investigation. But I have discussed the matter fairly well with some of the officials, with those who know, and I am led to believe that it is pretty much a matter of theory which

does not work out in practice, just as some of us believe very strongly in certain theories, say free trade, which we know in actual practice cannot exactly work out in any country.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Order.

Mr. EULER: I do not wish to be misunderstood by my Progressive friends. Perhaps I gave a very unfortunate example, and I do not want them to read into it anything that I did not intend. But the principle is still true. You can carry a theory to the extreme and find that it does not work out in practice.

I for one am not one of those who would like to place an autocratic power in the hands of any official or of any member of the government and a power which he might abuse at certain times especially during an election. The only fair way and the only reasonable way, it seems to me, for the committee to arrive at a conclusion on the matter is to carefully compare in a practical way the exact results of the application of the two methods. I have outlined the first practice, the practice now in vogue, and the statement is made by those who know that the judges in their investigations of the applications of those who desire to become Canadian citizens are in so many words inefficient in the carrying out of their duties.

Now I do not care to make the charge that the judges in general throughout Canada do not properly investigate the qualifications of the various applicants for naturalization. I would not like to think they were all derelict in their duty, but I do know this, that there are cases where the judges who ought to know the law do not know the law with regard to naturalization, and when an applicant is rejected because of a lack of knowledge of the law I say that an injustice is done to him which ought not to be continued if we have any way of avoiding it. I know, for example, that a judge granted applications for naturalization although the law distinctly stated that the applicant did not have certan qualifications. He approved of the applications. They were forwarded to Ottawa to the Secretary of State and there they were rejected. All that expense and delay could not have occurred if the application had gone in the first place to the Secretary of State. He at least knows the law and the various amendments that are made from time to time. I have known other judges who have accepted illiterates and who have rejected men on account of their racial origin, which under the law they were not entitled to do.

[Mr. Euler.]

I take pretty well the opinion of the men who have been in charge of this work; I do not think there is any member here who is well qualified to judge as to the merits of the question. I am not so very much concerned as to the probability that the Secretary of State—as the member of a partisan government if you like—is going to abuse his power. I would not even like to say that I would be very suspicious of the Secretary of State of any other government which might have come into power —if it were a government led by the present leader of the Opposition, or a government led by the leader of the Progressive party. I am free to say that I have a little more confidence in the integrity and good faith of the public men of Canada. And even if they were inclined to be derelict in their duty it would mean that they would have to have the collusion of the men who are, if I may say so, the paid servants of the people of Canada—the deputy minister, the under secretary of state, and all the other officials; and any secretary of state who would dare, just prior to an election, to issue wholesale certificates of naturalization to aliens who he thought would vote for the party which he represented would find, I think, it would not be a very paying thing to do. He would find that his government and his party were responsible and I believe it would do him a great deal more harm than good.

We should not shrink very much from placing the power which is proposed to be given in the hands of the Secretary of State, because after all he is the responsible minister of a government, and if the people of this country have placed upon him responsibility and power it is right that he should exercise it, and if he does not live up to his duty punish him when next he appears before the electors. There are certain safeguards provided even now. In the first place when the application goes in it must be supported by the opinions of two reputable men in the community from which the applicant comes. In the second place if it is found that naturalization is granted to a man who is not worthy of it the Secretary of State and the government have the power to revoke that naturalization.

Now, we will say that a general election is upon us because it seems to be the fear of those who are in opposition that when a general election is impending the government in power will naturalize those whom they believe are favourable to themselves, and perhaps withhold naturalization from those who are opposed ot them. As I say I do not believe there is very much likelihood of their

doing that but they can do it at the present time. We will say there are two candidates. One is Conservative and the other is Liberal, and they come along with perhaps one or two hundred names of men whom they desire to see naturalized. We will say that a Liberal government is in power as is the case just now. The Liberal gets his men naturalized. The Conservative cannot get his men naturalized at all if the Secretary of State—

Mr. MILLAR: Can they be naturalized without the three months elapsing? Must not the notices be posted up for three months?

Mr. EULER: Yes, but surely it is pretty well known longer than three months in advance that a general election is pending, although not always. But this is true: Even throughout the whole term of parliament with a certain government in power the Secretary of State, if he were so inclined, could reject every application for naturalization from persons he thought were politically opposed to him I think it is entirely unlikely that such would be the case.

I am not very strong in my opinion with regard to this matter. I believe that the officials of the department of the Secretary of State are entirely honest in the attitude they have taken, that their desire is to serve the public interest. I believe that the safeguards which would surround the whole situation in case the bill is adopted are ample and are quite sufficient in the interest of the country. It is for that reason that I feel, while supporting the bill as it stands at present, that if some other suggestion could be made that would satisfy the objections of those who are opposed, I would be very glad. I would like to see useful suggestions advanced rather than mere criticisms. To say that we must adhere to the old method is really not intelligent argument. If there are suggestions calculated to effect improvement I think hon. gentlemen opposite should make them, because the Secretary of State has intimated that he is willing to consider suggestions. As to the amendment of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni I feel that the committee ought to reject it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of hon. members that the committee should rise?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): One moment. Before the committee rises I wish to make a statement to correct a possible misunderstanding. I gathered from the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork) that he, at least, understood me to impute some lack of bona fides to the Secretary of State in this matter and that I inferred, or attempted to infer, that the Secretary of State desired to assume autocratic power,—unnecessary autocratic power,—and to obtain the opportunity to naturalize orientals. Nothing was further from my thoughts, and I regret it if any member has understood me to draw such an inference. What I did intend to make clear was, that in my opinion the necessity for the judge's favourable report on an application, and that it was a wise provision to retain in the law, not that the Secretary of State—in this instance at any rate—would not give fair consideration to any application that came before him. What I say is, that the Secretary of State should have the advantage of the judge's report as well. As regards the refusal by the British Columbia judge to naturalize Japanese. I merely cited that as a case to show that the judicial investigation is a real one, that the judge exercises discretion and has power, and that unless he gives a favourable report, the Secretary of State cannot grant a certificate of naturalization. This I say is a wise and proper precaution but I do not, and did not, intend in the slightest degree to impute lack of bona fides to the Secretary of State in this instance.

Progress reported.

RADIOTELEGRAPH ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 144, to amend the Radiotelegraph Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister should explain what the law is and how this bill changes it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Explanations were given when the resolution which preceded this bill was considered in committee, but I have no objection to repeat what was then said. Section 10 of the Radiotelegraph Act gives the Governor in Council the right to prescribe a tariff of fees to be paid for licenses and for examination for certificates of proficiency held and issued under the provision of this act. The aim of the bill is to add a certain paragraph for the purpose of authorizing the payment of a portion of that license fee to a provincial government or a private company for services given in connection with the operation of broadcasting stations and for services performed for the minister in connection with the licensing and inspection of stations.

Within the last two years radiotelegraphy has made considerable progress. Last year there were 10,000 licenses in Canada, and this year it is estimated that 50,000 licenses will be issued. Those licenses are mainly, almost ex-

clusively, for receiving apparatus. Last year sixty-three licenses were issued for broadcast transmitting stations, but only forty were operated. This year only twenty-five licenses had been renewed. Those stations divide themselves into stations operated by big firms selling receiving apparatus, stations operated by newspapers for their advertisement, and then there are also broadcasting stations operated by provinical governments or private companies. The cost of establishing and maintaining a broadcasting station is rather high. The establishment may cost from $7,000 to $20,000, and the cost of upkeep is from $2,000 to several thousand dollars a year. Therefore, it is rather expensive, and many of the present broadcasting stations are going to discontinue.

This bill is to meet specially the situation in Manitoba, where there were two broadcasting stations, one operated by the Free Press and the other by the Tribune. Both have been abandoned on account of the cost. The provincial government operates the telephone system in that province, and it is quite prepared to operate a broadcasting station, but it wants to have something in return. We think it is only fair that the thousands of persons who are getting enjoyment out of their receiving apparatus should pay something to the broadcasting station that supplies the enjoyment, and the idea is to give part of the license fee to the provincial government or to any company that will operate a broadcasting station. The licenses might be collected by the province itself, part of the license to be kept by the province for the cost of operating the broadcasting station and for the cost of collecting the licenses, and the other share to come to the federal government. This is the system in force in England. In England the cost of a receiving license is $2.50, $1.25 of which goes to the government and $1.25 to the broadcasting company. So far the license fee in Canada for receiving stations has been only $1. It is estimated that about 50,000 licenses will be issued this year, so that would give an amount of $50,000. The cost of a license for a broadcasting station is $50.

When this legislation was in committee on the resolution, the former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) wanted to know the expenditure and the revenue last year. The revenue received on account of license fees last year up to the 31st March amounted to $16,200. The cost of inspection service, including administration expenses at Ottawa, amounted to $19,250.18, and the cost of issuing licenses was $5,522.80, making a total of $24,772.98. It must be noted that part of that cost of inspection goes for the inspection of the 160 commercial and eight navigation stations, the 255 Canadian ship stations and all foreign ships visiting Canadian ports carrying Canadian passengers, and this inspection would have to be made in any event. The estimated expenditure for the present year is:

Inspection service..	$24,920
Issue of licenses..	6,100
Total..	$31,020

The estimated revenue from license fees is approximately $50,000. This bill is for the purpose of giving to the Governor in Council power to make arrangements with a provincial government or any responsible government to broadcast and to keep part of the license fees for doing that service.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—Governor in Council may authorize payment of portion of license fees to provincial government, private company or other party for services rendered.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Why should the whole cost of issuing licenses run into something like $5,000 or $6,000? What is the special expense in connection with issuing licenses?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the large cities, Montreal, Toronto, even Quebec, there are officers specially employed for that purpose. In Montreal, last month, the first month of the present fiscal year, over 3,000 licenses have been issued. A special service is required for that work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How does the licensing of these machines come under federal jurisdiction?

Mr LAPOINTE: It has always been under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not deny that. I see the bill was passed in 1913.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is similar to the telegraph. It is interprovincial; it is national; it is even international. We have conventions with other countries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be based on some treaty, some convention; but really I cannot see any other ground. The bill, however, seems to be all right.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 151 to extend the period of the Canada Highways Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Friday, May 4, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the Minister of Finance now definitely fix the date for the presentation of the budget?

Mr. FIELDING: I had contemplated presenting it on Thursday next, but as that day, I find, will be a holiday I will now fix it for Friday If anything happens to necessitate a change there will be ample notice in advance.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): As a private member may I ask a question? We have now entered the fourth month of the session, and I should be glad if the Prime Minister could tell us whether it would be possible to expedite the business of the House by holding more frequent sittings. On Wednesday we sit for three hours, and most other days only six hours. Last session the Railway committee sat for three months and brought down an important report practically a day or so before parliament prorogued. Important committees are now sitting, one of which is the committee on Banking and Commerce, and these committees have not yet reported. Can the Prime Minister tell us what the rest of the sessional programme will be? As I say, we are now in the fourth month of the session and something should be done to speed up the business.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not know that the government can do anything in particular towards expediting the work of the committees. So far as the work of this House is concerned, I think, it is proceeding pretty well. It rests, I think, largely with my hon. friend and other members opposite as to how quickly we shall get through.

CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the writ been issued yet for the election to be held in Cape Breton North and Victoria?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the government not changed its policy in regard to that constituency? There was great expedition in the case of North Essex.

Mr. GRAHAM: The result will be the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is, the hon. gentleman will be defeated.

U.S. LABOUR DELEGATES DETAINED

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is said that importunity will move even an unjust judge. I wonder whether the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) can tell us yet what has been done in the Howat case.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The officer in charge at McAdam Junction has rejected Howat, but has passed Myerscough into the country temporarily. So far I have not had notice of appeal from Howat.

CATTLE SHIPPED TO GREAT BRITAIN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MILLAR: Has the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) received any notification from the British authorities that the first shipment of store cattle to Great Britain was not entirely free from tuberculosis? According to a report in a Regina paper it would appear that they were not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No report of that nature has been brought to my attention. As a matter of fact animals shipped for slaughter do not require to be tested for tuberculosis before entry into the United Kingdom. The conditions regarding tuberculosis apply only to breeding animals.

SINGAPORE NAVAL BASE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In view of the vote of $50,000,000 by the House of Commons at Westminster for the naval base at Singapore,

and the comments in the British parliament and in the press that this signifies strained or possibly strained relations between Great Britain and Japan, I would ask whether the government of my right hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) has acquiesced in this policy which is being pursued by the British government at the present time?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is for the British government to determine their own policy and for us to express no opinions concerning it.

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT

On motion of Hon. Mr. Graham, Bill No. 151 to extend the period of the Canada Highways Act was considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 152 respecting the Canadian National Railways.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to allow the Canadian National Railway Company to do its own express business. Formerly there was the Canadian Northern Express Company, which afterwards became the Canadian National Express Company; there was the Canadian Express Company, which operated over the Grand Trunk and whose stock was vested in the Grand Trunk Company; and there was the Intercolonial Express Company, which had no connection with the Intercolonial Railway so far as ownership was concerned, being a distinct company organized by other parties for the purpose of doing express business over the Intercolonial Railway. Eventually the Canadian Express Company took over the Intercolonial Express Company. This combined company was afterwards amalgamated with the Canadian National Express Company in one organization. The stock of these various express companies of course is now vested in the Canadian National Railway Company, and for the purpose of economy the board has recommended that the Canadian National Railway Company itself be given power to do its own express business.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Canadian National Railway Company authorized to carry on express company business:

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the minister think that this is going to be the right method for the Canadian National Railway Company when it appears to be the wrong method for successful privately managed companies? The Canadian Pacific, as everyone knows, operates its express work through a subsidiary company—the Dominion Express Company. Other railway companies do likewise. I am not sure that the practice is universal, but it is almost so. Here, apparently, the practice is being changed. What is really to be gained by change? Of course, I am quite aware that just as the railways were amalgamated so the express business should be too, but why is it not amalgamated into one company operated as a separate company, thus getting whatever advantage the private railway companies get by that method?

Mr. GRAHAM: We get away from one more of the many companies that we have in connection with the Canadian National Railways. I could see some object in a private railway company having a separate express company in which there are sometimes other relationships that those interested in would not wish the railway company to be directly associated with, but I could not see any advantage of such a situation to a railway in which all the stock is owned by the government. There is no stock of the Canadian National Express Company distributed among the public; there is stock of the other express companies outstanding.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Dominion Express Company?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think so. Maybe the Canadian Pacific Railway Company practically owns all of the stock, but I think you will find some of it in the names of other people. As the stock of the Canadian National Express Company is absolutely in the hands of the government, the board thought it would be more convenient and economical if the railway company itself performed all the duties and functions of the express company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see why it would not be true of the Canadian Pacific Railway if it is true of the Canadian National Railway, because I have always been informed very definitely that the Canadian Pacific Railway owns all the stock of the Dominion Express Company, and this company does no business save with the Canadian Pacific, just as our express company, as I understood it would do no business except with the Canadian National. Besides, the merging of the express

company in the parent company, extinguishing the separate corporation, if it is justified in the case of the express business, would surely, be equally justified in the case of the telegraph business. The telegraph business is still carried on by the Great Northwest Telegraph Company. Does the minister know any reason why he is dealing wth one and not with the other?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know of any reason. I know we have one telegraph company called the Canadian National Telegraph Company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but the stock, as I understood, is owned by the other company.

Mr. GRAHAM: That may be. The question of the telegraph service has never been discussed. This matter has been discussed by the board pretty thoroughly, and they have arrived at the conclusion that there are economic reasons for taking this authority to perform the express business as a branch of the railway management rather than as a separate branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister will remember that after he presented his railway budget I expressed the opinion that in the re-organization of the amalgamated railway systems upon the taking in of the Grand Trunk and upon the accession of Sir Henry Thornton there had been no very sincere attempt at getting the advantages of amalgamation. The struggle seemed to be more to find some place for everybody with a sufficiently dignified title. Now I come to the point as regards the merging of the express company in the Canadian National Railway. It is a fact, is it not, that Mr. Robb, all his life in charge of the mechanical department of the Grand Trunk, brought up in that department and the head of it for a long time until very very lately, has now been made vice-president in charge of express business? And does not the minister see that the purpose of this merger is just to enable the company to put Mr. Robb in with the title of vice-president?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, it looks very much like it to me.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not a fact that Mr. Robb has never had any express experience? He is vice-president now of express and colonization, in respect to neither of which has he had a day's experience; and I understand his assistant is in just the same position—each brought through and living their lives in the mechanical service. I have not a word to say against Mr. Robb in that service. I believe he was a success, one of the few—

Mr. GRAHAM: He was connected with motive power in the first place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is in the mechanical department. In that service he was brought up; there he served all his life. He is now a man of about seventy and he is made vice-president in charge of express business and colonization. It is a very poor encouragement to the men who have served their lives in the express business, who have pushed themselves forward by efficient work from post to post, to find that the big post, toward which, of course, all strive, is simply taken over by a man who knows nothing at all of it.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend's preliminary remarks respecting Mr. Robb may have been all right, but his conclusions are not so accurate. Mr. Robb was given charge of transportation long before this board came into existence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just for a few months.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, for several years. I have had business to do with Mr. Robb in that connection. He was there long before the amalgamation took place. My right hon. friend shakes his head, but I know; I happen to live on the line of the Grand Trunk and I have had dealings with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was it two years?

Mr. GRAHAM: A good deal more than that. I had dealings with him at Brockville on questions of transportation long before there was any amalgamation. But, as to his connection with this company, what my hon. friend says is all new to me. The reasons given by the board I believe to be sound. They say they can more economically manage the express company and give, perhaps, better service, by having it as a branch of the railway company rather than as a subsidiary.

Mr. HANSON: What is the position now occupied by Mr. Hayes, late traffic manager of the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think Mr. Hayes will be connected with the express business, rather than Mr. Robb.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If Mr. Robb is not being put in charge of the express business, as the newspapers tell us, what is he doing?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that I can give that information. He is in charge of work in Montreal, as vice-president.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In charge of what?

Mr. GRAHAM: Several things—railway insurance, for one. I cannot at the moment recall his exact duties.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The papers say —and I do not know that they are not correct—I would naturally think that the responsible minister would know better than they did—that Mr. Robb, who was in the motive power branch during at least seventy-five per cent of his railroad life, has been made vice-president in charge of express and colonization, and that Mr. Hayes is the successor of Mr. Pullen, formerly manager of the Canadian Express Company, the Grand Trunk express company. My hon. friend talks about economies. We want them; now let us know what they will be. What economies will result? How many dismissals are going to be made, and where is the work going to be done?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know anything about the details of how these things are to be managed. The board make a representation to me that they can save money and serve the public just as well by doing away with one company and making it a branch of the railway company. The board will have to be left to carry on the management as they think best.

Mr. FORKE: Does the board make all these appointments?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend need not think we want the details of the business.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman asked me how many men were going to be dismissed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The question is, what economies can be effected? Did the board say that in the name of economy they wanted to wipe these things out? Did they go even that far?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then it comes down to this: The string is pulled; the board says, "Get rid of these things, because economy will result," and my hon. friend does not know a single detail as to what economy will be brought about. Not even an approximation is given. Did my hon. friend discuss it at all? Has he any information except that bald statement?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have some information as to the returns from the operation of the express company and the number of employees. I think I am following out the policy announced by my hon. friend himself that when it comes to the details, that is a matter for the board. When the board makes a recommendation that looks reasonable to me, I accept it. Sometimes I do not have to decide upon it, but in this case parliament has either to accept or to reject it. If, of course, parliament does not want to accept it, I cannot help it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think anyone would suggest that the details of management should not be left to the board. I never heard anyone suggest that, save hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in opposition. That principle, of course, must be adhered to. But when the Canadian National Board presents legislation to the House through the Minister of Railways, the House is entitled to know something of what is to be done under it, to have something on which to base an opinion whether this new system of operation is in the interests of economy. The minister asks us to go at it blindly. He says we are told it will be economical, therefore it is all right. Now, as to Mr. Robb, he is for the first time in his life placed in charge of a vast express system. He never in his career had anything to do with the express business. He had to do with motive power, which is part of the mechanical department. Naturally transportation would be connected with motive power, though during the last two or three years he had, I thought, less than that to do with transportation. But he never had anything to do which was connected with the least degree with the express or colonization business, and he is now made vice-president in charge of both, at a salary, I understand, of $25,000 a year. How many more of these vice-presidents are there?—for they all receive $25,000 a year—and are there others who never had any experience whatever in the work that is committed to them at this large salary?

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, I have to go back to what I said before: If parliament wants me to interfere with the work of the Canadian National Board to the extent of knowing the qualifications of every man they select, knowing what he is to do and how much he is to be paid, then we need not have the Canadian National Board; we had better put it where

it was in the case of the old Intercolonial, when the minister was the last word in the matter of management. I want to give everything to parliament that parliament should have, because parliament has to supply the money. But this is a case of internal management. The men whom we have entrusted with the task of managing the system come to me as minister, the medium through whom they have to approach parliament, and say that they can effect economies in this way. I do not think I ought to be asked for details of what this man does or what that man does; that is a matter in connection with which I take the advice of the Canadian National Board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nothing could be a greater contrast than the position of the minister to that of his friends when they were on this side of the House. I wish to take exactly the same position that I took then: I do not believe in details of management being revealable every day or discussable in the House of Commons, and never did. At the same time I realize, as I realized when in power, that there are some matters in connection with which the details might be brought before the House at the proper time —when that might be done without interfering with the actual day to day management, and when all the doings of the company could be scrutinized by hon. members. If the minister himself was not in the House at the time, there are others here on all sides who were, and those who were will remember that in the session of 1921 I moved the appointment of a committee of this House to review the following subjects—I speak now from memory: The first was the system of management by a directorate of the national system with a view to recommending improvements in the method of appointment, the constitution of the directorate, or otherwise. The second object was to determine what should be contained, and to what extent details should appear, in the report of the company. The third object was to determine at what time and under what circumstances the matters of management might be made known to the House of Commons and to the Senate. While management is on and while they are hiring this man and firing that man, buying coal here and refusing to buy it there, we admitted and argued strenuously that it was impossible to have these things subjected to daily scrutiny, but we always said that the time came when the House had a right to inquire into everything in management, and we asked that committee to ascertain when that time came and how these matters could be brought before the House. The fourth object was to recommend to the House whether and for what purpose the committee so established should become, and become known as, a Standing Committee of the House. The matter of steamship management was included in the National Railways I believe I have now given virtually completely the purposes of that committee. It was presided over by the present member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). The committee was appointed, however, only about three weeks before it was necessary for the House to close owing to the conference. The committee really never finished its work. Its report, however, is of value. This House has never followed the report of that committee. This government, made up of those who, while in opposition, screamed for details from day to day, demanding that everything be known right off, has never proceeded along the line even that the late government took toward the appointment of a committee to complete the work of the committee that was then appointed to find out the right system under which the scrutiny that, undoubtedly, we as representatives of the people ought to make of National Railway affairs and National Railway operation at the proper time, could be made. That scrutiny, I say, can be exercised, but this government has never moved a step to establish such a system, and the consequence is that now, a year and a half after they came into office, this House is practically blindfolded to the National Railways, and there is no method whatever by which the scrutiny we ought to exersise at the proper time can be made.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to ask the minister if he has any information as to the termination of the contract of the Dominion Express Company with the Canadian Government Railways? If so, why is it being terminated? It might appear to be a duplication of the same service, but in so far as there was competition between the Canadian Express Company and the Dominion Express Company the communities which were served jointly by these two companies got very much better service than they will get if the contract with the Dominion Express Company is terminated.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is correct; I am not disputing it. The same thing would apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But our express company is not allowed to do business on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HANSON: Why should they not be?

Mr. GRAHAM: They are not. If the company are going to run this as a business proposition we have to let them run it that way. The public must be served, that is true, but there is no reason why the Canadian National Railway Company doing an express business should ask somebody else to go into its own line and take its business away providing it is serving the public. The Canadian Pacific Railway does not do business that way. The first thing is service to the public. If that is neglected we ought to have something to say. Upon the recommendation of the board I did give the Dominion Express Company notice that on all our lines we would do our own express business, as they have never allowed us to do business on their lines, as I understand it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I just recall to memory that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the resolution to which I referred for the appointment of a committee and the devising of a plan for the examination into Canadian National affairs. Indeed, if I remember rightly, he wanted to go further even than we went. He has been remarkably silent this session. I think he might favour the House now with a statement of his view and just how far he suffers with patience the present policy.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I remember that last year I asked for the appointment of a committee—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no, the hon. member is wrong. He was very quiet last year. It was two years ago he asked for it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Two sessions ago, and I think I very plainly stated then the purpose I had in mind in asking for the constitution of such a committee. I had in mind particularly an inquiry into the matter of the operations of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I was fairly well satisfied with the information I got. I do not remember that I declared myself particularly one way or the other in respect to the appointment of a committee to deal with Canadian National Railway matters. I think I espoused the idea some time ago, I do not know how far back, that it might be advisable to have a standing parliamentary committee before whom and by whom all matters relative to railway administration might be discussed so that we would avoid all discussion in the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Indeed that was the very purpose of the hon. member's motion, but he has not yet explained how he is satisfied to let matters go along without any committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: Confidence is increasing.

Mr. FORKE: I am at a little loss to understand this situation exactly. I understand that the board of railway management has control of employment and the operation of the railways. Just how is the minister going to get this information as to what is being paid to the employees, how they are employed and generally the method of securing them? Is it the idea to have some committee to which the railway board will report, and to have its report come before parliament for discussion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At the right time.

Mr. FORKE: Then what steps would parliament take supposing it is not satisfied with the operations of the railway board? Would parliament over-ride the decisions of the railway board in that case? For instance, in connection with this express company, if parliament thought that a wrong appointment had been made would it interfere with what the railway board had done? What is the meaning of the whole thing?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We would get into a fine mess then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) says it would be a fine mess. I would just suggest to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) that he read the speech of the minister two years ago demanding that very thing. I might also say, and I say it without any sense of malice whatever, that if the hon. member will at the same time read the speech of the hon. member now sitting to his right (Mr. Crerar) he will find the greatest possible cause for the establishment of such a committee. We did contend, we always contended, that we could not directly as a parliament or as a government control the operation of the railway, and we thought it was only consistent with that that the management should not be harassed from day to day by having the matter of operation wrangled over in this House, disclosed to it and made the subject of discussion and debate. But we had to fight heroically to maintain our ground against the assaults of hon. gentlemen here, who claimed that the dismissal of every man, or the purchase of every ton of coal, should, if demanded be made a matter of discussion right on the floor of parliament. But we went this far ourselves: That this was the place where railway expenditures should be made known, but made known at a time when they would not harass

the management of the system. Consequently the committee was appointed to look into the whole situation and see when, and by what means, those things should be known. Now the hon. member asks for what purpose should they be made known? Just in order that the people of Canada would know about it and realize how their railway system had been managed. If such things, for example, were revealed as disclosed a lack of care on the part of the directorate, then the very fact that they were revealed would bring home to the government the need of altering that directorate. Undoubtedly no one could argue, no one did argue, that it was not necessary that these matters at the proper time be made known, and made known in whatever detail hon. members might desire. The only thing we wanted to guard was that we did not so pry into matters of operation while operation was on as to harass the management of the system. Now, I think I have made the matter clear, and I know that two years ago there was no difference of opinion that we should go that far. There were others who argued we should go far further, a great deal further—that we should go into these matters at any time. But all I ask now is that we do go as far as the House, as every hon. member of the House, was ready to go two years ago and that a committee should be appointed to work the matter out, and complete the work of the committee of two years ago.

Mr. FORKE: I can only say I was not expressing an opinion, I simply wanted information.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Agreements with other companies or municipalities:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the effect of this clause?

Mr. CHURCH: The effect of this clause 2 is to enable the directors of the National Railways to enter into an agreement, which they cannot do now, for the sale of part of a national railway to a municipality. At present they can only sell to another railway company. The object of the bill is to enable the directors of the National Railway to sell part of the Toronto Suburban railway to the city of Toronto. There has been a change of policy on the part of the new board of directors. The old board had a friendly working arrangement with the Hydro-power municipalities of central Ontario, including the Niagara, Hamilton, and Toronto districts. The Hydro-power municipalities are 346 in number. These have a cheap light and power system of their own which is operating successfully and paying a large surplus. They wished to go into the railway business and to take in certain railways operated by the National system and establish a radial system of their own, including the Toronto Eastern, the Niagara and St. Catharines, and the Toronto Suburban. The by-laws for this purpose were adopted by the interested municipalities. No politics intervened in connection with this scheme. Liberals and Conservatives alike worked together from the start of the Hydro in the interests of improved transportation by radials and the people's own light and power scheme which operates at cost.

The plan proposed would have the effect of relieving the National railways of these three radials and heavy deficits. The people of Toronto have recently taken over the street railway system there. They have spent $17,000,000 in betterments, have rebuilt 140 miles of track, and are to pay nearly $12,000,000 as a result of an arbitration for the acquirement of the Toronto street railway. They have eliminated private ownership of the street railway franchise within the borders of the city and all other electric franchises except the small section referred to, the Toronto Suburban railway within the city limits. It is to consummate the purchase of this line within the city that the present proposed legislation is necessary. The acquisition by the city of the Mackenzie and Mann radial lines running in various directions in the county of York left the railway in question the only line not under the control of the municipality. Arrangements have been made for taking this line over, and arbitrators have been appointed for that purpose. The policy of the old board of directors of the National system was to work harmoniously with the Hydro in rural and urban municipalities. An arrangement had been entered into to sell these three roads to the Hydro municipalities interested: first, the radial system in the Niagara district known as the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto railway; second, the Toronto and Eastern railway, to be built from Toronto to Bowmanville, partly constructed; third, the Toronto Suburban railway running partly through the city and over 62 miles of track to Guelph partly on the highway and partly on a private right of way. The by-laws, based on the options obtained with the old board of directors of the National railways were submitted to the people and carried and options for the purchase of the three roads were given to the municipalities affected

in the districts in which the three roads were. The ratepayers thoroughly discussed the project, the Hydro Commission engaged experts in the United States to study the question from the standpoints of engineering, commerce, traffic and policy, and decided to carry out the plans. Some of these municipalities are represented in this House by Liberals, others by Conservatives. The by-laws were carried by large majorities. What happened after the vote had been taken and the bonds for the purchase of these roads had been deposited in the proper quarter. An election was held, a new government came in, a new railway board was appointed and they went back on these solemn agreements and options with the Hydro.

I may say that in the operation of this radial railway scheme Liberals and Conservatives are united. There has been no politics in the administration of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, the object is to carry out a cheap light, heat, power and transportation scheme at cost and give proper service. In Toronto private ownership has disappeared in a light, power and transportation sense. The municipality has bought out the private companies and they were glad to get out. In the past under private ownership the operation of these radials created large deficits; but the municipalities by rebuilding the line and carrying out certain betterments and economies will soon place the lines upon a paying basis, and they are now giving most efficient service. What has happened in consequence of the change in the directors of the Canadian National Railways? The President, Sir Henry Thornton, had scarcely been installed in office when he sent a telegram to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto going back on the radial options given and virtually declaring war. At that time an election was pending, the people were voting on the various hydro radial by-laws to which I have referred, they wanted to be left alone, they desired to help the National railways through the medium of hydro radials of the new plans as Ontario has always done. As I say there are 346 municipalities directly interested in the Hydro Electric and radial schemes. They have no quarrel with private ownership. They respect the men who went into the privately-owned light and power companies and who bore the heat and burden of the day and then sold out to the Hydro. But the owners of these private systems wanted to sell out and the municipalities bought them out. Sir Henry Thornton, as I say, sent a telegram to the Board of Trade of Hamilton which upset the proposed hydro radial schemes by which so many municipalities had planned to go ahead with the extension and operation of their own hydro radial system. In connection with the acquisition of the Toronto Suburban railway a letter was written the Board of Control of Toronto by Mr. Walter Gow of Blake, Lash and Cassels. It was referred to in a report to the city council in this question before the board of control. I will not read his letter but he says that the bondholders have bonded the entire road from Toronto to Guelph and they were not going to be allowed to sell part of the road or the bonds on the whole would come due. The bondholders would set up the "doctrine of severance" in law, and if part were sold the bonds on all would become due. So I contend that the government cannot sell part of this road legally to the city, or the doctrine I have referred to would apply and the debentures on all the road would become due.

If this section is passed to-day what will be the result? The National Railways can sell this road to a municipality. I have no objection to the second part of the section, to enable the Canadian National to sell the entire road, but I object to the Canadian National Railways coming around after the hydro municipalities have a radial scheme of their own validated by the people at the polls and for which the municipalities are willing to pay, after private ownership has proven a failure in its operation of the three Mackenzie and Mann roads in the district, and after the government agreed to let them go to the Hydro—I say I do object to having Sir Henry Thornton upset all this.

The Toronto suburban roads have gone behind $70,000 since September 1, as the board of control's report which I have here shows. The acceptance of the offer means that the city of Toronto will have to pay the deficit incurred by these lines, which will amount to about $70,000, and about $190,000 for the city sections of the Toronto Suburban. I cannot understand why Sir Henry Thornton comes along and wants to spend a lot more of the money of the taxpayers of Canada on three radial railways which railways should be taken over by the municipalities and without a dollar's cost to Canada. The municipalities are willing and eager to take them over and to release the government of this country from any further liability and all the large capital expenditures and deficits, and will rebuild them without cost to the country and incorporate them in a hydro system. If the proposition is accepted it will save the

country millions of dollars. The people's own Hydro Electric radial will act as feeders for the National Railways and millions of dollars of business for the National in the future would have been obtained by Sir Henry Thornton and his directors if he had sold these radial roads to the municipalities and let them operate them. He came along and upset it all after the people of Toronto had carried by-laws to take over the two roads—the Toronto and Eastern and the Toronto Suburban. The people of the district from Toronto down to Bowmanville had carried by-laws to take over as a hydro radial the Toronto and Eastern partly built which would have been a great financial success. The people in the suburban districts around Toronto through the constituency of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) had carried by-laws. So had the people in the municipalities from up to Halton and they were to thus have a radial system of their own which would have solved their difficulties, and would have brought the farm produce into the city at all hours of the day, thus solving under-production and unemployment and conferring a great boon on the people of many counties in central Ontario.

Now Sir Henry Thornton comes along and proposes a radial system of his own, known as the National radial scheme for the Toronto district. I venture to say no practical man who knows anything about radials will approve of the scheme and that it will never pay the fixed charges on the proposed road. In the first place he proposes to electrify the Toronto and Eastern and link it up with the old belt line on the Don and then connect with the Guelph section of the Toronto Suburban. As I say, it will go along the old belt line and across the northern part of the city north of St. Clair avenue and through the city of Toronto and York county and link up with the Guelph system of the Toronto Suburban. That proposal is absurd and will be a huge failure for this reason: The city of Toronto is spending $26,000,000 in rebuilding the Toronto harbour and one of the main reasons why they are spending that money themselves has been to eliminate level crossings on the water front and in the city proper where many people have been killed in past years, where traffic is blocked and where the conditions have become intolerable. After we signed a viaduct agreement with the government of Can-
4 p.m. ada, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a viaduct and eliminate all level crossings on the water front, it seems to me a pity that we cannot have this viaduct built. Now Sir Henry Thornton comes along to the north and will establish sixteen level crossings in the northern part of the city of Toronto, and the township of York at the following streets: Bowie avenue, Bromley, Rowland, Fourth and Fifth streets, Sydney avenue, Dufferin street, Rosebury avenue, Sixth street, Second street, Cheyne avenue, Hilltop avenue Mayfair avenue and city line In other words, it is going to take $32,000,000 presently and in the future to eliminate the sixteen level crossings which with one sweep, without consulting the municipalities, Sir Henry Thornton proposes to establish for his radial in and to the north and west of the city of Toronto.

This radial scheme will never pay the interest on the bonds. The people's own system of radials is what the people of the city and the farmers want. They carried the by-laws for their own system by a large majority, in many cases by three to one in the Toronto district, and the people's own hydro radial system was to run along the water front on elevated tracks with no level crossings. The railways come in on elevated tracks. It is a fast express service that the people want. Sir Henry Thornton's scheme will use the Toronto and Eastern and the old belt line will electrify them and run over them, and will involve sixteen level crossings. Not only that, but he comes along after the city of Toronto has spent $30,000,000 to acquire the Toronto railway and provide betterments, parallels part of the city line, and does a local business.

I am very much surprised if this is what we are to expect from the Canadian National Railways and I think we might as well close up altogether if they are going to spend millions in the foolish and unnecessary manner proposed here, and establish sixteen level crossings over the township of York and Scarborough and the city of Toronto after we had in good faith made an agreement with the government to have our own system without cost to Canada, spent millions on the water front to improve the harbour and eliminate level crossings, acquired our own light and power scheme, and taken over our street railway system. I am surprised that Sir Henry Thornton should come along and propose such an absurd scheme involving the creation of sixteen more level crossings. The privately-owned Mackenzie and Mann roads were glad to sell out to the city of Toronto as they had deficits on their radials and I think there was just as good business ability in the Mackenzie and Mann Company as there is in the management of the Canadian National road.

This Sir Henry Thornton radial scheme has not the confidence of the people of the county of York. I will leave that to the hon. member for West York, and other members from that district. The people of this district, Liberals and Conservatives alike, wanted their own radial programme and the people of the York district will not back up this new radial proposition. It is not their own scheme but a scheme which the people do not want, which will add to the deficit of the National Railways by millions of dollars, and will establish a system of level crossings, the like of which is not to be found in the city of Toronto to-day. There are 320 hydro municipalities that want to be the friends of the National Railways and to spend their money on a radial scheme of their own to do this work which the Dominion government should never be asked to do. The hydro radials would act as feeders to the Canadian National. Why should Sir Henry Thornton put forward the proposition now before us, and why should we be told that this money is going to be spent for the benefit of the farmers of York when they do not want it? It could not be called a work for the general advantage of Canada by the widest stretch of imagination, yet we are going to spend millions of the taxpayers' money to put this radial proposition through. The people want their own hydro radial system and they want an elevated fast traction entrance into the city of Toronto. Under the scheme proposed by Sir Henry Thornton we will have a slow system over level crossings and we will have great deficits.

It seems to me that the present board of directors of the National Railways have altogether too much power. They are going up and down the country spending millions of dollars in building skyscrapers and promising Ottawa and other parts of the country new terminals. They have promised the city of Ottawa new terminals. They have made a trip to Hamilton and other cities and promised to spend millions of dollars on terminals there, which will never be built, and if the board of directors of the National Railways would only carry out the capital commitments and agreements which they have now conditions should be better.

There are many other agreements with priority which the Canadian National Railways cannot carry out, involving millions of dollars, from coast to coast, and here we have a board of directors going up and down the country promising the people something which they know they can never give them because parliament will never vote the money. I want to discover, if I can, just what powers this National Railway Board has. Under the British North America Act parliament is defined as comprising two houses, the House of Commons and the Senate; but it seems to me that under the new order of affairs, since Sir Henry has come, we have three houses of parliament, the House of Commons, the Senate, and the House of Thornton. It is pretty nearly time, I think, that we had responsible government in Canada, so far at any rate as railway matters are concerned. Parliament is responsible to the taxpayers; yet we have no control over the spending bee of this board.

Now, public ownership is not responsible for the present railway situation in this country; the condition of affairs that exists to-day in connection with our railways is attributable to the operations of private ownership. I think Sir Henry Thornton should carry out the agreements made by the late government with these hydro municipalities in the Niagara, Hamilton and Toronto districts, where both Liberals and Conservatives and all the people are interested in the hydro-electric radial scheme. We desire to co-operate with the Canadian National Railways, with whom we are friendly; and it seems to me that it would be better for Sir Henry to endeavour to work hand in hand with the municipalities instead of sending such a telegram as he did to the Hamilton Board of Trade on the eve of a municipal election, proposing a system of radials which would never pay the interest on the investment. It is a level-crossing system and is perfectly absurd, for you cannot get directly from one point to another. If you wish to travel from point A to point B you are bound to go over a circuitous route; you must touch at C and D in three other sections before you can finally reach B in a straight line. It is the most absurd sort of radial system one could imagine, and if you are going to run the Canadian National Railways in that manner at all you are bound to have deficits. I do not regard the minister as being responsible for this condition of affairs in connection with this particular line. I believe that if he had his way he would carry out the agreements made with the late government and give the municipalities a chance to have their own system. I certainly am of the opinion that if the agreement were carried out it would relieve the country of a very heavy financial burden which is unavoidable under the York Radial plan proposed. I repeat again that it would be by far the best thing for the minister to carry out the honourable bargain entered into with these municipalities.

Mr. GRAHAM: The question raised by my hon. friend in regard to the rights of the bondholders being protected calls for a remark, I think. The bondholders of the Toronto Suburban are subject to the terms of the franchise of the old Toronto Junction, now Ward 7 of Toronto, just as are the shareholders. Outside of the franchise their rights would have to be secured in any sale made. These are my instructions from the solicitor of the Canadian National Railways. This bill is to allow the Canadian National Railways to sell to the city of Toronto certain portions of the suburban railway lying within the municipality. The reason for this bill is the fact that, while under the statute of 1919 the Canadian National Railway Company was empowered to make agreements with other railway companies, it was not empowered to sell to the municipality. The franchise expired in 1921, and Toronto desires to take over the portions of this line within the city, so that it is necessary to have the Canadian National Railway Company empowered to treat with the municipality as they are empowered to treat with other railway companies.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can my hon. friend tell me why the decision to sell lines which to quite a large extent depend on municipal franchise was reversed? It was thought good Dominion policy that the Dominion railways should in fact be steam railways. True, they might be electrified afterwards, but it was thought best that the railways of the larger lines should be operated by steam. It was regarded as good policy to sell these electric lines, many of which depend on the municipal franchise, to the people that gave the franchises, getting out every cent of money we had in the lines and securing an agreement that we should get the benefit of all freight produced. Why is the partial sale being made instead of a total sale, so far as Dominion governmental interest is concerned? I want to tell my hon. friend that there are more people interested in this question than are to be found within the confines of the city of Toronto. If there is one disgraceful railway on the face of the earth it is that very Toronto suburban line. My hon. friend is operating cars on that line that can be duplicated only by the Toonerville trolley which we see in the papers in the morning, and the only reason that things are in their present lamentable shape is that for years it was understood that the municipalities were to get these properties, so that we have been putting up with this condition in the meanwhile. Why is the original proposition being departed from?

Mr. GRAHAM: The new board of management believe that these are very valuable properties that should be secured for the Canadian National system rather than be disposed of to any interest. If they are not properly managed they are now subject to the board of commissioners the same as any other part of the National Railway system. The people should have a good service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But they are not getting it.

Mr. GRAHAM: They should. The municipalities east of Toronto rather expressed the view in the last election that they did not wish to have the radial system, and I think that the city of Toronto itself expressed that view. That being the case I believe the board is acting wisely. But, apart altogether from that, here is a property consisting of some electric railways which are feeders to a large extent to the Canadian National system and which are owned by that system. Why should they be sold to anyone else? I admit that service to the people is the prime consideration, but if that service be given—and it can be given by that company as well as by any other—then why should we all over Canada who have an interest in this property sell it to someone else? These, I think, can become in a more extensive manner feeders to our Canadian National Railway system, and I agree with the board that it would be unwise to hand these feeders over to some other company that might operate them against our interest; but when we own the feeders, when we own the electric lines some of which run parallel, or nearly so, to our own steam lines, then it makes no difference which way the traffic goes, it belongs to the Canadian National Railway system. It has been a difficult proposition to work out, and in the main I agree with my hon. friend that electric railways are in a different category from steam railways. But here we have electric railways that came into our possession through the purchase of the Canadian Northern system and all its ramifications. I agree with the board that if these electric railways are a good paying system, or can be made so, the Canadian National Railway Company, serving all the people of the Dominion, should retain them rather than sell them to any person else. But, of course, the people should be served by the National as well as by any other company.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is working in the larger issue with one which

is a good deal smaller. There is no doubt that the general radial policy did suffer defeat at the hands of the ratepayers at the last municipal election, and there is also no doubt what the reason was. I will come to that reason in a minute. But apart from the general scheme there was also the idea that these lines could be easily owned by the municipalities. They were willing to undertake the burden and to agree that the Dominion should get quit of everything. And my hon. friend well knows that these lines were not paying. The St. Catharines branch has always paid, and there is no reason why it should not continue to pay; but the Toronto Suburban has never paid a cent, nor has the Toronto and Eastern. However, it was thought that with the local business which could be worked up these lines could be made to pay and to become valuable feeders to the national railway. And I do not know that it hurts a steam road at all to have this local traffic collected for it. However that may be, my hon. friend takes the position which he has just declared to us. We have not yet had any particulars, and I should like to know whether my hon. friend is implementing in his vote what he says ought to be done for the people of these counties? We have not cars, we have not tracks, we have not service, and it costs money to give us these.

Mr. GRAHAM: Which one are you referring to?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Toronto Suburban.

Mr. GRAHAM: Running to Guelph?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It runs up to Woodbridge, and through part of the riding of my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister. Is my hon. friend taking that up in his estimates this year? These people might be getting service to-morrow if the sale be put through. My hon. friend says the people are entitled to that service. Will he see that it is given to them?

Mr. GRAHAM: The whole question of suburban service is now being considered by a committee of the Canadian National Railway Board if I remember correctly. The line to which my hon. friend refers is in a little different position to the one I had in mind when I was discussing the larger question of radials. That line might well be discussed at closer range. It is really a smaller line subsidiary to Toronto.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So is the Toronto and Eastern.

Mr. GRAHAM: I had the larger radial scheme in mind. I shall be glad to discuss that with the board.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister has referred to the Niagara Central This is one of the roads that have been allowed to deteriorate, and to-day it lacks equipment, and the people in the counties served by it are not satisfied with the way it is operated. Besides lack of service the municipalities concerned, not only the city that I come from but the adjoining municipalities, complain that they are not able to get their streets paved because the management of the road will not in any way conform to the wishes of the people in this respect. It seems to me that something should be done in such cases. This road should not be allowed to remain in its present shape, and the municipalities should be met by the management in a reasonable spirit and be allowed to make public improvements.

Mr. GRAHAM: I agree altogether with my hon. friend that the fact that the Canadian National Railway Company retains owners ip of any of these lines should not militate against proper co-operation with the municipalities affected. I shall be glad to call the attention of the president of the road to what my hon. friend has said. He is referring to St. Catharines, I presume?

Mr. CHAPLIN: And to the villages of Merritton and Port Dalhousie, all of which very recently have made representations regarding the condition of the road, which has continued for a considerable time. In my judgment the road has not been operated either in the interests of the road itself or of the municipalities through which it runs. It seems to me that some movement should be made by the management to get in touch with these municipalities. As I understand it, the franchises under which the road is operating have been allowed to lapse. Someone should get in touch with the municipalities and assure them that the franchises will be taken up and that the wishes of the local people will be treated in a reasonable spirit. When a municipality goes to the management to-day and asks to be allowed to fix up its streets it is met with the reply, "Oh, we have not got any money to fix the street." The result is nothing is done, and of course the people are getting sore with the management. It is not in the public interest that

the present condition of things should be allowed to continue.

Mr. BAXTER: The discussion has taken a fairly wide range and I trust that I may be in order in what I am going to ask, but if the minister is not prepared with an answer now I should like him to give it to me later on. When he visits the New York Central station he sees a wonderful ceiling representing some of the heavenly bodies. If he were to visit the humble city of St. John—very humble, though hoping some day to rival New York—he would see not merely a few of the constellations but all the stars that are visible in the northern hemisphere. Some years ago in an attempt to repair the roof the whole structure collapsed. Since that time the site has been surveyed and re-surveyed, it has been measured and re-measured, it has been taken apart and put together theoretically, and yet so far, except for the few holes that have been drilled, we cannot find anything that evidences the commencement of a new railway station. I know the deficit is formidable, but still the rigours of a New Brunswick winter are not at all relished by those who have to use the open air train shed at St. John. Down there it is becoming a case of "How long, O Lord, how long." If the minister can get information from the railway board and transmit it through this House to the long-suffering public in St. John, I know they will be glad to receive even the shadow of a promise of the commencement of this much-needed work. The new chairman of the railway board was in St. John and made a speech—a remarkable thing—not exactly in the open-air train shed but very close to it. He must have observed the celestial roof, and I should have thought, with the rapidity with which things are now moving in the Canadian National Railway world, we would have seen before this a brick or stone or concrete commencement of a new station. But as yet there is nothing. We have great expectations, but nothing more.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course, man cannot live by bread alone. The new railway board and the Department of Public Works have been in consultation respecting the terminals at St. John and the harbour developments there. I do not know just how far the discussion has proceeded, but there has been some difference of opinion as to how far the Canadian National terminals and the harbour developments of the Department of Public Works are being co-ordinated.

Mr. BAXTER: That would hardly affect the railway station.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know. However, if I can get a ray of hope from the board for my hon. friend I will try to extract it.

Mr. BAXTER: If the minister will simply get us the truth, whatever it is, we shall be interested to hear it. If they are not going to do it, let us know.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: With reference to that telegram from the president of the Canadian National Railways to the effect that the Dominion would electrify the railways in the district referred to, my hon. friend knows that the people are very anxious to get that electrification if they can, and I would ask him whether the suggestion contained in the telegram was merely a pious aspiration, or was it really meant? Do the minister's estimates this year provide for the electrification of that line?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not so far as I know.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then what was the idea of the telegram?

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not send it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We see in the papers a statement to the effect that a million dollar site has been purchased for a new ticket office building in Toronto. It will cost another million to put up a suitable building, and the people in our district, who find that there is no money available to put the road in shape to do business in their part of the country, are very much interested in knowing whether it is true that a million dollars will be spent in that way.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: All this discussion with regard to a station at St. John and the erection of buildings in Toronto is out of order. Shall clause 2 carry?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION

The House again in committee on Bill No. 45, respecting Chinese immigration, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): When this bill was previously considered in committee section 3 was allowed to stand because there was some doubt whether or not the Civil Service Commission had control in respect to certain matters dealt with therein. I wish to submit a new clause 3, which I would ask the committee to accept. It is as follows:

3. The Governor in Council may,—

(a) appoint any official of the Department of Immigration and Colonization or of the Department of Customs and Excise to be chief controller or a controller.

That confines the appointment to persons who have previously been selected by the Civil Service Commission. We bring the Customs Department in because at many ports there are no immigration officials and we may name the customs official to act in our behalf for the purposes of watching the situation at such ports. The amended clause continues:

(b) appoint and fix the salary or remuneration of officers in countries other than Canada for the purpose of endorsing passports or performing other duties under this act.

That is the only official whose appointment we are asking to have control of. He will be stationed in China.

(c) assign any duty in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act to any officer or person in the employ of the government of Canada;

(d) define and prescribe the duties of such officer or person;

(e) make regulations for the carrying out of this act;

(f) designate certain ports as ports of entry for the admission to Canada of persons of Chinese origin or descent;

(g) make regulations providing for the payment of fees for the furnishing of substitutional certificates, endorsing passports and other administrative work in connection with the carrying out of this act.

That makes it very clear what we intend to do under section 3.

Mr. LADNER: On Monday last when other features of this bill were under consideration I was under the disadvantage of being out of the city at the time and was not able to make the few observations I desire to bring before the minister. Apparently in the changed clause which the minister proposes one of the chief remedies for bringing about exclusion of the Chinese from entering British Columbia is to be by regulation through the Governor in Council. I would point out to the minister that so far as the province of British Columbia is concerned and the people there, there is one straight issue and that is whether there is to be absolute exclusion or admission of Chinese into the province.

The CHAIRMAN: The question of admission of Chinese is not before the committee at the moment. The question before the Chair is the appointment of officers.

Mr. LADNER: The minister referred to certain regulations and the clause deals with the question of regulating immigration into Canada. As I understand it, the powers are wide enough to cover that, I shall only be a minute or two with respect to the question I have under consideration. Last year a resolution was introduced by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) asking for exclusion. We are told by the Prime Minister that effective restriction would be provided by the amendment which was proposed at that time, and that the effective restriction thus proposed was the diplomatic way of bringing about exclusion to the satisfaction of the people. Now this bill is the fulfilment of the Prime Minister's promise at that time. It is to carry out the pledge of effective restriction, and my submission is that the clauses which propose to bring about the restriction by order in council will not be effective because of the ingenuity of the applicants in their efforts to enter this country. I also submit, Mr. Chairman, that the feature of the bill dealing with merchants will permit of an immigration which is not consistent with the wishes of the people of British Columbia, who are in fact insisting—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's remarks would more properly come under section 5 which confines immigration to certain classes.

Mr. LADNER: I merely wish to make the general observation that so far as this matter is concerned the provisions are not strong enough to keep out the Chinese, and the minister will have to be very careful when he comes to make his orders in council because otherwise the same ingenious devices will be resorted to by the wily Chinese that have been resorted to during the past number of years. I think that upon reflection the minister might consider the wisdom and expediency of making whatever restrictive measures he proposes part of the act itself rather than leaving it to order in council.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 5—Immigration confined to certain classes:

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We had a good deal of discussion on Monday when the bill was up for consideration and an amendment was suggested by my hon. friend for New Westminster attempting to define what we call merchant, but it was not defined in that way, and it was suggested by the Prime Minister that a merchant should be defined as one

—engaged in import and export trade, including sales agents and purchasing agents while representing bona fide Chinese exporters and importers carrying on international trade between Canada and China, buying from or selling to persons, firms or corporations in Canada.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that if we adopted that definition and put it in the act it would increase the duties of our immigration officers a thousandfold, because it would be statutory and no regulation would affect it. It is needless for me to point out to the members from British Columbia the difficulty of enforcing any regulation or statute even against immigration of the character we are trying to regulate and control, and if it would meet the wishes of the committee I would move to add after the word "merchant" the words "to be defined by regulation". My hon. friend for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) has just raised some objections in connection with the definition of that word. Our difficulty is this. Every advantage is taken not only by the Chinese, but by orientals generally of any implication by which they can enter the country. For instance, I am told by the officers of the department that in China they are in much the same position as we were in the days when the small shoemaker was the only manufacturer of boots in Canada and made boots in a room in his own house. Now he would come under such a definition as has been suggested. I merely mention that as one case. The officers of the department inform me that the amendment suggested by my hon. friend would really be wider than the old act, and if we put such a definition into the statute we would have a much more difficult task controlling the entry of Chinese into British Columbia than we have under the existing law. What I read to the committee the other night was the regulation I proposed to apply. It provided that before a merchant left China he would have to establish the fact that he had been engaged in business in China as a merchant, that he had a certain sum of money invested there in his business, and that when he came to Canada he would engage in the business of merchandising stuff grown or manufactured in China. But the proposal suggested by my hon. friend was that we should exclude by statute

—any merchant's clerk, or other employee, tailor, mechanic, huckster, pedlar, or person engaged in taking, drying or otherwise preserving fish for home consumption or exportation, or having any connection whatever with a laundry or restaurant.

To put that definition in the act would tie our hands if there are legal methods by which they can get around that provision, but when it is left to regulation all we would have to do in case of an evasion would be to cover the case by an amended regulation at the next meeting of the cabinet. In any case we must take the responsibility for the enforcement of this act, and I am asking for this act in order to strengthen my hands in the enforcement of the law. We have confined immigration to merchants and students, and we think it best to leave the definition to regulation which can be amended within a day by the cabinet rather than having to wait for the next session of parliament as we would have to do if there was a statutory definition.

Mr. CARROLL: I may say that I am in perfect accord with the minister in not defining words in the statute unless it comes in as part of the interpretation of the act. I think that our governments are going altogether too far in that direction. These words have a well-defined meaning, their meaning has been defined by the courts of the country, and I think that the words should be left in the act bearing the interpretation that the courts of our country have placed upon them. In the present instance I am not objecting to the minister making regulations defining these words, but I do strenuously object to having the statutes of this country laden down and overborne with definitions of mere words that have been interpreted by the courts on various occasions as meaning such and such a thing. However, if the minister says he is going to make regulations governing the matter it may be a different thing.

Mr. LADNER: I was going to suggest to the minister the wisdom of putting in the specific class of Chinese which will be excluded, and which are set out in the amendment, and then adding provisions enabling the minister to supplement that by order in council.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may point out to my hon. friend that we have done that. If he will read further he will see the words: "Who shall substantiate their status to the satisfaction of the controller at the port of entry subject to the approval of the minister."

Mr. NEILL: May I point out to the minister that what he proposed the other day is a different regulation from what he is now giving us; apparently his definition has blossomed into quite a different statement and now includes fish dealers, hucksters, tailors, etc. As I understood it the other day the regulation, which the minister said was a regulation adopted by his department, was along the lines that a merchant had to have $2,500 invested in a bona fide business in China and must show evidence of his intention to invest the same sum of money here. That is quite a different regulation from what he has suggested to-day. I would like an explanation of that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are identical with the exception that I have added clauses at the end. The other day it was in positive form but to-day it is in negative form—that is all the difference. I have discovered that the provision is much more effective worded in this way.

Mr. NEILL: Is the regulation which the minister alluded to the other day set forth in the amendment which he has now moved?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I do not propose to make it a statutory amendment. I simply give it to the committee as a regulation under which we could work acceptably.

Mr. NEILL: In that regard then I agree with the hon. members who have spoken and who have suggested that it should be embodied in the act, with all due deference to the hon. member (Mr. Carroll) who spoke from an opposite point of view. If necessary, take also power to add to the definition by regulation. If the minister is in Ottawa and the controller is in Vancouver or Victoria, the decision on which will be based the rejection or acceptance of a Chinese merchant must be conveyed by that minister to that controller by some means of communication and I suggest it would be done by writing or by wire. Therefore that communication must contain what, in the opinion of the minister, is the definition of a merchant and on that decision the controller in Vancouver or Victoria, who has no jurisdiction of his own, will act. Now if the minister can define to his satisfaction, as he must eventually, what is a merchant, in his office and by regulation, why can he not place the definition in the act? Suggestion has been made that the Chinese are very alert in getting round any regulation that is adopted and therefore it is necessary to have a loose definition; but in the final analysis language must be used to express the minister's conception of a merchant, and if that language can be used in a regulation, it can be equally used in an act which will be much more effective than merely leaving the term merchant in a blank form.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I gave the committee my conception of what I would embody, as defining "merchant," in a regulation; but I also take care to point out that we have this advantage over placing a definition in the statute. My hon. friend desires to have that regulation a statutory one. If we make it statutory I cannot say to him, nor can he perhaps say, that it will be with full assurance that we have sufficiently covered the situation. Take for example the amendment suggested in the discussion the other day. I find, after investigation, that had we adopted it we would have widened the provisions of the statute in a way that I could not possibly control. I am willing to take the full responsibility of giving the best administration possible under this act, but I say to the committee: Leave me free to make any amendment by regulation to cover any contingency that may arise that we have overlooked. That can be done by way of regulation but if it is provided that it must be by statutory enactment it will not be possible to meet a possible contingency, if such arises, until parliament meets at the next session.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There are two points on which I would like to get information. It is not specifically stated whether the wives of these various classes are to be permitted to enter. Further, with regard to Chinese already in Canada, or to the merchants or students who may come in later, it is not clear whether they are to be separated from their children who have been born prior to their coming to this country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as the student is concerned he does not acquire domicile or residence in Canada on the mere fact that he comes as a student; he is only permitted to be here during the period of his attendance at the institution of learning which he enters. So far as the merchant is concerned one of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with to-day is that the Chinaman, particularly if he is a man of even very moderate means and has property in China, does not care to become naturalized and become a Canadian citizen. The moment he does that he sacrifices the property he holds in China. The result is that his home—although he might be here for ten, or fifteen years and in some cases twenty years—is still in China and very likely intends to go back there some time or other. He has the privilege of having two or three wives, he has two or three families, and quite frequently in late years he has asked for the privilege of bringing in his children, and we have the utmost difficulty in arriving at a conclusion as to whether the child who is seeking to obtain entry is the child of the alleged parent or not. It is a most difficult thing to do. We hope by the establishment of an official in China that we will get over a great deal of that difficulty. Wives of merchants are not admissible under the provisions of the act, largely because of the difficulty we experience in this respect. I think I would be safe in saying that not ten per

cent of the Chinese residents of Canada are desirous of bringing their wives. Someone has suggested that we might allow them to bring in one wife. It is a very difficult matter to deal with.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Dealing with these two points it seems to me we are nothing less than hypocritical if we talk about the immoralities of the Chinese and yet permit them to come under conditions that would breed immorality. We object to their coming because they make poor citizens, and then take from them the very things that are necessary to make them good citizens—that is the presence of their wives and children with them. I am not pleading that several wives should be admitted. That is not in accordance with our law in this country, but it would seem to me that if a man is to live in this country the least that can be done is to see that his wife, if she so desires, is permitted to come. I am not urging that she should be asked to come if the immigrant does not want to bring her. The minister suggests that a good many do not wish to establish homes in this country. We have heard it said again and again on the floor of this House that one of the dangers is that too many will come and establish residence in this country, and will bring their families, and that thus we shall have an oriental population. Those of us who have lived on the coast recognize that there is already a very considerable number of Chinese in this country who have their wives. There is a very considerable number of children who are growing up in the schools. We have to deal with them, and I cannot think that we are travelling along the right lines when we make arbitrary restrictions of this kind. A good deal has been said on the side of the exclusion of the Chinese from this country. I should like to make a few general observations, because I think we must recognize that this is by no means a small problem. No one who has lived where there is the conflict of two civilizations, of two different types of people, can be oblivious to the seriousness of the problems which arise. I am not making light of them. I confess that I am not at all sure that we are prepared at the present time to receive more orientals than we have. I know that at the present time at the coast conditions are far from satisfactory, and it may be necessary to have total exclusion for some time, until we are prepared to deal properly with the matter. At the same time I fancy any one who has listened dispassionately to the discussions on the floor of this House from time to time will recognize that there is an immense amount of prejudice towards the orientals. For example, not only on the floor of the House but in the West we have complaints about the low sanitary standards of the Chinese, and yet a year or two ago the oriental nurses or girls who wished to train as nurses were excluded from the Vancouver general hospital.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: An hon. member says "hear, hear". It may be well from one standpoint, that the white nurses shall not be contaminated by the presence of yellow nurses—Chinese or Japanese—but I submit, since we have large numbers of orientals already in the country, that in some way or another we ought to permit them to live up to our standards. We fail to do so with danger to ourselves and to our civilization. I said last year—and I do not intend to go into the matter at length—that it does not seem to me that mere exclusion definitely solves the problem of the competition of the white with the oriental races. We may exclude them from competing with us on this side of the Pacific, but they will inevitably compete with us on the other side of the Pacific, and as long as the water remains a very easy channel of communication between the countries, the products of Asia will come to us in this country, and our workers in this country will feel the full competition of the people over there. We simply transfer the place of competition. We make it a little less obvious, but it is there none the less, and the cargoes of goods that are coming in from time to time clearly show that this transfer has already been effected. However, if in order to maintain our standards—and I think we should do that—it is thought desirable to exclude certain classes, I would feel that at least we should give very generous treatment to the student classes to which reference is made in this act. It seems to me that we must very definitely and consciously attempt to overcome the prejudices which we have against men of other races and other colours than our own. All students of ethnology will recognize that after all there are a great many more things in common between the different races than things which separate us, and the apparent divergences are not so great as sometimes we imagine. The stranger has always been regarded as more or less of an enemy, and we are naturally content to look down upon those who are not of our own kind. We have been too apt to form our estimates of

5 p.m.

the Chinese very largely from the individuals with whom we may come in contact in this country. It is generally known that these as a rule belong to the lower classes, and that they do not fairly represent the whole of the people over there. We have to deal in these days, not merely with the individuals who come to us in this country, our laundrymen, our vegetable men, or our keepers of restaurants, or our tailors; but we have sooner or later to deal with the whole of the great people of China. We must remember that China represents a very ancient and a very high type of civilization. It is quite true that for a good many centuries Chinese civilization remained almost stationary, but one reason for that was that the Chinese shut themselves off from contact with the larger world outside, a policy which some in this country would like us to adopt with regard at least to the oriental races. We in the west have been superior very laregly because of the industrial revolution with all that it has brought to us in the advancement of science, and in the possibility of large-scale production, and may I add also in the possibility of our securing arms which from the military standpoint have made us dominant throughout the world. But now, as thoughtful students have observed, we are losing that advantage which we have had for the last hundred years or more, and the Orient is beginning to open its doors to western science, to western civilization, to western industry, and to western militarism. When the hundreds of millions of people across the ocean have gained possession of the tools of production and destruction, we have no advantage, or comparatively little advantage over them. There is not much wonder that some writers are afraid of this "rising tide of colour". It is a real danger; yet there are other ways of meeting it than by attempting to turn back the rising tide. It is a dangerous proceeding for a comparatively small portion of the human race to attempt by physical force to beat back the great masses of the coloured and darker people of the world. Very great changes have come within recent years in the Orient. With regard to China, Professor A. E. Ross, Professor John Dewey, Hon. Bertrand Russell, and a host of other writers, have been telling us of the changes that are taking place in their eastern civilization. They impress upon us there is a great intellectual awakening—an awakening that may be faintly understood. if we could realize the changes that took place in Europe at the time of the renaissance. The people are being given the literature of China in their own spoken language, and there is being translated into Chinese the literature of western Europe. A wonderful intellectual activity is consequently taking place among the masses all over China. Many of us, of course, are compelled to get at second hand these accounts of what the Chinese are doing. A gentleman returning a short time ago from China made the astounding statement that in his judgment Peking was destined to be the intellectual centre of the world. I can hardly accept that, but I cannot reject the testimony of men who are recognized authorities throughout Europe, and who declare that wonderful changes are taking place. It is a well-known fact that when an ancient civilization is touched and fertilized by a newer and different type of civilization the results are sometimes remarkable.

In view of the fact that the world has become so unified industrially and commercially, and in its political relationships, it would seem as if we had arrived at that juncture where we should very definitely attempt to establish a better understanding among the great peoples of the earth. I was very much interested in a resolution, to which reference was made on the floor of the House some few weeks ago, which was forwarded by the Federation of Canadian Students, urging that scholarships be established by the government of Canada which would bring considerable numbers of the representatives of various nations to this country, and on the other hand would send out Canadian students to those countries for the purpose of studying conditions there. If this suggestion could be carried out it would be a very definite contribution on our part towards establishing better world relationships. In opposition to the view expressed the other day, that as far as possible we should try to keep out students I would urge on the contrary, that we should heartily welcome them. If we have anything superior in our civilization to give them, by all means let them come over and discover it, so that they may learn what has made our nation great and may take that knowledge back to their country with them. We must get away from the old idea that we would lose by their gain, that we are superior so long as we can keep knowledge and information and science to ourselves and keep these other people more or less in ignorance. I would say rather that we should welcome their students. Let us take them in and give them the very best we have to offer intellectually and morally. On the other hand, I

should like to think that China has something worth while to offer to us. For years she was in advance of us intellectually, and led the way in some of the industrial discoveries by which the world has been blessed. She may still have something to contribute to the progress of the world intellectually and spiritually. I am looking, however, to the practical side of the matter. If we are to avoid frictions in the future there must be a better mutual understanding among the various peoples of the world. Personally, I believe that the chief cause of modern wars is economic, but I do not believe it is the exclusive cause. One of the dangers to-day lies in the fact that we do not understand one another's position, that as nations we are prejudiced one against the other. In this discussion we have heard a good deal about exclusion. While I am not opposed to a certain measure of precaution in this direction, feeling as I do that we have a right to protect the standards of this young country, at the same time I cannot let this opportunity pass without pleading with the government and the House that they treat this question in a broad way. Do not let our prejudice blind us to the greatness of the question or to the possibilities that are open to us, as a people, of making our contribution to the solution of the great world problems which are pressing upon us in these days as never before.

Mr. NEILL: Has section 5 been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN: The section has been carried.

Mr. NEILL: If I may be permitted, I should like to point out a mistake in this section. Unless I am utterly unable to interpret it, the section as it is printed is most emphatically wrong. In subsection 1 of paragraph (c) there appears the word "merchants," with whatever amendments may now have been passed. The next paragraph refers to students, and it goes on to say, "who shall substantiate their status." The substantiation called for refers only to the students and not to the merchants, as the section is at present worded; whereas I have no doubt it is the intention of the government to require this substantiation of status on the part of both merchants and students. Paragraph (2) reads:

> Students coming to Canada for the purpose of attendance, and while in actual attendance, at any Canadian university or college authorized by statute or charter to confer degrees, who shall substantiate their status to the satisfaction of the controller, etc.

Clearly the merchant does not come under that provision; the relative "who" obviously refers to the students. Is there no legal gentleman on the opposite side who can take up this point? If there is not I shall have to solicit the assistance of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The definition of the word "merchant," it is provided, shall be left to regulation. That gives the minister an opportunity to put in anything he thinks advisable, to oblige this class of people to establish their status as my hon. friend suggests. I think that provision is broad enough to give the minister power to impose such conditions as may be necessary in order to meet what my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps I have not made my point clear. I am not referring at all to the definition of the word "merchant"; you cannot incorporate in that definition anything about the controller as we have it in paragraph (2) of subsection (c). The words "who shall," as they appear in this paragraph, clearly refer only to students, whereas it is unquestionably the intention of the bill that they shall apply to both these classes, merchants and students.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): "Merchant" is defined by regulation and "student" by statute.

Mr. NEILL: I am not asking the minister to define anything. My point has reference to the requirement which appears in the paragraph I have quoted calling for a substantiation of status, and I say that this requirement undoubtedly applies to both students and merchants; that, I believe, is the intention of the bill. I am simply pointing out that as the paragraph is at present worded this intention is not carried out.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If that comma were changed to a semicolon would it not meet what my hon. friend has in mind?

Mr. NEILL: And the next words begin on a fresh line?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. I think if the semicolon were put in after the word "degrees" it would cover what my hon. friend has in mind?

Mr. NEILL: And the next words to begin a new line.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It would help to elucidate it.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, that is what I mean.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 24—Re-entry; registered persons, etc.:

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):: My hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) raised the question as to the permission for the return of Chinese who had registered out under the provisions of the Chinese Immigration Act and the War Measures Act. They were to be permitted to return one year after the gazetting of peace. Such Chinese have in their possession a certificate which permits them to return one year after the gazetting of peace in the Canada Gazette. The solicitor has pointed out to me that even with this section there may be doubt, but we are giving them one year in which to return to Canada.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—Offences and penalties; arrest and deportation of any Chinese who has illegally entered or remained in Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Objection was taken by my hon. friend to the clause as drafted, and he suggested that we add the words "peace officer," so that any officer might take into custody a Chinaman who was illegally in the country. That has been done by the amendment to 26. I beg to move this amendment, which is as follows:

26. Whenever any officer or peace officer has reason to believe that any person of Chinese origin or descent has entered or remains in Canada contrary to the provisions of this act or of the Chinese Immigration Act, chapter ninety-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, or any amendment thereof, he may, without a warrant apprehend such person, and if such person is unable to prove to the satisfaction of the officer that he has been properly admitted into and is legally entitled to remain in Canada, the officer may detain such person in custody and bring him before the nearest controller for examination, and if the controller finds that he has entered or remains in Canada contrary to the provisions of this act or of the Chinese Immigration Act or any amendment thereof, such person shall be deported to the country of his birth or citizenship, subject to the same right of appeal as is provided in the case of a person applying for original entry to Canada. Where any person is examined under this section the burden of proof of such person's right to be or remain in Canada shall rest upon him. Where an order for deportation is made under this section and in the circumstances of the case the expenses of deportation cannot be charged to the transportation company, such expenses shall be paid by the person being deported if able to pay, and, if not, by His Majesty.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 27—Arrest and deportation of Chinese who ceases to belong to exempt or admissible classes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is an addition of the same words. I move the amendment of the clause as follows:

27. Any person admitted as exempt from the tax under the provisions of the Chinese Immigration Act or any amendment thereof, or under this act, and who at any time after admission ceases to belong to any of the exempt classes as defined by the Chinese Immigration Act or any amendment thereof, or by this act, shall, unless he is a Canadian citizen, ipso facto forfeit his right to remain in Canada and may be arrested without a warrant by any officer or peace officer and brought before a controller for examination, whereupon the case shall be dealt with to all intents and purposes in the same manner and subject to the same provisions as in the case of a person apprehended under the provisions of the next preceding section hereof.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 32—Chinese landing in violation of act, or using forged or fraudulent certificate:

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) took exception to this section inasmuch as it did not definitely enough set out the deportation which was to take place in addition to fine and imprisonment. I have amended the clause accordingly. I beg to move the clause as re-drafted, namely:

32. (1) Every person of Chinese origin or descent who—

(a) lands or attempts to land in Canada contrary to the provisions of this act;

(b) Wilfully makes use of or attempts to make use of any forged or fraudulent certificate, or of a certificate issued to any other person for any purpose connected with this act;

is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for any term not exceeding twelve months and not less than six months, or to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars and not less than three hundred dollars, or to both imprisonment and fine, and shall be deported.

(2) Every person who wilfully aids and abets any person of Chinese origin or descent in any evasion or attempt at evasion of any of the provisions of this act, is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than six months, or to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars and not less than three hundred dollars, or to both imprisonment and fine, and shall be deported unless of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. NEILL: Are these offences to be tried by summary process or by indictment? There does not seem to be any provision here.

The CHAIRMAN: They are all subject to summary process.

Nr. NEILL: But anyone reading this section would imagine the guilty persons are to be tried by the controller. It says here, "and shall also be liable to deportation when so ordered by the controller."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Those words are struck out in the amended section.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 41—Chinese en route to Canada may be admitted within one month if head tax paid:

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I merely want to amend section 41 to avoid conflict with Chinese who may be en route to Canada, extending the time from one month to three months. As amended the section will read:

41. Notwithstanding any provision of this act or any order or regulation made thereunder, any person of Chinese origin or descent who is at the date of the coming into force of this act en route to Canada and presents himself for admission within three months from said date, shall if admissible under the provisions of the Chinese Immigration Act or any amendment thereof, be permitted to enter Canada upon payment of the head tax therein provided:

Provided that if he belongs to any of the exempt classes he may be admitted exempt from the head tax.

If they do come and are not within the classes defined in the act, they shall pay the head tax as formerly.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, as amended, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

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

Railways and Canals—miscellaneous—Canada Highways Commission: To provide for the organization and payment of staff of the Canada Highways Commission, including A. W. Campbell, C.E., Chief Commissioner of Highways, at $5,000 per annum, and W. R. Smythe, Commissioner of Highways, at $4,000 per annum; $70,000.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): This is merely the annual vote for the Highways Commission and staff. I have already given some information in this connection, but if there is any further information hon. gentlemen desire I will try to give it.

Mr. BOYS: Can the minister inform me, with respect to the provincial highway from Bradford to Barrie, what is the cost to date, what is the estimated cost per mile in finished state, with some reference to the specifications?

Mr. GRAHAM: Section B, Gwillimbury West township, mileage, 6·60; total estimated cost, $144,380; average estimated cost per mile, $21,875.75; 40 per cent of estimated cost, $170,292; kind of construction, gravel; amount paid to date, $107,719.86. Section E, Barrie and Oro township, mileage 1·20—

Mr. BOYS: The mileage in the township of Oro would be, I should think, about 14 or 15. Where is this 1·20 miles that the minister refers to?

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be just outside the town, not in the town.

Mr. BOYS: As a matter of fact I think some of the highway is within the corporate limits, though I am not positive as to that.

Mr. GRAHAM: We do not know anything about the provincial end of it.

Mr. BOYS: Can the minister tell me just where that mileage of 1·20 is?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is east of Barrie. Barrie and Oro township, 1·20 miles; estimated cost, $14,850; average estimated cost per mile, $12,375, kind of construction, macadam: Section F, Oro and Vespera townships, 1·60 miles; total estimated cost, $18,500; average cost per mile, $11,562; construction, macadam. Subsection G-1, Oro township, 3·60 miles; total estimated cost, $45,400; average estimated cost per mile, $12,611; macadam. Subsection G-2, Oro township, mileage 6·40; total estimated cost, $71,400, average cost per mile, $11,156.25; macadam. Subsection 11, Orillia township, mileage 4·20, total estimated cost, $48,110; average estimated cost per mile, $11,454.76; macadam. Subsection 12, Orillia totwnship, mileage 4·80; total estimated cost, $83,090; average cost per mile, $17,310.41; gravel.

Mr. BOYS: In connection with the portion of road just outside Barrie, approaching the township of Oro but not within the corporate limits of Barrie, there is a corner which was purchased from a Mr. Hughes. Will the minister tell me what was paid for that little corner and for a couple of scrub apple trees upon it?

Mr. GRAHAM: This government does not know anything about that. We had nothing to do with the approaches. That is a matter for the provincial government.

Mr. BOYS: I presume that when the Department of Railways and Canals is called upon to pay forty per cent it must know exactly what the total is, and the total is made up of the road construction with the bit of property I referred to and similar corners included.

Mr. GRAHAM: The province provides the right of way and we only contribute forty per cent towards the real road. We do not have anything to do with the right of way. They have to furnish that, and our auditors see that no right of way is put in the accounts as against the forty per cent contributed by the federal authorities.

Mr. BOYS: Then the estimates the minister has given me now do not include anything whatever for the cost of the right of way?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. BOYS: Do they include anything for the cost of ornamental trees, for instance?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. BOYS: Or the cost of construction of new ditches?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would imagine that would be part of the construction of the highway. That is for the drainage.

Mr. BOYS: I would also have thought offhand that the purchasing of a corner and building a highway on it all added to the cost of construction of the highway.

Mr. GRAHAM: In our regulations and the agreement the cost of any right of way is excluded so far as the federal authority is concerned.

Mr. BOYS: It is very hard to follow these figures given rapidly across the floor, but if I understood the minister rightly he was giving the estimated cost and then the average cost, and I cannot understand it. There seems to be a considerable difference in the figures.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend misunderstood me. Perhaps I did not read distinctly. The first figure was the total estimated cost, the next was the average cost per mile.

Mr. BOYS: Those figures were given with regard to a mile and a fraction, and one would think that the estimated cost and the average cost—well, there would hardly be an average cost for a mile and a fraction. It would be the cost of a mile and a fraction.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not quite get my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps the minister would refer to what he was kind enough to read a moment ago and see just what he read. Perhaps I misunderstood the reference entirely.

Mr. GRAHAM: Take section B Gwillimbury township. The mileage is 6.60; total estimated cost $144,380. The cost per mile would be $144,380 divided by 6.60 which gives $21,875.75.

Mr. BOYS: There seems to be a considerable difference between the estimated cost of the highway in the Gwillimbury section and the cost in the Oro section. That, I presume, is due to different specifications. Would the minister indicate what the difference is?

Mr. GRAHAM: Take that section in Gwillimbury township for instance; that is gravel construction. In Oro township the construction was macadam.

Mr. CHARTERS: What proportion of the roads approved by this government have already been completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will have to give that in the larger figures for each province. I might say that so far as Ontario is concerned, with so many different kinds of construction, the costs are very varied. In some cases there is extravagant construction. We are not paying forty per cent of the very extravagant construction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does that statement give the cost also?

Mr. GRAHAM: The figures by provinces are as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROJECTS UNDER AGREEMENT—BETWEEN THE DOMINION GOVERNMENT AND THE VARIOUS PROVINCES March 31, 1923

Province	Mileage under Agreement	Total Estimated Cost under Agreement	Average Estimated Cost per Mile under Agreement	40 per cent of Estimated Cost under Agreement	Amount Federal Aid Earned at Dec. 31, 22	Amount Federal Aid Paid at March 31, 23	Amount Federal Aid Province Entitled to	Amount Federal Aid still to be placed under Agreement	Remarks	Amount Federal Aid Estimated will not be worked out at April 1, 24	Dec. 31, 22 Mileage Completed	Dec. 31, 22 Mileage Uncompleted
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.		
P. E. Island	338·0	872,025 68	2,579 95	348,810 27	254,871 53	250,035 73	603,455 00	254,644 73	125,996 90 applied for	125,000 00	181·25	156·75
Nova Scotia	425·6	3,548,565 39	8,337 80	1,419,426 16	1,357,633 57	1,297,481 63	1,468,720 00	49,293 84	All applied for..	.....	298·29	127·24
New Brunswick	1,237·2	2,909,612 50	2,384 90	1,163,845 00	1,107,479 36	810,276 75	1,163,845 00	.....	.....	.....	309·1	923·3
Quebec	631·9	7,157,163 90	11,326 35	2,862,865 59	2,452,477 62	1,684,097 50	4,748,420 00	1,885,554 41	755,699 64 applied for	800,000 00	434·96	123·34
Ontario	638·69	13,424,318 54	21,018 50	5,369,727 42	5,374,247 29	3,374,247 29	5,877,275 00	507,547 58	All applied for..	.....	379 87	259·73
Manitoba	796·2	3,601,597 15	4,523 49	1,440,638 86	525,964 27	517,288 21	1,602,265 00	161,626 14	All applied for..	500,000 00	369·0	430·2
Saskatchewan	1,565·44	3,165,652 21	2,022 21	1,266,260 88	766,343 79	738,594 00	1,806,255 00	539,994 12	One-half required this year.	700,000 00	614·5	833·2
Alberta	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,477,810 00	1,477,810 00	It is expected some will be earned this year.	1,200,000 00	.....	.....
British Columbia	368·75	3,129,887 50	8,820 52	1,251,955 00	1,116,383 87	1,116,383 87	1,251,955 00	.....	.....	.....	137·19	61·43
	6,001·78	37,808,822 87	6,326 86	15,123,529 18	12,955,401 30	9,788,404 98	20,000,000 00	4,876,470 82	.....	3,325,000 00	2,724·16	2,915·19

Mr. BOYS: I suppose if we take the total expenditure the minister gave for Ontario and divide that by the mileage completed, which is 379.87, we would have the average cost per mile, or is there some expenditure included in the total expenditure which has reference to the 638.69 miles referred to by the minister?

Mr. GRAHAM: The average estimated cost per mile under agreement for each province is as follows: Prince Edward Island, $2,579.95; Nova Scotia, $8,337.80; New Brunswick, $2,384.90; Quebec, $11,326.35; Ontario, $21,018.50; Manitoba, $4,523.49; Saskatchewan, $2,022.21; British Columbia, $8,820.52.

Mr. BOYS: The minister says that in some cases the actual cost exceeded the figures quoted. I understand that these are the figures of the cost that you submit to. In the case of some other portions you have not been able to agree to the cost as returned because, I suppose, you considered it excessive. This is the approved cost, I imagine?

Mr. GRAHAM: These figures do not give possibly the whole cost of the road. These figures are based on the cost of construction towards which we contribute 40 per cent. When the cost exceeds a certain amount we do not contribute. The cost of the roads in Ontario is possibly higher than the figures which I have given.

Mr. BOYS: I suppose, as a matter of fact, that the minister would have on file the actual cost, and then what we might term the approved cost so far as the 40 per cent contribution is concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM: We could dig that out.

Mr. BOYS: I would like very much to get that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will get that information for my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: Now another question. There is a very considerable discrepancy between the average cost per mile of these roads in the various provinces of Canada to the extent, sometimes, of thousands of dollars per mile. Having in view the supervision which the department exercises, could the minister explain how it is there is such an enormous difference between the cost of constructing roads in the province of Ontario, and, for example, the cost of constructing roads in Price Edward Island, or in almost any other province of the Dominion?

Mr. GRAHAM: In the first place each province, to a large extent, selects the standard of its own roads. If the standard involves a lower cost we are quite willing to pay 40 per cent of that cost. Then there enters the question of broken stone and gravel. In some localities these are very plentiful, and in other places—if it is decided to construct a road of that kind—they may have to haul these materials a great many miles. I think the discrepancy may be due very often to the difference in the standards of the roads.

Mr. WILSON: Will the minister give us the estimated cost of the Hamilton and Brantford highway and the actual cost up to date.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that will be a little high. The mileage is 19.18. The total estimated cost was $658,907.05 and the average estimated cost per mile $34,353.86.

Mr. WILSON: That does not include the surfacing of the road? What does it cost to surface the road?

Mr. GRAHAM: That work was done under a provincial agreement. When the cost exceeds a certain figure we do not put up our 40 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The figures given merely represent the cost on which the minister puts up his 40 per cent.

Mr. GRAHAM: The cost to which we agree.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Over and above that there are other costs and those are on file in the office.

Mr. GRAHAM: We can get that information for my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: Will the minister be good enough to bring at the same time the information he promised a moment ago—in other words the actual cost and what I might refer to as the approved cost?

Mr. GRAHAM: We will find that in the correspondence probably, because application would be made for contribution for a road at a certain cost to which we would only agree up to a certain proportion.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister tell us what is the most expensive portion of highway construction in the province of Ontario and what is the cost of it?

Mr. GRAHAM: According to our figures the one referred to is the most expensive piece of road and, so far as our approval is concerned, it cost $34,000 per mile. The actual cost must have been more than that.

Mr. BOYS: Is that the highest cost per mile to which the department contributes?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. The highest expenditure to which we would contribute is $34,353.86.

Mr. BOYS: I rather gather from what the minister has said that apparently there had been some maximum cost per mile fixed by the department. If that is so I would like to know what it is?

Mr. GRAHAM: There has been no maximum fixed. Each case is dealt with as it comes up having regard to the conditions and the circumstances surrounding it. I am informed that no maximum has been arbitrarily fixed but that this is probably the maximum on which a contribution has been allowed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister could do this for us. We are interested, of course, in connection with road building and the cost of the different classes of roads. I suppose there are roads which are standard all over the country. For example there is the gravel road of the cheaper class.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is standard.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I suppose that the gravel roads are of fairly standard width usually. I wonder if the engineer could not furnish the minister with information which would give the cost of gravel roads in all the different provinces. Then you could take concrete roads and see what the cost of those are per mile in each of the provinces. Then there are roads which are bound with different binders, apart from concrete itself. We could have those also.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have got the mileage of those roads, but not the cost. However, I could get that information quite easily enough.

Mr. BOYS: With regard to the Hamilton and Brantford highway which has been mentioned I understood from the minister's statement that so far as he knows the highest cost to which the department has contributed, up to the present, is about $34,000 per mile?

Mr. GRAHAM: The actual figures are $34,353.86.

Mr. BOYS: If I remember correctly you are to contribute 40 per cent having regard to the reasonable and actual cost of the highway. I think that is the language of the act. As a matter of fact a return brought down to this House shows that, apart entirely from the purchase price of land for highway purposes, apart from ornamental trees and other extras of that description, this particular highway cost $72,085 per mile. Now if, as a matter of fact, we are to contribute 40 per cent of the actual and reasonable cost there must be something wildly extravagant in connection with expenditure when the cost, without the extras I have mentioned, comes to $72,000 and the minister could only see his way clear to recommend $34,300 of that. I would like to know how it is that following the language of the statute requiring a contribution of 40 per cent of the actual and reasonable cost—and the minister I am sure desires to be fair to Ontario—he could only contribute $34,300?

Mr. GRAHAM: Forty per cent of $34,300

Mr BOYS: How the minister could only contribute on a basis of cost of $34,300 when the cost returned, without the extras I have mentioned, is $72,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not like to criticize the Ontario government. I see that my hon. friend is getting some good material.

Mr. BOYS: Even if they deserve it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I see the pyramid my hon. friend is piling up here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just tell the facts.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure they will be appreciated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The facts are all we want.

Mr. GRAHAM: Take that road as a sample; an agreement was made with this department for a certain standard of road early in the construction, the cost of which was allowed by the federal department to be $34,300 a mile. The provincial authorities changed the system and made the road much more expensive than that to which we agreed. They made a better standard of road, but they had to pay the extra cost. I am not a real authority on good roads. I would not like to say the Ontario government was extravagant in building the road they did. That is their consideration, not mine. What we were providing was that we would only pay for the standard of road to which this department agreed.

Mr. BOYS: Can the minister tell us what the change was? It must have been tremendously expensive to jump from $34,000 to $72,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure that I am not getting beyond my depth in discussing this matter. They changed the standard and put on a great deal better surface than the standard to which we had agreed. I would not like to say offhand what they did. That is outside of our purview. The province did that in addition to anything we expended.

Mr. BOYS: Was the department asked to contribute on the basis of $72,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would imagine the federal department would be asked to contribute anything any province would hope to be able to get. There is no doubt in my mind that they asked for it but did not get it.

Mr. BOYS: If the minister feels sure about that, I do not want to press it unduly, but I want to know for certain whether they did ask for the contribution from this government on the basis of $72,000 a mile.

Mr. GRAHAM: No doubt about that at all.

Mr. BOYS: The minister said there was an agreement between the Dominion and the province.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, all these roads were built under agreement.

Mr. BOYS: In writing and signed?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, I will give the hon. member a copy of it any time.

Mr. BOYS: I would like to have that. Is there a fair wage clause in it?

Mr. GRAHAM: We do not construct. The province would construct. I imagine they would pay the rate of wages demanded in that locality. These details are for the province. It is one of the cases where the Dominion hands over its money under certain restrictions as to expense, but the province expends the money. I do not know anything about the details. It is a public road. A copy of any agreement as to roadmaking is at the disposal of the House or any member of it.

Mr. BOYS: I can assure the minister that we require considerably more information, and it will take more than a few minutes. But we are quite willing to go on.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot be here after six o'clock. I was hopeful of putting it through.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the continuation of the Brantford-Hamilton highway across the county I represent, I certainly would like to get some information.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my hon. friend would let me know what he wants, I would be glad to get it for him. It would take a cart to bring over all the documents in the department in regard to this matter.

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 132 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Darton.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 133 (from the Senate), for the relief of Minnie Eileen Biggs.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 134 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Henry Bottomley.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 135 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Ritchie Dowd.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 137 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eliza Harvey Northgraves.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 138 (from the Senate), for the relief of Olivette McMaster.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 140 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mahlon Beach.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 141 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alfred William Kelly.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 142 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Austin Pickell.—Mr. Martell.

Bill No. 143 (from the Senate), for the relief of Annie May Vogelman.—Mr. Duff.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 145 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mabel Gertrude Johnston.—Mr. Mewburn.

Bill No. 146 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilfrid Charles Brown.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 147 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gertrude Andrews.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 148 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Henry Davidson.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 149 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Robert Webb.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 150 (from the Senate), for the relief of Katharine Bryans.—Mr. Church.

SUPPLY

SECRETARY OF STATE

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

Civil government—Secretary of State—salaries, $127,837.50; contingencies, $29,620.

Mr. COOTE: Has Mr. William Pugsley been appointed to some office in the minister's department, and, if so, does it come under this item?

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): It comes under a later item.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—expenses under the Canada Temperance Act, $12,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. COPP: This is provided in case any plebiscites are asked for during the year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it not entirely insufficient for that purpose?

Mr. COPP: There are only three or four places in which the act is in force—Manitoulin island, Ontario; Thetford Mines, Brome and Stanstead, Quebec, Guysborough, Nova Scotia, and Lisgar and Marquette, Manitoba. The vote is provided in case any of these should ask for repeal.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—expenses under the Naturalization Acts 1914 and 1920, $18,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much was spent last year?

Mr. COPP: $19,360.12.

Item agreed to.

Adjustment of war claims—Secretary of State, $75,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What work is now going on in this connection?

Mr. COPP: We are asking for the same amount as last year. The work is proceeding as it has been during the last two or three years, comprising the activities of the clearing office the collecting of debts, and so on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood that as a result of the deputy minister's trip to Germany last year or the year before the matter had become clarified so that we were beginning to see where we were. I would not think that we should be continuing this expenditure year after year. There must be some end to this thing.

Mr. COPP: We all hope it may come to an end. We have not got all the property in that we hope to get. The clearing office in London is getting all the information it can; the same staff is employed as was engaged in the work when I took office. We have had a representative in the Old Country during the last five or six months gathering in stock and things of that kind. We hope to get the matter cleared up as soon as possible.

Mr. JOHNSTON: How much of last year's vote was expended?

Mr. COPP: $64,338.23.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How is that made up?

Mr. COPP: Salaries, $46,635. the balance consisting of printing, travelling and legal services, and sundries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much money has now been got in?

Mr. COPP: The cash on hand at the present is $2,760,159.23.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much of that was got in last year?

Mr. COPP: I cannot give the exact amount of money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Approximately then.

Mr. COPP: I have a record of the transactions during the war.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are they?

Mr. COPP: The amount and number of claims submitted against Germany in connection with pre-war transactions is $82,829.22 representing 109 claims, for the present year and $8,691,705.77, representing 885 claims, for previous years, or a total of $8,774,534.99.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It would appear to me that the further we get away from the war the more this work should diminish. Why the minister should ask for the same amount this year as last is hard for me to understand. If the claims are diminishing, the cost of administration should surely be less. I would have thought there could have been a reduction this year.

Mr. COPP: I regret we are not in a position to reduce the expenditure very much this year. We are employing the same staff, and there is a large amount of work to do carrying on the correspondence between the clearing offices. I quite realize that this is a large amount of money, but from the information I received from my officials I cannot see how we can reduce the expenditure this year. It will please me very much when we reach the point where we can do so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister was giving a list of the activities. What else is being done this year?

Mr. COPP: I have a statement here as follows:

German claims for debts owing by Canadians

(b)	To March 31, 1922	Period April 1, 1922, to March 31, 1923	Total as on March 31, 1923
Amount and number of claims received	$7,580,494 74	$ 571,862 76	$8,152,357 50
Total number	8,081	562	8,643
Amount admitted	$1,661,257 01	$ 145,794 60	$1,807,051 61
Admitted but not credited	78,196 22	3,355 99	81,552 21
Total admitted	$1,739,453 23	$ 149,150 59	$1,888 603 82
Amount contested	902,175 83	142,757 32	1,044,933 15
Amount defective	3,859,577 98	940,702 26	4,800,280 24
Total amount handled	$6,501,207 04	$1,232,610 17	$7,733,817 21
Total claims	7,121	1,047	8,168

Total number of claims received to March 31, 1923.. 8,643
Total number of claims dealt with.. 8,168
Balance, under investigation.. 475

(c) Judgments obtained under the Treaty of Peace order in council between 1st April 1922 and 31st March 1923.

10 judgments have been entered against Canadian debtors for non-compliance with the regulations and non-payment of indebtedness.

Amount sued for..		$63,098 76
Amount collected.	$62,908 76	
Amount due..	190 00	
	$63,098 76	$63,098 76

Previous to 1st April, 1922, 50 judgments had been entered for a total of $35,600.

(2) The Custodian's Office (Property, Rights and Interests)—

(a) Claims against Germany, sequestrated property of Canadian in that country.. .. .. Total claimed	
Claims forwarded to Germany in respect of property of Canadians sequestrated by Germany previous to 1st April, 1922, (34), subsequent to that date, (8), total (42)..	$5,217,878 28
Nomber and amount of claims admitted (29)..	1,556,895 66
	$3,660,982 62

(b) Proceeds of liquidation of enemy property in Canada and the crediting thereof.

The following has been credited to Germany under Article 297.

Amount..	$844,131 02
Commission charged by this office..	17,227 15
	$861,358 17

(c) Real Property and Securities—

(i) Real Property in Canada—

Enemy owned estates have been sold, or partly sold, under agreements for sale for..		$409,639 00
Instalments paid to date.. ..	$100,000 00	
Amount still outstanding. ..	309,639 00	
	$409,639 00	$409,639 00
Property not yet sold, estimated at.. ..		90,000 00
		$499,639 00

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

(ii) Securities in possession of the Custodian.

Under the provisions of paragraph 10 of the Annex to section 4, part X, of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was obligated to transfer to Canada all certificates for shares, bonds, debentures, securities, etc. To date there has been received from Germany in this connection 38,858 shares of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and $148,580.00 Note Certificates of the same company. Other securities amounting to about $1,000,000 have also been handed over. It is estimated that all the securities would amount to about $12,-000.000.

(iii) Securities in the possession of the Public Trustee, England.

The Public Trustee in England holds approximately $6,000,000 in securities which are subject to certain liens, the amount of which is at present unascertainable, but it is hoped that at least $4,000,000 will be realized.

That is a matter of book-keeping between the local clearing office and the central clearing office. We cannot tell exactly what balance will be due us, but we estimate it to be between three and four million dollars.

We also find upon investigation that there are a number of securities held by the Alien Custodian of the United States which we claim belong to Canada. He holds approximately $1,250,000 of Canadian securities. That is now under investigation, and we hope to get it settled during the year. I inquired recently and I think the amount is somewhat larger than I have just given. The three last mentioned items total $17,250,000 and after allowing certain deductions for shrinkage the approximate results should reach about $14,-000,000.

A great many applications have been made to the department for the releasing of certain shares of stock that we have taken. In some cases we find upon investigation that stock has been taken illegally and we have to release it.

Applications for the release of enemy property vested in the custodian are continually being received on the grounds that the applicant is now an allied subject by virtue of the terms of the Treaty of Peace, or that the property was bona fide purchased by a neutral prior to the passing of the trading with the enemy regulations, May 2nd, 1916. In this connection property to the value of more than $10,000,000 (including accrued dividends) has been released, a very large proportion of this amount being Canadian Pacific Railway shares.

Nine applications have been received from Canadian women, married to German nationals, asking for the release of their property, and in two cases the opinion of the Supreme Court was obtained and upon its ruling all applications were approved and property to the value of $225,000 was relinquished.

I do not know that I could give very much more information to the committee by reading further details but perhaps hon. members may have some special questions to ask.

Mr. FORKE: I understood the minister to make a statement about property sequestrated in Germany, was that correct?

Mr. COPP: That was Canadian property in Germany taken over by the German government.

Mr. FORKE: What sort of property would it be?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They were claims by Canadian merchants. For example there was a claim by one of our large manufacturing companies which was adjusted a long time ago. Most of what the minister has been telling us is history. Take for example his account of what transpired in Germany. That happened long ago.

Mr. COPP: Certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He has been settling these claims and getting back the money. For example there was the claim of the Massey Harris Company. A lot of this settling was done a long time ago. The adjusting of these matters was supposed to have been settled long since. Mr. Mulvey was sent over in order to wind it up.

Mr. COPP: Not wind it up.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, to arrange a system of settlement that would properly function; to get rid of all this expenditure and try and secure some final action on these matters. In spite of that I observe the vote is continuing just the same. What we are trying to find out is, what was done last year and not what has been done since the war. All these Canadian Pacific Railway shares were in long ago.

Mr. COPP: No, not all, we are getting them almost daily.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many did you get in this year?

Mr. COPP: I could not tell my hon. friend exactly how many shares. I know we have not got them all in; they are coming in weekly and monthly; I could not say daily; and we are dealing with them just as they have been dealt with in the past.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The principal thing done this year was to issue claims for some $62,918.76 on behalf of Canadian debtors.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend should not say that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, what else was there?

Mr. COPP: What I have read to my hon. friend related to the work of the clearing office. It has been going on just the same during the past year as in the year before. We have the same officials and the same work is going on. We have to carry on a correspondence between the clearing offices and attend to other business. I have asked my officials if there is any possibility of getting along with a fewer number of employees and a smaller expenditure and from the statements made to me I do not see how we can.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the attitude of the minister in regard to it? This work is going on apparently the same as it has in the past although there is not the same necessity for it. What is the idea? Is this to be a perpetual department?

Mr. COPP: Claims are still coming in from Germany and they have to be considered now just the same as they have been in the past. Possibly there are not as large amounts of money involved, the claims now, possibly, are smaller but we are trying to get them cleared up and we need the staff to do the work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection was that a time limit was fixed for all this sort of business and it should be up by now; I do not know whether it has been extended. What I want to know is whether this is to be a perpetual office or not. I simply want to get the facts?

Mr. COPP: I cannot tell my hon. friend just how long the work will be going on. He knows very well that you cannot settle up such matters as these in a week, or a month, or even a year. I am sure the staff have been working as faithfully as they could and with all possible speed to try and get this matter settled up. We hope to get it settled some time but I cannot say just when.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: From what the minister says it is a pretty hopeless looking situation. He says the staff are working hard. Perhaps they are, as to that I cannot say. What I am trying to find out from the minister is when this work will be over. The German claims against Canada numbered 8,643. They have been looked after and all that is left on hand out of all the mess is 475 claims. There is not such an awful lot left to be done as far as that is concerned.

Mr. COPP: Claims are coming in all the time; they are coming in yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many claims were received last month? Let us get some idea.

Mr. COPP: I do not think I can tell my hon. friend that.

Mr. FORKE: Is there no time limit for the filing of claims, or will they be received for all time?

Mr. COPP: The time has been extended.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much longer are you going to go on extending the time?

Mr. COPP: That is a matter which would be decided by conference between the different clearing offices, but they have not been able to get together recently on account of the difficulty between Germany and France. The whole matter is being worked out by the clearing offices of the different countries interested. This is only a local clearing office here and we have to work through the central clearing office in London. The time limit has been extended from time to time, and I suppose will continue to be extended until such time as the Powers can get together and come to some conclusion as to the final disposition of the matter.

Mr. COOTE: Who is in charge of this work for the minister's department?

Mr. COPP: My deputy is the deputy custodian in charge of this work.

Mr. COOTE: What official title has Mr. Pugsley in connection with it?

Mr. COPP: He is a commissioner under the Inquiries Act to carry on an investigation in connection with the reparations question. He is not identified with my office at all.

Mr. COOTE: Is he steadily employed?

Mr. COPP: Just as a commissioner to make inquiries on the reparations question under the Inquiries Act.

Mr. HANSON: Is he paid out of this vote?

Mr. COPP: Paid out of this vote.

Mr. HANSON: How much is it proposed to pay him?

Mr. COPP: At the rate of $9,000 per year.

Mr. COOTE: Who was his predecessor in this work?

Mr. COPP: Sir Douglas Hazen, of St. John, was first appointed but later on he expressed a desire to be relieved of this work and Dr. Pugsley was appointed.

Mr. HANSON: How much was paid to Sir Douglas Hazen during the time he acted?

Mr. COPP: He did not occupy the office. He came up and looked into the matter and decided he would not take it.

Mr. HANSON: Did he not go to Washington? Did he not make some investigation?

Mr. COPP: I think not.

Mr. HANSON: It is rather strange that the amount supposed to be paid to the Hon. William Pugsley, synchronizes with the salary of the position which he has just given up as lieutenant governor of New Brunswick? It looks to me as if this place had been made for him. I should like to point out to the minister that as long as I can remember that gentleman has never been off the payroll of the government, and I question very much the advisability of appointing him at the salary to which the minister has referred. I doubt very much if it is worth that much to the country. Has it been decided that the claims of private individuals shall have priority over the claims of the Crown in connection with the German moneys in the hands of the custodian?

Mr. COPP: I cannot quite understand what you mean?

Mr. HANSON: We are entitled to some reparation from Germany under the terms of the Peace treaty. I understand there are certain German properties in the hands of the custodian. So far none of these reparations have been received by Canada to re-imburse her for expenses in connection with the war, and it is not probable, so far as we can see from the turn of events, that we will ever get anything out of Germany. Is it not supposed that the country should be re-imbursed with some of these moneys for part of the expense Canada was put to in connection with the war, and will the claims of the country have priority over the claims of private individuals?

Mr. COPP: I do not think they will. The investigation is being carried on at the present time because, under the treaty of Peace, the question of reparations and the filing of claims for reparation from Germany was advertised, and a very large number of claims have been filed, I think, amounting to twenty-five or thirty million dollars. Those have been on file in the office for the last two or three years. Some were filed as far back as 1918. Those are being inquired into now, to ascertain whether they are valid claims to be considered and whether the claims are too large. Every one who wishes to file a claim will have an opportunity of appearing before the commissioner himself, or by solicitor or counsel, and placing the facts before the commissioner, and on those facts

the commissioner will make a report to the government. When that is done the question of payment of those claims will have to be decided later on, as a question of policy. I am not in position to tell my hon. friend or the House or the country, what the final result will be when these claims have been adjudicated upon. We will have a certain amount of money obtained from property we have sold, and shares, stocks, and bonds that we are holding at the present time as custodian or trustee. After the payment
9 p.m. of the debts between the two countries is arranged there will be a large amount. It is only an estimate but we hope there will be ten, twelve or fourteen million dollars in the hands of the custodian. The question of what will be done with that money, whether it will be applied in satisfaction, or in partial satisfaction, of claims for reparation, is a question of policy to be decided later on. I am not prepared to say how it will be settled. The same is true of the Old Country and the United States. They are carrying on investigations in the United States into the same question, to get information and obtain evidence upon which they can make a report and take action when the time comes to bring the matter to a finality.

Mr. HANSON: Is that question of policy one that will be decided by the federal government or the Imperial government?

Mr. COPP: I would not like to say what will be done. I think it will be decided by a conference between the governments.

Mr. COOTE: When was the commissioner appointed?

Mr. COPP: On the 13th March last.

Mr. COOTE: Who previously did this work?

Mr. COPP: No work was being done in regard to it. This commissioner is holding an investigation as to the validity of the claims that have been filed. The claims have been all filed, and he is acting in the position of a judge to hear the claims, take evidence, and make a report as to what claims are valid and what claims are not.

Mr. COOTE: Is there any good reason why this should not be done by a judge of the Exchequer Court? Would he not be the proper person?

Mr. COPP: Just now they are rather short of judges in the Exchequer Court.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You might make an appointment.

Mr. BAXTER: The Montreal Star says the government is going to appoint an hon. member to the Exchequer Court judgeship.

Mr. COPP: I am sure any hon. member will agree that the gentleman who has been selected to carry on that work is very well qualified for the position and is a man of splendid legal attainments. He occupied a seat in this parliament for many years, and I have always regarded him as one of the greatest legal minds in the Dominion. I think the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) will agree with me.

Mr. HANSON: Do not slobber over him too much.

Mr. BAXTER: I entirely concur in the remarks of the Secretary of State with reference to Mr. Pugsley's ability. I would ask at the same time why this mad rush to appoint this gentleman with the ability? As far as I can find out from anything he tells us tonight it will be at least years, and it may be decades before a single dollar will be available for Canada. I do know that the governorship of New Brunswick became vacant some time ago.

An hon. MEMBER: He is out of a job now.

Mr. BAXTER: That is a very good reason.

Mr. COOTE: Is there any reason why the vacancy in the Exchequer Court should not be filled, and a judge of that court perform this work?

Mr. COPP: I have nothing whatever to do —more than assuming my share of responsibility—with the appointment of a judge to the Exchequer Court. I am sure if a judge were appointed he might do the work, but this is not an exchequer court matter at all. It is a matter outside of our courts, a matter of inquiry, being held very frequently outside of this country, to get information upon which this government can reasonably act in reference to a public question such as this.

Mr. COOTE: Are all the hearings held in Ottawa?

Mr. MARTELL: Does the hon. member know the legal ability and the great qualifications of the gentleman whom the government have appointed to this position? Evidently the hon. member does not know. I venture to say that if he went to Cape Breton, and from there to Vancouver and British Columbia, traversing the whole of the Do-

minion, he would not be able to find a man of greater legal acumen and ability or better qualified to deal with these questions than the Hon. William Pugsley.

Mr. STEVENS: I would suggest that they should get the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) to nominate a man for the Exchequer Court, and help them out of their dilemma.

Mr. MARTELL: In spite of all my hon. friend's sarcasm, I would suggest that the hon. member for Hants knows many lawyers in Canada quite well qualified to fill the position but the hon. member for Hants undoubtedly, as a supporter of the present administration, having complete faith in them, knows that they will on the right occasion and at the right opportunity, appoint a man with eminent qualifications.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend has aspirations himself.

Mr. COOTE: I am sure we are much indebted to the member for Hants for enlightening the House as to the ability of the present commissioner. I really think that the present commissioner has been before the public of Canada long enough for them to judge for themselves of his ability and his particular fitness for the position. I might ask the minister again whether these investigations are all held in Ottawa or whether the commissioner has to travel about the country to hear claims.

Mr. COPP: He will hold an inquiry wherever it is most convenient to hear any number of claims.

Mr. HANSON: How long is it anticipated that this gentleman will be employed at the rate of $9,000 a year and expenses?

Mr. COPP: I cannot tell my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON: Is his engagement subject to no definite term?

Mr. COPP: His services will be dispensed with when he has completed the work he will undertake.

Mr. HANSON: Well, I want to warn the minister that he will be on the job until another one is in sight.

Mr. STEVENS: The special pleading of the member for Hants (Mr. Martell) for our old friend Mr. Pugsley, suggests a question to my mind. Upon what basis is this eminent legal light to adjudicate these claims? The minister says that the work is not one for which the Exchequer Court is adapted. I gather from that suggestion that the basis on which the claims will be examined is not judicial. Well, is it to be a political basis? If not, I ask again, upon precisely what basis will the claims be adjudicated? The interpolation of my hon. friend for Hants rather arouses in my mind a suspicion that perhaps there is something more than the necessity for eminent legal ability involved in the matter.

Mr. MARTELL: To the pure all things are pure.

Mr. STEVENS: I will grant that the Hon. Mr. Pugsley possesses great legal ability, but my acquaintance with him in the House also convinces me that few gentlemen in Canada have more political astuteness or adroitness than has that same gentleman. It is natural therefore that we should be very anxious to know exactly the basis upon which these claims are to be adjusted.

Mr. MARTELL: Who appointed him governor of New Brunswick?

Mr. HANSON: If the hon. gentleman wants some inside history in regard to that question I can give it to him.

Mr. MARTELL: I might agree with you, too.

Mr. STEVENS: I have asked the minister a question; I wish he would answer me. Upon what basis are those claims to be adjudicated? The minister declares that it is not to be political. Well, then, what is it?

Mr. COPP: The various claims that are filed will fall into certain categories, and among other things the investigations will be directed towards ascertaining to which of these categories any particular claim belongs. Compensation may be claimed from Germany under article 232 in respect of damage suffered under any one of these categories, of which there are ten. They include:

(1) Damage to injured persons and to surviving dependants by personal injury to or death of civilians caused by acts of war, including bombardments or other attacks on land, on sea, or from the air, and all the direct consequences thereof, and of all operations of war by the two groups of belligerents whatever arising.

(2) Damage caused by Germany or her allies to civilian victims of acts of cruelty, violence or maltreatment (including injuries to life or health as a consequence of imprisonment, deportation, internment or evacuation, of exposure at sea or of being forced to labour, wherever arising, and to the surviving dependants of such victims.)

(3) Damage caused by Germany or her allies in their own territory or in occupied or invaded territory to civilian victims of all acts injurious to health or capacity to work, or to honour, as well as to the surviving dependants of such victims.

(4) Damage caused by any kind of maltreatment of prisoners of war.

(8) Damage caused to civilians by being forced by Germany or her allies to labour without just remuneration.

(9) Damage in respect of all property wherever situated belonging to any of the allied or associated states or their nations, with the exception of naval and military works or materials, which has been carried off, seized, injured or destroyed by the acts of Germany or her allies on land, on sea or from the air, or damage directly in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war.

(10) Damage in the form of levies, fines and other similar exactions imposed by Germany or her allies upon the civilian population.

These are the various matters in respect of which damages can be claimed and into which investigation will be made.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the claimant have to establish legal right?

Mr. COPP: He has no legal right under the act; it is a mere matter of establishing his claim, and the inquiry is to ascertain whether or not any claim comes within any of the categories I have read.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely my hon. friend has not the slightest idea of the treaty. It is obvious that whatever rights are given by that solemn covenant are legal rights; the question is entirely a legal one. It is nonsense to say anything else. If therefore this is a matter of legal right why not leave it where it was before? And it is absolutely legal, because the category to which any claim belongs is a matter of legal construction. You might as well say that the rights under a deed or an agreement are not legal. They are legal, just as the rights under a treaty are. My hon. friend says that this is not a proper matter for reference to the Exchequer Court. Why should not the Exchequer Court have jurisdiction in this matter? There are two possible reasons, and it would be only fair to the minister to let him state his own first if he has any. I would ask him again why cannot this matter be properly looked after by the Exchequer Court?

Mr. COPP: We no doubt could have a judge of the Exchequer Court act as a commissioner, but I do not think the Exchequer Court would be the proper tribunal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection is that the Exchequer Court has jurisdiction in any matter of this kind; it is a sort of administrative court, and the government has absolute power to refer to it any such question. I should not have thought that there was any doubt about that. But there are, as I say, just two reasons for the action that is intended here. The first is, that there is a vacancy on the Bench and it is not convenient to the government to appoint the person properly selected for that position during the term of this parliament. That is one reason.

Mr. MARTELL: Who is selected?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend knows very well; if he does not he is not as close to the counsels of his party as I thought he was. But perhaps they are wiser than some people give them credit for being. However that may be, there is another reason. An appointment outside gives the government an excuse for paying so much per annum to a political friend. That is the second reason. There are no other reasons except those two. Now, my hon. friend says that a commissioner was appointed before—the Chief Justice of New Brunswick. That is true. But my hon. friend will find that that commissioner was to get no $9,000 a year; in fact he was to get nothing at all. Under our act he could get nothing except his mere expenses.

Mr. CAHILL: Did he do any work?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He did not do any work. He came up to Ottawa and after the change of administration he gave up the appointment. But for the change of administration the work would have been gone on with just as soon as there was any real necessity for it to be undertaken. Now, the hon. minister knows perfectly well that there are any number of judges quite capable of doing this work whose services could have been availed of by the administration, but of course in such event there would be no payment of $9,000 a year. Will my hon. friend give me any reasons for this appointment except the two I have advanced?

Mr. COPP: I can only repeat, Mr. Chairman, what I have already said. We found it necessary to have a commissioner to investigate this matter, and as Sir Douglas Hazen, who was appointed a commissioner for this purpose just prior to the going out of office of my hon. friends, afterwards expressed a desire to be relieved of the appointment, we asked Mr. Pugsley to undertake the work. I am sure he will conduct the investigation satisfactorily to the government as well as to parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's answer reminds me of the deaf man who, when called upon to pay a longstanding debt, answered, that it was a very fine day. The question is, why appoint someone who is to be paid a salary when there are any number of members of the Bench whose regular duties

are just of this character, determining claims, who could have been appointed. The hon. member knows quite well that Sir Douglas Hazen upon the accession of this government offered, if it was the will of the government, to place the position at their disposal. Well, of course they eagerly grasped it, and the Honourable William Pugsley now has a large salary at the expense of the state. It is a position demanding legal ability; our judges have legal ability. I do not deny at all that the Hon. William Pugsley has legal ability, but if it is only legal ability that is necessary, it is no news to my hon. friend to be assured that 99 per cent of the talents of the Hon. William Pugsley would be wasted. What I should like to ask is this: after the long list of appointments, east, west, north, south and central, that have gone, with really rather wearisome monotony, to party friends of the government of the deepest dye, ending with the appointment of Mr. Congdon to investigate why the Grand Trunk directors voted gratuities, are many more such appointments still to be made? Is the waiting list long yet? Let us know about when we may expect to get to the end of it.

Mr. COPP: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend any information.

Mr. COOTE: Have any claims been filed with the minister's department in regard to what is generally referred to as the Hoppe and Isenberg coal lease?

Mr. COPP: Nothing has been filed with us.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Coote) does not lead the government to appoint another commissioner.

Mr. COOTE: Was this position filled through the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. COPP: I am afraid not.

Mr. HANSON: Why was not this matter referred to Mr. Justice Audette, the Assistant Judge of the Exchequer Court, and a gentleman very well qualified to deal with claims of this character? He has done a great deal of this class of work or work analogous to it, for the government. Was his name considered in connection with the appointment?

Mr. COPP: There is only one member of the Exchequer Court Bench at the present time. Various names were considered, and it was thought that Mr. Pugsley's name would be the most acceptable to the country generally on account of his ability and experience in that line of work.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. HANSON: Then it simply amounts to this—Mr. Pugsley needed the job. Is that the idea?

Mr. COPP: I did not say so.

Mr. HANSON: That is what you mean.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. Minister of Marine groans.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I was exclaiming at Mr. Hanson's remark.

Mr. STEVENS: The answer to the Secretary of State reveals a rather misty state of mind. He advises the House that one judge is carrying on the business of the Exchequer Court satisfactorily, and that there is no need to appoint another judge.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend misunderstood me. I did not say anything like that.

Mr. STEVENS: Not in A, B, C, language, but that is the inference which we must take from his observation. But the government finds it necessary to appoint a special commissioner in a judicial capacity to pass upon legal claims, and he says he does not know whether it will be a decade, two decades or three decades before this appointment will terminate; he has not the remotest idea. I would suggest to the minister, if he and his colleagues cannot find a suitable appointee for the Exchequer Court vacancy, that the Hon. Mr. Pugsley should be appointed to that court as a judge to carry on this work at the salary of an Exchequer Court judge. He would then have all the machinery of the Exchequer Court at his disposal. My hon. friend and the government are setting up a separate court to do undoubtedly the very thing which the Exchequer Court is supposed to do, and at the same time refraining for a month to appoint a judge to the vacancy in the Exchequer Court. Either the country does not require another judge in the Exchequer Court —in which case why appoint an additional judge?—or else the work of that court does require that another appointment should be made.

I am going to move, Mr. Chairman:

That item No. 382, $75,000 for the Department of the Secretary of State, be reduced by the sum of $9,000.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment should be put in writing.

Mr. STEVENS: I will put it in writing, Mr. Chairman, in a moment.

Mr. COPP: I hardly think my hon. friend can be serious in the amendment that he proposes. We have not increased the expenditure this year; we are not providing for any special outlay. The matter was given very careful consideration, as it was, I am sure prior to the defeat of the government of my hon. friend, when a commissioner was appointed by them to carry out this work. Whether it was because of the change of government I do not know, but Sir Douglas Hazen expressed his desire to be relieved from any duties in that connection. We had hoped that we could get along without appointing another commissioner, but those who had filed claims were pressing very strongly for consideration of those claims by some tribunal, and it was therefore thought advisable that a commissioner should be appointed for the purpose. As to referring the matter to a judge of the Exchequer Court, we have only one judge there at present and we thought it would not be well to ask him to take on this extra work. But aside from that, I doubt whether it would be a proper course to pursue to ask any judge to withdraw his time from his judicial duties in order to attend to an inquiry of this kind. We had a number of names before us for the position. The government of my hon. friend had appointed the Chief Justice of our province, a man of high standing, and we thought it only right and proper that we should select in his stead a man of ability, of wide legal attainment and experience, a man who for a number of years had occupied the position of Minister of Public Works in the federal government. I am charged with appointing Dr. Pugsley on political grounds, but that same gentleman was so highly thought of, so highly respected by my hon. friends, that he was selected by them to fill the high and honourable position of Lieutenant Governor of the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should do full justice to the subject while he is at it. The late government appointed very many strong Liberals to high positions throughout the entire Dominion. The late government was in no way narrow in that regard.

Mr. COPP: Nor, were we in any way narrow in appointing the very man whom my hon. friends had appointed as Lieutenant Governor of that province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did not make jobs for them, though.

Mr. COPP: We followed the example of our hon. friends; we selected a man who is admirably qualified to fill the position. My hon. friend's amendment would only embarrass the department in carrying out its work. If we were asking for a very large increase I could understand my hon. friend taking that position, but under the circumstances I am sure the committee will agree that the amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. GOULD: It is very interesting for the newer members of the House to watch the little battles that take place between the old time parties. It recalls to my mind a certain incident that occurred in the year 1920. A party of twenty-two members of this House went down to St. John, where they were given a dinner, and at the end of the table sat the Hon. Mr. Pugsley, whose name has been mentioned here to-night, and the then Minister of the Interior. As one listened to the complimentary speeches made on that occasion one could not anticipate any such criticism of Mr. Pugsley as we have heard here to-night. On that occasion each handed the other what might be termed bouquets—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to substantiate what he says by something in the nature of quotation? I assure him that anything I said I would stand by to-day and am ready to repeat before this House.

Mr. GAUVREAU: The right hon. gentleman sometimes forgets pretty quickly.

Mr. GOULD: Everything was harmonious; if any criticism at all was offered it was directed to one poor timid little Progressive who had only shortly before that reached the House. I know the Minister of the Interior at that time suggested that a new political force—my right hon. friend wants quotation—had arisen in the land, and he predicted that it would be of short duration. The timid little Progressive, responding for Saskatchewan suggested that while everything seemed to run harmoniously between the hon. gentlemen who sat at the head table, representing the two "old political parties," as they both termed them—"historic political parties"—the day might not be far distant when the new force in the land would relegate the "historic parties" to the prehistoric stage. I say again that as my mind harks back to that occasion—and a very pleasant one it was, I must say—it could not possibly have been anticipated that certain of the gentlemen sitting at that table would subsequently offer any sort of criticism. The gentleman in question stands as high in the esteem of the people at the present time as he did then. No crime can be charged against him simply because he

happens to be a Liberal, nor could there be if he happened to be a Conservative, and I cannot see why criticism should be levelled against him as it has been. That is the type of politician I am; I will fight as hard and as honestly for an individual who has politically opposed me at all times as I will for anyone else, provided that he is honest and sincere and capable of filling the position to which he is assigned. That, I think, is a fair expression of the politics that we in this corner of the chamber believe in.

Mr. HANSON: Nobody questions the ability of the Hon. William Pugsley to fill this or any other judicial position, but what hon. gentlemen on this side question is the necessity of the appointment. And we are naturally suspicious when the appointment synchronizes with the completion of his tenure of office as Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick. It does look to us like a job—

Mr. CAHILL: He could not hold both, could he?

Mr. HANSON: No, he could not hold both. He has been known to hold more than one job, but he could not do so in this case—and it is not his fault that he could not. I do submit that the point raised by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) is well taken and that this commissionership should have been given to one of the judges. Had that been done, there would have been no cost to the country except his necessary expenses.

Amendment (Mr. Stevens) negatived; Yeas, 34; Nays, 48.

Item agreed to.

MINES DEPARTMENT

Geological survey—for explorations, surveys and investigations, wages of explorers, topographers and others..	$202,000
For publication of English and French editions of reports, maps, illustrations, etc..	60,000
For maintenance of offices and museum, instruments, chemicals, books of reference, miscellaneous assistance, and contingencies.	50,000
For museum equipment..	15,000
For purchase of specimens..	5,000
	332,000

Mr. MEIGHEN: I observe that the minister's efforts for economy have resulted in another increase. Perhaps he will explain that in the usual way.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of Mines): There is a decrease.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is an increase of $10,000.

[Mr. Gould.]

Mr. STEVENS: Is that the usual explanation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The usual error too.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend refers to the increase of $10,000 for publication of English and French editions of reports, that is the result of a reduction last year. My hon. friend will see that this is the same vote as in 1921-1922. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance asked for a statement last year of what we had unexpended and we gave him the expenditure for ten months. Unfortunately it does not cover the amount of the publications, and we are asking for the amount this year that we formerly had. That has happened in two cases. There was a reduction of $8,000 on another item of the same character.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister give us some information as to the exploration work that is being carried on? I notice that one of these parties was down in my constituency last summer. I should like to know how much work is being done in eastern Canada, for instance, this year, how many parties are out and where they are located.

Mr. STEWART (Argenetuil): We plan two exploration parties in New Brunswick, one under Mr. C. H. Freeman and the other under Mr. D. B. Dowling. One is doing topographical surveying work and the other geological mapping and investigation of the Minto coal basin.

Mr. HANSON: Do they come under this vote?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: Can the minister give us any information regarding the work being done in the coast province?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Hanson is to be in northwestern British Columbia, Mr. W. L. Uglow, in Cumberland, Mr. W H. Miller at Aldermere, Mr. W. A. Johnston at Barkerville, Mr. C. E. Cairnes at Similkameen, Mr. Dolmage at Copper mountain, Mr. G. A. Young, who is making an inventory of iron ore resources, Mr. M. E. Bancroft, and Mr. J. E. Walker at Windermere.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister mentioned one party at Copper mountain. What is that party doing?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are mapping and making a detailed study of the copper ore deposits of Copper mountain.

Mr. STEVENS: That mountain was diamond drilled by the company that is located there. Are they taking advantage of that work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I believe so.

Mr. STEVENS: Another question in regard to oil well inspection. There are several oil wells being drilled in southern British Columbia, and the question arose some short time ago as to whether the companies drilling these wells were dealing with the matter in a fair manner as regards the shareholders and the public. That is, a driller might give out information that there was water in a well and that it was a non-successful operation, and the stock would be sacrificed and gathered in. I understand that the department have inspectors and experts who look into this work and advise companies of the actual condition of these wells, or at least they check up the operatives so that they cannot give out false returns for manipulation purposes. Can the minister give us any information on that subject?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That would more properly come up under the Interior department estimates. However, I can give the information. We had up till recently an engineer in charge, a Mr. Slipper, who is located in Alberta but is available for inspection work in any province where oil boring is going on. It is a most difficult thing even for the expert to ascertain the facts if the driller is not prepared to give him information. We try to keep logs of all the wells in order that we may have a history of formations in the various districts where drilling operations are going on, but they are not always reliable, I am free to say. However, we have that engineer, and he is employed in the Interior department, not in the Mines department.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister also mention whether a survey of the iron ore deposits is being made in conjunction with the provincial authorities? If so under what agreement and what portion of the cost, etc, is being borne by this government, and to what extent has the survey been carried out?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My deputy tells me that the arrangement is that the geological work is done by the Department of Mines of the federal government, and the drilling and testing by the provincial government.

Mr. STEVENS: Does this vote cover, or apply, in every way to the ore testing plant that is under consideration?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is a separate vote.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it provided for in this year's estimates?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The new ore testing plant spoken of in British Columbia?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have no vote.

Mr. STEVENS: It has been dropped? There was one carried for a number of years.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am going to ask for a small sum in the Supplementary Estimates to pay for the shipment of ore to our testing plant here during this year so that the British Columbia miners may be in the same position as those who live very much closer to the Ottawa plant. There have been some negotiations—perhaps I should not say negotiations but there have been representations—for the acquiring of a plant at Nelson but we have not gone very far in that connection. I am of the opinion that a small sum of money—that is small in comparison with the interest charges on capitalization account for the construction of an ore-testing plant in British Columbia—would bring ore here and enable it to be tested. That would give a service although not as rapid as if the work were done out there and at much less cost than would be required were we to undertake a new plant in British Columbia at the moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Is it possible to get the true commercial value of the ores by bringing them here and treating them at the Ottawa plant?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Identically the same service will be given here that we propose to give in British Columbia. I may say for the information of the committee that this is only a temporary arrangement. I am not intimating that this is the end of the plan for an ore-testing plant in British Columbia. This is only intended to be a temporary service in the meantime I am going to ask for $10,000, I think that is the amount, to cover the freight charges.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Will that amount cover the freight and express charges from British Columbia to Ottawa on the complex ores that are required to be assayed or tested?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would be pretty hard to answer that question; we have no knowledge of how much ore will be offered. But I think it will. I think that we

will be able to pay the freight for that amount of money and possibly give tests to ores furnished by all the people in British Columbia who are interested.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Is the minister aware that there are unlimited quantities of ore in British Columbia awaiting the installation of some ore-testing plant? Does he think that $5,000 or $10,000 would provide that convenience and develop those ore resources?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of course, my hon. friend knows a great deal more about the subject than I do but the testing of a 200-pound lot will give a fair indication of almost any sample that is forwarded, and $10,000 will bring a great number of lots forward. I am merely suggesting it in order to give some service to the people of British Columbia who have been waiting for some considerable time to have this testing plant established in their province.

Mr. STEVENS: I think, perhaps, the minister has not clearly appreciated the point at issue which was referred to by my hon. friend for Kootenay and myself. As a matter of fact there are in British Columbia—and I presume in other sections of the country as well—very large deposits of refractory ores, for instance silver lead and silver zinc ores, with mixtures of other metals that up to the present no commercial plant has been able to profitably separate, although they have been experimenting for years. I was at one, the Trail smelter, one of the finest institutions of the kind in Canada, where they have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to solve this problem. If it were solved it would mean a tremendous saving to the country and an impetus to the mining business generally, not only in British Columbia but wherever such ores are found Now, the expenditure contemplated in the location of an ore testing plant—at least the amount set a few years ago—was in the neighbourhood of $100,000. It was recognized then that the establishment of such a plant would cost probably from $100,000 to $200,000. There was a difficulty in the minds of the officials of the department as to the best place to locate that plant, whether in the interior or on the coast. Personally I have never expressed any opinion—I do not think I am competent to do so—as to where it should be located. The officials of the department should determine that in the interest of the investigatory work; it is very important. I want to say to the minister that I appreciate this contemplated vote of $10,000 to test these small samples of ores, but that will not do very much good in solving the problem I mention. It must be treated on a commercial basis, and it will perhaps take some years to find a process that will successfully treat these ores. I am certain that the return would amply repay the department for the investigation. I am very sorry if the former vote has been dropped from the estimates, because what the minister now suggests to replace it will not meet the case at all.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have given the matter some consideration and I do not think $50,000 would construct the plant that would be required in British Columbia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What amount?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I should say $100,000, I do not know whether double the amount, which would involve an annual expenditure of some $50,000, would do. In the meantime I thought it wise to offer facilities to the British Columbia miner who is desirous of having tests made of the product of his particular mine or claim. If he agrees to forward samples here from his nearest railway station we will give him all the tests that he would probably get at the inception of a plant in his own province. Of course I quite follow my hon. friend's suggestion that this plant would require developments as various ores came to it for the purpose of determining a proper course of treating, but we do identically the same testing work here. I am quite of the opinion that a plant of this character will have to be established in British Columbia but I may say, generally speaking, that unless there is an absolute dire necessity for the building of this plant out there and the purchase of the necessary machinery I think it well to delay matters, at least for a year, in the hope that both machinery and building costs will be reduced. However, I have no desire to penalize the very important industry in British Columbia, and in the meantime this required service will be given for the benefit of the province.

Mr. HUMPHREY: In view of the fact that a vote was passed some time ago and has been allowed to lapse, representing a district that depends entirely upon its mineral resources. I give it as my opinion, and the opinion of those better able to speak with authority than I am, that such action is penalizing the people of British Columbia and especially the mining industry. At the present time that industry in British Columbia is on the eve of improvement. There never was a time in the last eight years when the

outlook was as good as it now is. We have this smelter situated at Trail, the property of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, a very large institution doing a great deal of work for the province. Nevertheless, there are many kinds of complex ores throughout the province, and in the districts where they have these ores they require a testing plant. The minister has mentioned this small plant located at Nelson. As I am particularly conversant with this plant, and as I know how it happened that it is situated there I can tell the minister that, with a small expenditure, it would be in a position to handle the process of testing these different complex ores in the initial stages. This plant can be made available with a very small expenditure. By holding up this vote which was put through in the last few years, I think the government is holding back the mining industry and the assistance that it should have in developing what is considered our greatest asset.

Mr. McBRIDE: I am fully in sympathy with this move to get a plant out in British Columbia to test ore, but I think the government should investigate the situation in order to ascertain the most feasible place to locate the plant. Personally, I think Kamloops is about the most central location, and I would ask the government to go fully into the question, in order to ascertain the most feasible place to put the plant so as to give accommodation to everybody. We have both the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific railways at Kamloops. It is well supplied with railways.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In reply to both hon. members, I may say that I am entirely in sympathy with the idea of establishing a plant. I believe the mining industry warrants the placing of a plant in British Columbia. There is the practical difficulty raised by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride). We have made some investigation of the plant the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Humphrey) speaks of. We have not approached the owners for the purpose of finding out what it could be purchased for. It occurred to me that probably that plant was not favourably located to serve the needs of British Columbia, and that would need some investigation as well. It would serve the needs of southern British Columbia entirely, but as mining is carried on, and probably will be carried on, throughout the whole British Columbia region when the plant is built, I think it should be placed as near a central point as possible, in order that freight costs may be reduced to a minimum. What we will do this year I think will give the service to every man very reasonably. If a man brings his samples to the station, puts them on the train
10 p.m. and sends them forward we will agree to give them a test and return him the results of the test. I do not want it to be inferred that, because we have not put an amount in the estimates for the construction of the plant this year, the idea has been dropped, because it has not.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Is it the intention of the department to carry on further investigations in regard to establishing this plant in British Columbia this year, or is this the final move, providing an appropriation for bringing the ore to Ottawa?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. I thought I made it clear to my hon. friend that this was only a temporary measure to cover the year. We will certainly try to place the plant where it will be most convenient. The question of whether it is wise to establish a plant has been settled so far as I can ascertain from the officials of the department. There are no two opinions about that, but there is some question as to whether it should go right down to the coast where the railways all concentrate, or whether it should be put in a central portion of the province, as suggested by my hon. friend for Kamloops, or some place where cross-country railways would serve the interests of all parties concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY: The department could very well decide the location of the plant, if they would admit the principle of establishing one in British Columbia. This question has been considered and certainly negotiations have been carried on for a number of years back. The mining people of British Columbia feel that they are being penalized by the government not being able to reach a decision. Representations are being made to the department in respect to particular points, and the desire is to co-operate, and to render any assistance that may be possible to the department to assist them to come to a decision. It is not for the particular benefit of one point or one locality so much as to render some assistance and co-operation to enable the government to come to a decision. Representing a district that is entirely a mining district, I could not do otherwise than bring out the qualifications of that particular district, especially in regard to the plant now located at Nelson. That plant

could be acquired practically without any outlay of money. A very small sum would purchase it, and it is equipped with something like $40,000 or $50,000 worth of machinery which is lying idle. I simply offer these suggestions with a view to assisting the government. This particular point is located in the interior, where there is practically the greatest amount of complex ore, and it is easily accessible from any other point in the province.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is it the intention of the government to give any assistance to the Coast Range Steel Company? I believe that company has asked for a guarantee of bonds, or something of that kind.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Representations have been made to the government but, so far as I know, no commitments of any kind have been made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No results.

Mr. MILLAR: What success has the department had in drilling for oil in southern Alberta? When I was there last fall, at what is known as the Maclean well, they had reached a depth of about 1,900 feet. They were expecting oil in a very short time. South of that is what is known as the Sunburst well in Montana and from the wells nearby I saw oil floating in great quantities. I understand that the oil prospectors believe that the intervening country, to the extent of some seven miles, is rich in oil, and it seemed to me a wise thing for the department to spend money in drilling for oil where they were. With what success have they met in connection with the Maclean well on the international boundary?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understood my hon. friend to say that the department was drilling. The department does not do any drilling, but I can give my hon. friend some information about the Coutts Sweet Grass Company. They have reached a depth now of 2,800 feet, and we know that in all cases of drilling for oil you may be 50 feet off the basin in which the oil is located and miss it. They, like other drillers, are very confident that they will get oil, but whether they will or not I cannot say. They make the statement that at 2,200 feet they struck a small vein but did not think it of sufficient volume to warrant the stopping of drilling operations, and so they went to a greater depth.

Mr. MILLAR: I understand that they are going further.

[Mr. Humphrey.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. PUTNAM: Whereabouts did the hon. member see oil flowing?

Mr. COOTE: How much, approximately, of the vote of $202,000 is spent in each province?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For geological survey, the item under discussion, we estimate for exploration in British Columbia and Yukon, which are combined in the item, $38,300; in the Northwest territories, $5,000; in Alberta, $17,000; in Manitoba, $4,500; in Saskatchewan, $4,500; in Ontario, $24,200; in Quebec, $11,000; in New Brunswick, $3,000; in Nova Scotia, $6,500; and "in general," $2,300. In connection with the topographical surveys we will spend in British Columbia, $12,000; in Manitoba, $4,500; in Ontario, $8,500; in Quebec $8,600; in New Brunswick, $6,000, and in Nova Scotia $8,000. A question was raised last year by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and I think by the member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), in regard to an apparent over-lapping, and the matter was looked into. At first I had an idea that it would perhaps be well to combine all topographical surveys under the Surveys branch, but I find that some years ago the Geological branch were desirous of controlling the work for the purpose of mapping areas upon which geological work was to be carried on; and they did that work under their direction. I find also that in the Department of National Defence some work was being carried on. Under the chairmanship of Doctor Deville we have taken care to see that there is no overlapping in the work, and hence you will find a variation in the expenditures in the Geological branch and the Topographical branch in the various provinces. I can assure the committee—and this is the point I wish to make—that there is absolutely no overlapping; the operations carried on by the various organizations, are co-ordinated and made use of. For example, if in any section the geological parties have already done the topographical work, then there is no party from the Topographical branch doing work there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that the minister had any task in stopping overlapping. I had a survey committee at work for some time while I was in the department some years ago, and under the chairmanship of Doctor Deville I provided successfully against overlapping. What I called attention to a year ago was something in regard to which apparently I was not able to influence the government—that is, the survey

work being done in the Militia department. If any human being can tell me of what value that is to this country, then the information would be in addition to my knowledge.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They have joined us on the board; we do not know what they are doing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did my hon. friend say that they are joined under the minister?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No; they work with us; we know what they are doing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know what they are doing too, and it is because I know what they are doing that I think the work is worthless; and it is very expensive.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The topographical work?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. They are doing such thorough topographical survey work that in the area they have covered you can tell where every schoolhouse is, where every church is, where every house is, almost where every telegraph pole is, if not the height of it. It is really a sort of literal photograph of the entire country; and they have done now so much after about twenty-five years of work that if they can keep on through next millennium and half of the following one, they will have done. Such is the nature of their work; and by the time they are about one-hundredth part through, the beginning of the work will be of no use, because all these things change. I do hope that the minister will exert his influence to see that worthless survey work is done away with. I do not find fault with the officers; I think they are doing their work well. But of what value the work is to the country for the amount of money expended I never was able to understand. I sincerely trust that now that the attention of the government is called to the matter this work will be done away with. I did not know about it until close to the termination of my office. May I suggest another thing to the minister for the exercise of his dormant talents, if he has any left after the Interior department is taken care of. He should try to avoid unnecessary expenditure and save some money for serving the country. There is a necessity in connection with that ore-dressing plant in British Columbia. I remember being entirely convinced of an urgent necessity there. I cannot say that I can bring the reasons to bear just now why it is not possible, effectively and with practical results, to bring ore here. What the minister has in mind may possibly alleviate the situation for a while, but he will find that in the end it will likely have been better for him to have saved the money and got sooner to work constructing a proper ore-dressing plant. So convinced was I of this that in the last year I was in office an estimate was put in for the purpose of starting work in this direction. But of course the contest came on that year and we could not go on. Let the minister exert his energy to prevent the appointment of grotesque commissions, and the prolific creation of fancy sinecures for party friends, and then there will be some money left for work of this kind that goes to develop wealth in the country. The minister has an ore-dressing plant in one part of the city of Ottawa; I forget the street. The plant is a good one and it is not expensive and it is to that plant that this ore will come. Some two or three years ago we were testing there new methods of ore flotation. It is well known that the mineral flotation people have a patent method of flotation by oil which they control and out of which they exact very large profits, making the company immensely wealthy. A new flotation system was being tried and, before I left, had met with very encouraging success. I should like to know whether that success has been continued, and what the opinion of the department is as to its value.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One of the difficulties in connection with research work of this character is to convince parliament and the people that the money is well expended. We have made a very heavy expenditure at Bienfait on experimental work with fuel which has not yet resulted successfully The experiments mentioned by my hon. friend are still going on, and I watched them with a good deal of interest last year in the plant there. We are asking for some money to buy improved machinery. I had the deputy minister visit England, Germany, and Belgium as well as keep very closely in touch with the Bureau of Mines of the American government in order that we may know what other people are accomplishing in research work respecting new methods of treating ores as well as fuels and so get value for the money we expend and perhaps discover better methods of handling these problems. No very great success however, has yet attended the experimental work that my hon. friend has referred to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The liquid flotation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Nothing that we can say is a definite success.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has it been tried upon the refractory lead ores of British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot give that information at the moment. I saw them experimenting there, but not on lead.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On gold?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was considered rather successful on gold in my time. Has that opinion been reversed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am told on copper and gold they have got definite success.

Mr. COOTE: Has this department any revenue from some of the provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. COOTE: Does not the government control the mineral rights in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. COOTE: Have you not revenue from mining and oil leases?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, but that is in the Interior department; this is the Mines department, which is entirely separate.

Mr. COOTE: You have no revenue from British Columbia or the other provinces in this connection?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not in this department.

Mr. COOTE: We could get particulars of the revenue when the estimates of the Interior are brought down?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Revenue from what?

Mr. COOTE: Revenue from leases of mineral and oil rights. It seems to me it is a question that should be looked into as to just how much money we should spend on provinces that have their own mineral resources when there are other provinces that have been deprived of such resources, and I do not know whether any money has been spent to help the latter develop these resources.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can tell my hon. friend that money has been spent, and the fact that those provinces were deprived of their resources has been a consideration in spending more money there. There is a very, very large expenditure in geological survey work in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, particularly in the northern parts of those provinces where our chief finds were. Of course, in British Columbia there has been the greatest expenditure because British Columbia is really by nature where the best results could be expected.

Mr. COOTE: It may be true that British Columbia has the greatest mineral resources, and those resources will enure to the benefit of British Columbia alone in that sense. So that the prairie provinces are not being justly dealt with in this regard. I would point out the injustice that Alberta is suffering from at the present time. We have on our statute books an act governing the payment of bounty on crude oil according to its specific gravity, and the standard is set in such a peculiar way that I think none of the wells in Alberta have been able to secure any bounty, although the Dominion owns those resources and has received large amounts in rentals from oil leases; but the government is paying considerable sums every year for crude oil produced in Ontario, and there the provincial authorities own the mineral rights. I think it is time the government amended the act so that crude oil produced in Alberta may be given the same bounty as the Ontario crude oil. For the last eleven years the Alberta oil men have been trying to get successive governments to change the act, but so far without success. Before this session closes I hope the government will see that this injustice to Alberta is removed. It is certainly aggravating when one considers that the Dominion owns the oil resources in Alberta and yet refuses to give a bounty to the crude oil that is being produced there, although the oil producers in Ontario are given this advantage notwithstanding the fact that the oil rights there, as I said before, are owned by the provincial government.

Mr. ROBB: As the payment of these bounties is under my department. I may say that the act in question was passed long before oil was discovered in Alberta, and that its provisions do not discriminate in any way against Alberta or any of the other western provinces. The same specific gravity applies to Alberta as to Ontario oil, but apparently only the latter oil comes within the act. However, the observations made by my hon. friend have the consideration of the government, and it is quite possible that we may amend the act, if not this session then next session.

Mr. COOTE: I am quite pleased to hear that this matter has the consideration of the government but I believe it has had the

consideration of successive governments for quite a number of years. The trouble is that the government of the day never does anything but consider this matter. I want to serve warning on this government right here and now that if more than one session elapses after this session, and the act is not amended, there is going to be war right in this House on this particular matter.

Mr. ROBB: Who is going to make it?

Mr. COOTE: If nobody else will I will make it myself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose I am included in the indictment. The matter was brought to my attention and not only received consideration but decision. I will give the ground of the decision to my hon. friend. I do not know whether it got very long attention at the hands of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce; I am inclined to think this is about the first he has heard of it. The act was passed in order to make oil production in Ontario a business possibility. The Ontario lands were granted in fee simple, the oil exploiter there had to buy his land or his right and parliament considered that unless this bounty were granted the capital investment necessary was such, and the production possibilities so low, that there would not be any oil production. It has been continued for that reason. Very careful examination has disclosed that it has been necessary—whether it is just now I could not say, but I fancy so—or there would not be oil production. So much for the Ontario situation. In the West we own the lands and we make leases. The exploiter pays a certain rental per acre the first year and a smaller rental thereafter, and such moneys as he puts into actual development are credited against the rental for two years—I am disposed to think I extended that to three. All these things do not apply in Ontario. In western Canada the capital expenditures that the oil exploiter puts in are credited against this rental; when he gets oil he then proceeds to pay rental based on his oil production. What would be the common sense of charging the oil well owner a rental on his oil production and then paying him a bounty on that same production? If the rent is too high, make it less, but I cannot see any object in taking a rental from him and putting it into the treasury and then taking it out again and paying it back to him in the form of bonus. The point is that the system of production in the two places is wholly different. The system in the West credits the oil man with part of his capital investment; when he gets oil we then charge him rental, because there we are the owners of the property not the private individual. In Ontario the private individual is the owner. The man who goes in to produce oil, makes his capital investment and then he may have to pay rental—royalty, we call it—to the owner of the property. He does not pay anything here; if he did it would be senseless for us in Ontario to pay him back something by way of bonus.

Mr COOTE: It seems to me this is the same old story; the state will bonus private individuals, but when it comes to bonusing its own industry it refuses to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not our own.

Mr. COOTE: In Ontario it is not a much more difficult task to drill an oil well than it is to drill a water well, but in going after oil in Alberta they drill on an average from 3,000 to 5,000 feet, and that is an expensive operation. It is very hard to get oil prospectors to risk enough money to put down an oil well, some of which cost in the neighbourhood of $100,000. So far as this bounty is concerned, if the government will cease paying it to Ontario I will be quite satisfied. I want these oil men put on an equal basis; I think we have good ground for demanding that. I do not want to discuss the question further at present, because I am not armed with the statistics I would like to have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would my hon. friend be really willing to have that done?

Mr. COOTE: I am quite willing to have it done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the government would simply have to act as the private individual does in Ontario—make the oil man pay rent right from the start, give him no credit at all on his capital investment, then when he gets the product charge him a royalty on it. I assure my hon. friend it would be no hardship on the country to allow the exploiter, under those conditions, a bonus under the Bounty Act.

Mr. COOTE: I do not see why the government would be compelled to do any such thing. If they simply cease to pay the oil bounty in Ontario that need not entail the dire results that the right hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly equal treatment.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I do not want to get away from the item that is being considered.

but I would like some more information with regard to the ore testing plants. How much ore can be treated in this plant at Ottawa. What is its capacity?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can hardly tell my hon. friend what its capacity is, but we have had no difficulty so far in testing all that has been offered, and I think we can take care of a considerable increase and still give service without undue delay.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Any ores sent from British Columbia can be taken care of?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, unless some complex problem arose that would necessitate new machinery or entail an unusual amount of experimentation. That frequently happens.

Mr. HUMPHREY: There are so many different kinds of ores that a plant should be constructed in such a way as to be able to deal with them. Is the plant in Ottawa of such a character that under certain conditions new machinery may be necessary, while the mining districts of British Columbia are being held back for the want of these facilities?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At present we are testing ores from all over Canada. There might be complex ores that we could not test properly, but in a general way we can take care of any of the ore-testing problems that may come from British Columbia.

Mr. HUMPHREY: What are the regulations governing the forwarding of ore from British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All that is necessary is to take it to the nearest railway station and forward it here for testing.

Mr. STEVENS: In what quantities?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Two hundred pounds is quite sufficient for testing in most cases.

Mr. GOULD: The Topographical branch is carrying on work throughout the prairie provinces along the international boundary, including the erection of towers which have caused some of the residents to suggest that the government was going into radio work. Does the United States government share the cost of survey operations along the international boundary?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. This matter comes under the vote for boundary surveys, in which both governments have joined.

[Mr. Humphrey.]

Mr. GOULD: These towers are about 100 feet high. They are permanent institutions?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. COOTE: Have there been any recent discoveries of iron ore in Alberta and if so where?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, not of a quality that would warrant development I suppose my hon. friend refers to the reported discovery at lake Athabasca.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, and there was some report in the press of a discovery northwest of Calgary.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Butterfields were the parties who made the discovery at lake Athabasca. That was investigated by one of our officials and by Professor Allan of the University of Alberta. Their report is available if my hon. friend would care to peruse it. It is to the effect that so far as the investigation could determine, it is not possible to utilize the ore commercially.

Mr. LOGAN: Can the minister tell me what amount of money has been spent up to date at Bienfait in Manitoba in connection with the briquetting plant?

Mr. STEVENS: Is that included in this vote?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, it is under another vote. The expenditure by the board up to March 1, 1923, was $1,031,625.37

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What has become of the reported finds of coal in Ontario? Has the department been following that up? Have we had any results, and what are the prospects?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not been investigating that. The Ontario Department of Mines have been making that investigation, but we have their report.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To what effect?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The report is that the coal is of no commercial importance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it coal that won't burn or what is it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot tell my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was another matter that was being looked into of which I have not heard anything for some

time, and that was the utilization of the shale deposits of the Maritime provinces, the winning of fuel oil, I think it was, from the deposits. Is any work going on in connection with that now?

Mr. BROWN: Is the minister thoroughly satisfied with the reports that have been made in connection with the ore deposits at lake Athabasca, that they are really as vauleless as has been indicated in Professor Allan's report?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no opinion in the matter. I have to be guided by the report.

Mr. BROWN: I have reason to know that the Butterfields have themselves expressed great doubt. As to relying on Professor Allan's report, it is questionable if he was ever near enough to the property to make a satisfactory report.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think that is most unfair. Not only was that property investigated twice before the Butterfields ever saw it, but it has been investigated on one occasion since. There may be a very good reason for a difference of opinion, and at some future date it is possible that this may prove to be a valuable deposit, but I think it is very doubtful from the nature of the reports made. But to say that the geologist was not there is most unfair.

Mr. BROWN: Has the government any intention of making further investigations to satisfy themselves as to the nature of these deposits?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The only way in which they could really be proved would be by using a drill. I had a long discussion with this gentleman about this deposit, and after he had made representations we had Professor Allan report to us, and his report coincides exactly with the report of Geologist Alcock of the Geological Survey. I scarcely think that these two men would be mistaken. They are both trained men. I might say to my hon. friend that Butterfields' statement is that deeper down the ore would improve, but the only way to test that would be by taking in a drill at considerable expense and drilling down, and keeping a log, to discover whether or not his supposition is correct. From the reports we have received from the geologist that would appear to be a very doubtful expenditure.

Mr. BROWN: Is the report as to quantity or quality?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Quality, but as to quantity as well.

Mr. BROWN: The samples that were shown me, if they were true samples, do not seem to indicate a deposit of very high grade.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would not advise my hon. friend to put any money in it.

Mr. BROWN: I have none to put in.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Replying to my hon. friend for West York who asked about the shale deposits, representations have been made to us not by the New Brunswick government but by parties interested in the development of those shales there. We do not appear to have very authentic information, but we contemplate making some further investigations to prove the value of those shales in conjunction with the New Brunswick government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the department's attention not been called to these deposits in connection with the fuel question? I thought Mr. Louis Simpson had quite an extensive paper on these shales, and I understood that he had taken it up with the department.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The only matter that was brought to my attention was the oil extraction from the shale.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole matter came to the front in connection with the fuel situation. It was represented that we could get fuel oil at a comparatively low cost from the shales down there, that there was an unlimited supply, and that the oil was of high character. I thought the committee would be interested to know just what was going on in that regard, whether we were looking after that possible source of fuel supply.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is more or less a question of solving the extraction problem. There is no doubt about the oil shale being there. I think that is proven; the reports would indicate so. It is a question of how to extract the oil from the shale. It is very similar to the tar sands problem in Alberta, and we have innumerable people doing experimental work on that problem. But not very much has been done in connection with our oil shales.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You have no one working on the problem of extracting oil from these shales?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not at the moment, but it is on our programme.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has that question been referred to the Scientific Research Council?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are they dealing with it now?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They probably will.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has told us pretty well of the activities in British Columbia and in some parts of Alberta. What work is being carried on under this vote in the other provinces? Are we doing anything at all in the Maritime provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, I gave a report of the work that was being done in the different provinces and gave the names of the heads of the different parties that are out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where was that? What is being done?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These are geological parties doing investigational work, also topographical parties. They come under this vote we are now discussing. Of course, we have gone very far afield in this discussion, but as I said, I have given the names of the men at the head of these parties doing investigational work in the different provinces.

Mr. TOLMIE: Has any investigation been made in the last three years of the iron deposits on Vancouver Island?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. We have Doctor Young working on that steadily.

Mr. TOLMIE: Any results of interest lately?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The work is still going on. I cannot say that there have been any definite results such as my hon. friend is asking for. Borings will have to be undertaken before definite results will be obtained.

Mr. TOLMIE: What is the nature of the work being done now?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I made that statement before, however I will be very glad to give it to my hon. friend again. There is geological work, which Doctor Young is doing, and any boring required is undertaken by the British Columbia government.

Mr. GARDINER: When the minister brings down the information that has been asked for with respect to the inspection of oil wells, I would also like him to submit the inspection reports for the Monitor district.

Item agreed to.

For organization and equipment of the Explosives division under the Explosives Act, chap. 31, 4-5 George V, $12,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is a very small amount and there is a reduction, as will be noted, in the item. We asked for this vote last year for testing purposes. However, what Colonel Ogilvie has discovered has proved valueless to us, therefore we are dropping the vote and not going on with the experiment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do I understand the minister to say that the work for which he asked this money is going to be of no use?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We asked for a vote for investigational work in the Explosives division. It really had relation to a new method of testing explosives. Since then Colonel Ogilvie has discovered that new methods are being developed. Therefore we are not going on and we shall not need a vote for the purpose this year.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the object of the vote of $12,000 this year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is for the general work of the Explosives branch.

Mr. STEVENS: What work is being carried on in that branch now?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Control of the composition and method of manufacture of explosives disclosed by manufacturers confidentially, and examined for authorization for manufacture and storage in Canada or for importation. Importation is permitted only on the authority of the minister when regulations are complied with. There are only 17 factories in operation. Plans of factories and magazines have to be submitted and licenses or continuing certificates are issued by the minister only after the chief inspector has decided on the purposes for which buildings may be used, the quantities of explosives which may be stored, and the safety measures necessary for the protection of the workers, the public and property. Factories are subject to inspection to ensure that the conditions in the license and the general regulations are being observed. The general work for the protection of life and property is carried out under Colonel Ogilvie.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I observe a notation that the appropriation not required during 1923-24 is $250,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That vote was for the Lignite Utilization Board. The vote last year was $250,000 for further investigational work and I have already given to my hon. friend the total amount expended for that purpose. But we have ceased investigational work except in so far as regards the trial of a process for carbonization which only involves a very slight expenditure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was spent under this vote last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think, if my memory serves me right, it was $178,000.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Monday, May 7, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill No. 154 (from the Senate), to incorporate Trans-Continental Assurance Company.—Mr. Carroll.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CROWN LANDS, ALBERTA

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What has been the revenue, and cost of collecting same, during each of the past five years, from: (a) Coal; (b) Petroleum; (c) Grazing Lands; (d) Sale of Crown Lands in Alberta?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Answers as far as the Department of the Interior is concerned.

STATEMENT OF NET REVENUE RECEIVED DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS FROM COAL, PETROLEUM AND GRAZING LEASES, AND SALES OF DOMINION LANDS, WITHIN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

Fiscal Year	Coal	Petroleum and Natural Gas	Grazing Leases	Sales of Land	Total Revenue
1918-19	$ 366,504 73	$ 85,782 28	$ 66,511 50	$ 605,546 44	$ 1,124,344 95
1919-20	336,524,69	282,392 33	78,822 76	743,923 11	1,441,662 89
1920-21	445,254 21	535,433 42	79,479 52	546,094 85	1,606,262 00
1921-22	400,085 95	273,453 55	60,535 20	260,458 85	994,533 55
1922-23	345,750 69	244,577 08	70,665 14	65,258 66	726,251 57
Totals	$ 1,894,120 27	$ 1,421,638 66	$ 356,014 12	$ 2,221,281 91	$ 5,893,054 96

EXPENSES OF COLLECTION

STATEMENT of expenses (including salaries) paid in various offices of the Department of the Interior, in the Province of Alberta, in connection with the collection of revenue from mines, petroleum wells, grazing lands, and sale of Crown Lands for the past five years.

Name of Office	1918-19	1919-20	1920-21	1921-22	1922-23	Sub-total	Total Direct Charges of Collection
Calgary Mining Office	$ 5,969 53	$ 7,060 09	$ 9,801 77	$ 9,631 97	$ 7,606 02	$ 40,069 38	$ 40,069 38
Calgary Petroleum Office	Nil	2,685 26	7,741 10	8,152 27	9,861 89	28,440 52	28,440 52
Calgary Grazing Lands Office	6,063 65	6,380 12	7,414 99	11,304 25	10,474 46	41,637 47	41,637 47
Dominion Land Agencies	116,653 00	129,156 05	141,615 28	137,324 80	133,738 12	658,487 25	526,789 80 (80%)
Dominion Land Sub-Agencies	15,984 68	15,651 76	15,577 08	14,753 63	13,260 00	75,227 15	60,181 72 (80%)
Totals	$ 144,670 86	$ 160,933 28	$ 182,150 22	$ 181,166 92	$ 174,940 49	$ 843,861 77	$ 697,118 89

NOTE:—The revenue derived from Coal, Petroleum and Natural Gas, Grazing Leases and Sales of land during the past five years in the Province of Alberta is 80% of the total revenue credited to that Province by the Department of the Interior. The same percentage was therefore used as the basis upon which to reckon charges of collection in respect of the total expenditure incurred in the Land and Sub-Land Agencies within that Province.

Memorandum of Explanation—The total revenue derived by the Department of the Interior from the province of Alberta in connection with coal, petroleum and natural gas, grazing leases and sales of land for a period of five years is shown as $5,893,054.96 and the direct cost of collecting same as $697,118.89 This cost of collection, however, does not take into account a number of indirect charges which ultimately should enter into the cost of administering the Dominion lands and other resources in Alberta and the collection of revenue.

In connection with the above mentioned administration and collection of revenue, a proportional amount of the expenditure incurred by Land Patents, Mining Lands and Yukon, Timber and Grazing, Dominion Lands and Accounts branches should be charged against the Province of Alberta. This also applies to a proportion of the expenditure of officials of the department in Ottawa responsible for the administration of other branches and whose duties and jurisdiction have a bearing on the Department of the Interior activities in the province of Alberta. It is, however, impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the actual amount involved in these proportional charges and any figures which might be compiled could not in any way be looked upon as a true and correct statement of the case.

EGG INSPECTOR—YUKON TERRITORY

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Is any official of any department of the government to be stationed at Whitehorse, Yukon territory, for the purpose of inspecting eggs or other foods imported into Yukon?
2. If so, what is his name and position?
3. What are his official duties?
4. At what cost will he be so stationed and acting?
5. At whose request or suggestion is such official to be so stationed?
6. What information has the government of the necessity of incurring the expense of such action?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. There is no present intention of stationing an officer of the Department of Agriculture at Whitehorse, Yukon territory.

2, 3, 4, 5. Answered by No. 1.

6. It was expected at one time that it would be necessary, under the regulations, to appoint an egg inspector for the Yukon territory, to inspect eggs imported from the United States. Owing to the fact, however, that the Yukon is now purchasing eggs from British Columbia rather than from the United States, largely due to activities by the Department of Agriculture, there is no immediate necessity for such an appointment.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

RALSTON COMMISSION—FINAL REPORT

Mr. CHURCH:

When will the final report of the Colonel Ralston commission on soldiers' civil re-establsihment be received?

Hon. Mr. BELAND: It is expected that ar interim report in respect to certain questions of soldiers' civil re-establishment will be available for presentation within the next two weeks; it is unlikely that the final report of the commission will be available before the close of the session.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE—INQUIRY BRANCH

Mr. DENIS (St. Denis):

1. What is the name of the person lately appointed to the position of senior clerk in the Inquiry Branch at the Montreal post office?
2. What length of time has the above person been in the service?
3. Did said person pass examination for this promotion?
4. If so, how many competitors were there?
5. What are their names and years of service?
6. Were arrears of salary, from 1919, to the amount of $1,100 paid to said person after promotion as senior clerk?
7. If so, why?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. There has been no recent appointment to the position of senior clerk in the inquiry section of the Montreal post office. Recently Miss Boisseau who was performing the duties of postal information clerk as from 1918 was confirmed in her classification of postal information clerk retroactive to the 1st of April, 1919.

2. Since 1st January, 1916 –7 years and 5 months.

3. Miss Boisseau qualified by examination for the promotion referred to in No. 1.

4. There were three candidates in that promotional examination.

5. Miss Blanche B. Boisseau, appointed 1st January, 1916; Miss B. Duckett, appointed 8th June, 1917; Mr. Lucien Gervais, appointed 22nd May, 1914.

6. Yes.

7. The salary of the position of postal information clerk was revised to the same as that of a senior postal clerk as from 1st April, 1919, on the understanding that the employees holding such positions demonstrated by a practical examination that they were capable of properly fulfilling the duties of the position. Miss Boisseau passed the practical examination, and as she assumed the duties of the position in 1918 she was given the classification retroactive to 1st April, 1919, the date the classification became effective.

HOUSING AND OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

Does the government intend this session to introduce any legislation to aid and assist the following important economic problems, for the general advantage of Canada, namely:—(a) The Housing Problem; (b) Old Age Pensions?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, it is not possible for the government to give a final answer at the present time.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD, EDMONTON—INSURANCE

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Has it been the policy of the government with respect to insurance arising out of the business of the Soldier Settlement Board at Edmonton, Alberta, to divide such insurance amongst ex-service men in the city of Edmonton engaged in the business of insurance?
2. Is it the intention of the government to discontinue that policy? If so, what is the new policy of the government in this respect?
3. Is it a fact that the business of insurance arising out of the transactions of the Soldier Settlement Board at Edmonton, Alberta, is to be given to three selected persons, some of whom have no service overseas in the late war?
4. If so, have any selections been made? If so, whom?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

IMMIGRATION—STAFF TRANSFER

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Were a certain number of officials of the Immigration department of New Brunswick or elsewhere, transferred, last spring, to the Immigration department at the Port of Quebec? If so, did they understand and speak the French language?
2. Is it the intention of the Immigration department to transfer said staff this year?
3. Were complaints made by French-speaking immigrants and citizens, that a great number of said staff could not speak or understand the French language?
4. What salary is paid to each of the said officials and employees for the immigration season?
5. How much is allowed to each for their expenses?
6. What salary is paid to citizens of Quebec, who occupy similar positions to the ones occupied by these strangers transferred to Quebec?
7. Can Mr. Joseph H. Byrne, caterer for the Immigration department at Quebec, by virtue of a certain clause in his contract recently agreed upon with the Immigration department, employ French Canadians who do not speak English fluently?
8. Can said Mr. Joseph H. Byrne, under his contract recently agreed upon with the Immigration department, offer for sale without special authorization, all the products made by manufacturers of the city of Quebec?

PUBLIC WORKS—CHIEF ARCHITECTS BRANCH

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What are the names, official titles, and salaries of officers-in-charge of Dominion Buildings, Chief Architect's Branch, Department of Public Works, on January 1st, 1912, 1922 and 1923?
2. In what cities or towns are located the offices of each?
3. What is the date of their appointment and how have they been classified?
4. What was the number of employees under each officer-in-charge on January 1st, 1912, 1922 and 1923?
5. What is the number of buildings each officer-in-charge had under his charge on January 1st 1912, 1922 and 1923?
6. Have all the positions of these officers-in-charge been classified by the Civil Service Commission or Arthur Young & Company?
7. Are there any positions of these officers in charge vacant?
8. If so, what are they and since what date are they vacant?
9. What are the causes of these vacancies?
10. In what locality have they occurred?

SHIPPING RATES—GRAIN

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other communications passing during the summer or fall of 1922 between the Dominion government or any of its ministers or representatives and the Dominion Marine Association or any of its agents or representatives, or of any other person or persons whatsoever, in any way relating to the abrogation or suspension of the Dominion Coastal Shipping Regulations, or in any way relating to the grain congestion at lake ports or Montreal, or to the alleged combine, or the imposition of exorbitant rates by shipping interests engaged in the grain trade.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John and Albert): May I ask why the government proposes to allow this resolution to be adopted, in view of its refusal to give me the same information regarding a portion of the question, in response to an inquiry I placed on the order paper? This distinctly calls for, among other things, the correspondence with Mr. W. T. R. Preston and his correspondence with the government. I do not object to the motion; it calls for information that I desired to get, and something in addition. But why is one policy followed in respect to some members and a different policy in respect to others?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Perhaps this motion had better stand until the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) is here. Speaking offhand, I am inclined to think that the answer to my hon. friend is this: At the time he asked for this information it would not have been expedient to make public some of the particulars that were desired, but the time has now arrived when it is really immaterial whether they are given to the public or not.

Mr. BAXTER: I may say that, in respect to the information I asked for, everything had been made public, as Mr. Preston's report,

in the columns of the Toronto Globe. The information, however, was refused this House.

Motion stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

SARDINE HERRING FISHERY

Mr. DUFF:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, memorandums, correspondence, reports of investigations, and other documents which have been received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since 1920 concerning the sardine herring fishery in New Brunswick, particularly any matter with reference to the sale and price of said fish.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—REAL ESTATE

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

For return showing all real estate properties, with the approximate location and area and brief description of each, sold or agreed to be sold by the Canadian National Railway Company or its subsidiaries since October 4th, 1922, and showing, secondly, all real estate properties purchased or agreed to be purchased or in respect of which an offer to purchase has been made by the Canadian National Railway Company or any of its subsidiaries since said date, and in each case showing the sale price or the purchase price, as the case may be, and the names of the purchasers and vendors.

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all correspondence, contracts, agreements, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the purchase of property on the north west corner of King and Yonge Streets, Toronto, by the government of Canada or the Canadian National Railways, for railway purposes.

SALE OF MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all papers, documents, sale specifications, terms and conditions of sale, agreements, official reports recommending sale, and all other correspondence relating to the sale of about 27 of the smaller ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine (Limited).

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Dairy Industry Act, 1914, and to provide regulations regarding butter substitute and the remanufacture of butter, the character and weight of butter, the keeping of records by manufacturers or dealers in butter and cheese, and the examination of such records by inspectors, methods of establishing the guilt of persons charged with the violation of the Act, and the procedure to be followed in all such cases.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution and has commended it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Baxter.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ASCENSION DAY—WEDNESDAY SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 9th instant, it stand adjourned until Friday, the 11th instant.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I suggest that this motion be amended to provide that we sit on Wednesday evenings. The Prime Minister stated the other day that in this respect he was in the hands of the House, and I think I voice the sentiment of the whole House when I ask that we sit on Wednesday evenings, if not from this Wednesday, at least from Wednesday week until the end of the session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did say that the government was prepared to be guided by the wish of the House in the matter. So far as I have been able to ascertain from the whips, it would appear that the members favour retaining Wednesday evening, and judging from the amount of applause that has greeted the suggestion of my hon. friend, I do not think the majority of the House are with him just at present. In any case, I imagine that a number of hon. members have made engagements for this Wednesday evening, therefore we had better let the motion stand as it is.

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Prime Minister able to tell us what further government legislation is to be introduced this session? I noticed that in answer to a question put by an hon. member asking whether the government had legislation for this session on, (a) the housing problem, and (b) old age pensions, the Prime Minister stated that no final answer could be given. I venture to suggest that the government has no legislation on either one; the accuracy of my prediction can be better judged later. But it would seem to me that if the government has legislation on such subjects as these, or on any subject, the House might now be informed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think my right hon. friend is correct in what he surmises about the legislation referred to, but I would not like to tie the hands of the government on any matter of legislation until the reports of all the committees have been

brought into the House. The government has brought down its important legislation. There may be further legislation arising out of the reports of committees that are at present sitting, also some railway legislation and possibly other legislation on minor matters. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has some legislation. I will endeavour to let my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) have a list at an early date.

PENSION REGULATIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the government, in view of the controversy which seems to be in progress between the Board of Pension Commissioners and the Great War Veterans' Association, whether the government proposes any action in the matter, and if so what action?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment): A similar question was asked a few days ago, and I informed the House that it was the intention of the government to introduce a bill during this session to carry out the recommendations of the royal commission contained in the interim report which has been laid on the Table of the House.

CANNED SALMON VIA PANAMA CANAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I desire to ask the government for an explanation respecting certain regulations of the Customs department. It appears that the Minister of Customs sent a telegram to the Gosse-Millerd Canning Company, of Vancouver, informing them that on shipments of canned salmon consigned via the Panama canal and New York to Halifax and other Canadian ports, a tariff would be imposed on the goods entering Canada. Other instances can be brought to the attention of the government, but this one is sufficient for my purpose. I wish to ask when and by whose authority such a regulation was established?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I happen to know that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) has this matter under consideration. He is not in the House at the moment, but as soon as he comes in I will direct his attention to my hon. friend's question and try to get a reply for him.

PRIVILEGE—MR. COOTE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): I rise to a question of privilege. It is reported in the Ottawa Citizen of last Saturday that I voted against an amendment by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). I wish to point out that that report is quite in error as I voted for the amendment.

OLEOMARGARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I wish to ask the government what is their intention with regard to bringing down an oleomargarine bill. Do they wish to renew the legislation?

Mr. MARTELL: Let it die.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall try to give my hon. friend an answer at an early date.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I might remind the Prime Minister that he told me not so long ago that the government would await the verdict on the resolution of the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll). Could he give us an idea of when he is going to have the House discuss that resolution?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall try to do so at an early date.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No policy.

Mr. LAPOINTE: At an early date.

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 54, to provide for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers.

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

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I was waiting for the Prime Minister to expound his bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I paused for a moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I paused for a moment too, but both of us were disappointed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have only to withdraw the word "Carried".

Mr. MEIGHEN: I merely want to say that I understand the Prime Minister had several amendments to propose. If so, it would ap-

pear to me that these amendments should be laid before the House and some time be given for their consideration, but if it is the desire of the government that the second reading be given now I wish to state that we want to reserve all rights of discussion in committee both as to principle and detail.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I would like to make the same statement on behalf of several members who have made the request that they have an opportunity of discussing this bill at a future date.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say in reply to my right hon. friend that I did not attempt any remarks on the second reading because I went rather fully into an explanation of the bill and its merits at the time of introducing the resolution. I also thought that possibly the time of the House would be saved if I waited before going on with the second reading to hear and reply to any criticisms which hon. members might have. I have purposely left the second reading over for a considerable period of time in order that all hon. members of the House might have an opportunity of studying the provisions of the bill carefully. I think it is almost two months since the bill was presented to the House, and in that period of time I have had the privilege of receiving a large number of communications and a large number of deputations in reference to the measure, and I think that both inside and outside of the House there is a pretty general understanding of its main provisions.

I would like to say, however, speaking broadly in reference to the criticisms that have been directed against the bill, that many of them are due to an entire misapprehension of what the government has in mind in the legislation which it has introduced. For example, I notice that many of the newspapers of the country have reported that the government is endeavouring by this legislation to legislate against combines as such, to legislate against the right of manufacturers or merchants to fix a resale price. There is nothing of the kind in the legislation. As a matter of fact, it proceeds from a diametrically opposite point of view. I explained that, I think, pretty fully at the time of introducing the bill. It proceeds broadly on the theory that in this age of commercial and industrial competition, not merely between industry and industry and locality and locality, between the industries of one province and those of another, but between the industries of one country and those of another, the industries one might almost say, of one continent and those of another, large combinations of capital, organizations of business in a large way, are an absolute essential if the business of our country is to hold its own in competition with the business of other countries. But just because it is recognized that it is necessary to have these large organizations of business, so the government recognizes that some restraint must be placed on the possible abuse of great power which may come into their hands. The legislation does not seek in any way to restrict just combinations or agreements between business and industrial houses and firms, but it does seek to protect the public against the possible ill effects of these combinations.

The definition of the word "combine" as related to the provisions of the Act has perhaps occasioned a number of persons that measure of alarm which some of them seem to have had who have not read the definition carefully, and who have thought that the definition goes much further than it does. If the House will look at the definition, and I will draw particular attention to the wording when we are in committee, hon. members will see that the kind of combination referred to is limited to a combination that operates or tends to operate, that has operated or is likely to operate to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, whether consumers, producers or others. No other class of combinations comes within the provisions of this act. If that point is quite clear, I think it will help to remove a good deal of the misconception that has arisen in reference to the legislation. For example, I notice in one press report it was stated that the act did not distinguish between good combines and bad combines. Well, that is the very distinction that is carefully made in the definition itself. Any combination, whether it is in the nature of a trust or merger or the result of some agreement, which is carrying on its business in a reasonable way, not operating to the detriment of the public or against the interest of the public, would not come under the important provisions of this legislation; once, however, it is shown that a combination is so operating as to prejudice the public interest, then that class of combination comes within the provisions of the act, first for purposes of investigation, and secondly, if need be, for purposes of prosecution under the criminal section which has been suggested.

My right hon. friend mentioned that he understood I had a number of amendments to move. I do not know where he got his information; I have one or two very slight amendments which I will mention to the House at the moment. One is to strike out

in the defining clause the words "in the opinion of the registrar or any commissioner" which appear before the words "have operated or are likely to operate to the detriment of or against the interest of the public." Those words were inserted with reference more particularly to the part of the act which deals with investigation, but when they are read in conjunction with the clause dealing with the new criminal offence which is created by the act, they acquire a significance they were not intended to have, and it is therefore my intention to move when we get into committee that those words be stricken out.

I might mention that some of the deputations that have waited on the government have pointed out that perhaps the act was too broad in permitting any individual to lay a complaint before the registrar, and it was suggested that possibly the language of the old Combines Investigation Act which required six persons to unite in presenting a request for an investigation would be a proper safeguard, and that those persons should be restricted, as they were in the old act, to British subjects. I think that is a perfectly proper amendment to have made in the act, and I shall move that also as an amendment when the House goes into committee.

There is one other slight amendment which is to strike out the words "or documents" that appear in section 18, line 42, of the act. The section as drafted makes it obligatory upon any person to give evidence before a registrar or commissioner and to produce documents. It goes on to state, however, that whoever gives testimony cannot be bound in a court of law by the oral testimony so given. The clause as it now reads goes beyond granting protection as respects oral testimony and includes documents. The effect of the bill as drafted would be that where any incriminatory documents might be disclosed in the case of an investigation, subsequently, when court proceedings were held, a combine might find its means of escape from the just penalty of its illegal actions, by having these documents protected. It is, therefore my purpose to meet such a possible situation by providing that the words "or documents" shall be deleted.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I explained, when introducing the measure in the House, the need for this particular legislation at this time. There is no legislation on the statutes of Canada to-day protecting the great body of consumers or producers against the possible ill-effects of combinations carrying their powers to too great an extreme in the way of monopolizing control of commodities, of unduly enhancing the prices of commodities or restricting their sale in a manner detrimental to the public. The legislation of 1910, the old Combines Investigation Act, was repealed by the legislation of 1919, the Combines and Fair Prices Act and the Board of Commerce Act. The Board of Commerce, as the House knows, did not function as it was expected to function. That legislation has ceased to be of any value, and it is proposed by this enactment to repeal what has become valueless. However, one of the effects of the legislation of 1919 was to make it impossible for section 498 of the Criminal Code to be operative except at the instance of the Board of Commerce. No prosecution could be commenced, under section 498 of the Criminal Code, against a combination in restraint of trade, except at the instance of the Board of Commerce, but as the Board of Commerce is no longer in existence at the present time, even such protection as the law afforded under the Criminal Code is not granted to consumers against the possible ill-effects of these combinations.

Recently there has been a decision given in Ontario, in the case of the Attorney General of the province vs the Wholesale Grocers, which, in the minds of some, would seem to raise a question as to the intra vires of the legislation which I have referred to as constituting a part of the Criminal Code. Anticipating that the matter might be referred to in discussion to-day, I asked the Department of Justice for an opinion and I may as well read at this moment the opinion I have received which will answer any questions on that particular point. Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, states:

> I have considered the judgments of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Ontario in the case of Attorney Genaral vs Canadian Wholesale Grocers, herewith, with relation to its effect as to section 498 of the Criminal Code, and I find that it does not conclude any question as to the authority of parliament to enact that section.
>
> The court was composed of the Chief Justice, Hodgins, Ferguson and Magee, JJ. The Chief Justice reluctantly considered that he was bound by the observations of Lord Haldane in the Board of Commerce case to hold that section 498 was ultra vires, as not relating to criminal law within the meaning of that section of the British North America Act, 1867. Hodgins and Ferguson, JJ. however, expressly refrained from expressing any opinion against the validity of section 498, although they agreed with the Chief Justice for other reasons that the appeal should be dismissed. Magee, J. concurred in the result without any observations or reasons, and so it stands that the invalidity of section 498 rests only upon the opinion of the Chief Justice.
>
> I do not think that it is at present necessary or advisable that our course of action should be in any wise modified by reason of the view which the Chief

Justice expressed. I do not think that the question is governed by Lord Haldane's observations, and when it arises for decision we will have an opportunity to make good our claim for legislative authority. Meantime I would proceed upon the assumption that the enactment is intra vires.

Mr. CARROLL: Has the question of the authority of parliament to pass this particular bill been placed before the Justice department?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. I may say to my hon. friend that this particular measure has been carefully reviewed by the Department of Justice and I am informed that in the opinion of the department it is intra vires.

In regard to this legislation—just by way of helping to make clear the main divisions of it—I may say that the measure falls broadly into two parts. The first part has to do with investigations and the necessary machinery for purposes of investigation. It is intended to provide that where there are grounds for believing that a combine is operating to the detriment of the public, or likely so to operate, any six persons who are British subjects—as it stands now, any individual—may apply to the registrar for an investigation. The registrar will be an officer appointed by the government whose duty it will be to see, in the first instance, whether the evidence that is submitted appears on the face of it to be sufficient to give reasonable grounds for believing that the combination that is alleged is of a character which in the public interest should be investigated. If the registrar comes to the conclusion that the combination is of that character, then he may continue an investigation or may recommend —or the government of its own initiative may appoint—a commissioner, with the powers which are given to commissioners under the Inquiries Act, to make a full investigation, to satisfy himself, or the commissioners to satisfy themselves, as to whether or not the operation of the alleged combine is against the interest of the public. Judging from past experience it would appear that it is on the whole better that these preliminary investigations should be held in private rather than in public. The purpose of the legislation is not to subject industry and commerce to all kinds of inquisitorial proceedings which may have a baneful or harmful effect, but rather to do as little in the way of interfering with legitimate business and business methods as possible. The bill accordingly provides that so far as this investigation by the commissioners is concerned it shall be held in private, leaving it, however, to the discretion of the minister—having regard to certain contingencies that might arise that theretofore are unforeseen—to say whether any part of the investigation should be public, or whether the report of the investigation should be made public. Up to that point there is nothing in the nature of any criminal proceedings against the combination. However, upon report of a commissioner authority is given to the government to remit or to reduce duties so as to permit of a wider measure of competition, should it appear that the effect of the combination is to take undue advantage of some clause in the tariff. If it be an unfair advantage of some patent right that is taken, the government, through the Minister of Justice, may proceed for a revocation of the patent right.

Possibly I can best explain what is fundamental in the measure by saying, that in regard to combinations operating to the detriment of the public the belief of the government is that there are certain classes of evils which publicity will do more to remedy than even penalty. In regard to combinations that are actually operating to the detriment of the public, the great difficulty has always been to ascertain just the nature and full extent of their operations. Once that is ascertained, if they are operating to the detriment of the public, and the fact is known, it is natural to expect that the public will speedily find some means to protect itself. Another principle that I think will help to illustrate what is fundamental in this legislation is summed up in the words that private rights cease when they become public wrongs. In other words, the bill does not in any way seek to restrain private individuals in the making of any contracts or agreements, tacit or implied or open, which they may wish to make, so long as in the exercise of their private rights they do not carry matters to a point where their joint action becomes a public wrong in the form of a combination operating to the detriment of the public.

I think these few preliminary remarks will serve sufficiently for an introduction of a consideration in committee of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Before going into committee I would like to present a case to the minister and ask him if it would come under the combine's bill which we have now before us. The newspapers have recently informed us that there is a daily newspaper combine in Canada. We have been told that an effort was made to establish a new daily paper in the city of Ottawa. If our information is correct, it was a newspaper that was proposed to dis-

seminate the doctrines of the Liberal party. But the executive of the daily newspapers association voted almost unanimously that the necessary service to carry on such a paper should be denied the man who wanted to establish a newspaper in Ottawa. To help the Prime Minister to a conclusion, if it is an improper thing for a man taking any manufactured article and fix the price, or to enter into a combine with others in the same line of manufacture in disposing of his goods to the public, is it not a much more serious matter when public opinion is stifled, and the opportunity to present to the public of this country, or this city or any city, a particular aspect of the affairs of the country, is refused, and that the men who have the money and are willing to put it up for this purpose shall be denied the privilege of doing it. I cannot conceive, Mr. Speaker, of any more dangerous form of combine than a newspaper combine. If you carry this out, the same organization of a dozen men, forming the executive of the daily newspaper association, can determine just where a newspaper shall be printed, and where one shall not be printed. If a company should be organized to establish a new evening paper, say in the city of Toronto, that company would have to go to the men who form the executive of the daily newspaper associations of Canada and ask their permission.

An Hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. HOCKEN: Not to ask their permission to put in a plant and print some kind of newspaper, but to ask their permission to get the service absolutely essential to the production of a newspaper that will sell. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, this government subsidizes, to the extent of $50,000 a year a telegraphic service for the use of the daily newspapers; and the group of men who happen for the time to form this association have it in their hands to prevent a man here or there or anywhere from enlightening the public as he thinks the public ought to be enlightened. Will the Prime Minister tell us in view of what he has said, whether this bill will apply to such a case? Because he has said that this bill is designed to control these men and prevent an abuse of the great power that might come into their hands. A very great power rests in the hands of daily newspaper editors and proprietors; practically everybody in Canada reads the newspapers nowadays, and there is no class or group of men in Canada who exercise more power than the men who are conducting the daily newspapers of the country.

Mr. PARENT: And also the weekly papers?

Mr. HOCKEN: Also the weekly papers, but the weekly comes out once a week, the daily six times a week. The one will have a circulation of 20,000 or 30,000 and the other 150,000. I do not renege on my statement that the men who exercise the greatest power in the public interest in Canada are the men who control the great newspapers. And unless there is opportunity given to those who think they have a message—it may be a political or it may be a social message—to publish that message for the benefit of the public, and if they are not allowed to give that message to the public on account of restrictions imposed by their competitors, I think it may be safely said that these competitors are prejudicing the public interest, to use the words of the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister further said that there were many classes of offences, combines, perhaps, where publicity would do more to effect a remedy than would a penalty. I entirely agree with that statement. I think publicity is one of the greatest penalties that some men can suffer for their misdeeds. If you have all the newspapers in the hands of a few, so that all kinds of abuses might exist and not have any publicity, then the public interest is surely most seriously prejudiced. If the Prime Minister feels so disposed, will he answer the question as to whether he would not consider a daily newspaper combine as one that would come within this act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the right hon. Prime Minister answers the question, I would remind the House that we are not yet at the committee stage, and therefore if the right hon. member speaks now it closes the debate, according to rule 21, unless by leave of the House the minister replies to the pertinent question put by the hon. member.

Mr. STEVENS: I desire to speak on the second reading, but the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) desires to ask the Prime Minister this question before he takes his seat, if it may be put in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the right hon. premier would prefer to answer all these questions when he exercises his right of reply, under rule 21 of the rules of debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite prepared to answer the question now, if it is the wish of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the wish of the House the Prime Minister may answer the question, but it is against rule 21.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the question asked by the hon. member illustrates perhaps as well as anything could, the merits of the proceedings we are proposing to establish by this legislation in dealing with the kind of case he has cited. My hon. friend says that if you have all the newspapers in the hands of a few, you have one of the worst combines conceivable. I agree absolutely with that. I think there could be no more fatal combination, so far as the public is concerned, than that all the news of the country should be controlled by a few men, in such a way as to make it impossible for any others to enter the field of news competition. However, in regard to the case just cited,—the application which has been made by the Liberal party for a paper in this city,—the contention on the part of those who refused to give the right to permit a new paper to acquire certain news is that they think the public interest is being best served by the papers that are here at the present time. They contend that there is not a monopoly. They contend that another newspaper can come in and start to-morrow on its own account, if the parties wish. However, they have among themselves, as I understand it, an agreement as respects the sale of a certain class of news that is acquired, by cable or telegram. It is that particular class of news which they refuse to give to any other paper. Whether that refusal amounts to a monopoly of a character which is injurious to the public, is something that, I think, can be determined only as a result of an investigation. This legislation provides that where there is prima facie ground for believing that a combine exists which is operating in a manner detrimental to the public, then any six persons may apply to a registrar for an investigation. Taking the case in point, I would assume that any registrar appointed under this legislation would feel, it if were possible to cite evidence of the character to which my hon. friend has made reference, that he should immediately investigate and see how far that monopoly, or alleged monopoly, extended in its operation, whether it went the length of shutting out other papers from this city, or whether its effort was merely to deny to a paper coming into a field a certain class of news which it either could or could not acquire in some other way. If there were reasonable grounds for believing that the public was being injured as a consequence of this monopoly, an investigation would then be made by a commissioner. The commissioner would take all the evidence under oath; he would then give a statement to the public, and the public would be in a position to judge whether or not the combination was of that serious character which some might be inclined to believe it to be. I doubt if anyone could pronounce upon the merits of the particular case without having all the facts of the case before him. That is why this legislation proceeds in two stages: The first setting forth the means of getting the fullest information and giving publicity to that information; the second stage providing a remedy whereby, if need be by way of criminal prosecution, any action of the combination which is against the public interest may be effectively put a stop to.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I quite realise that appearing as an apologist in any sense for anything that might be called a combine lays one open to attack and possible misinterpretation of one's position. During the past twenty years there has been a steady growth in the intense organization of business, in the formation of what is commonly known as combines, in the bringing of businesses of a similar character under the control of a smaller executive head, thus lowering costs of operation, increasing efficiency and, in many cases, stabilizing both production and prices. This tendency has been met on the part of the public in different ways; but there has been, with certain sections of the public, a growing resentment—shall I say?—against what is commonly known as a combine, without, perhaps, any careful defining of what a combine is. I notice that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), in introducing this legislation, both on a former occasion and to-day, stressed particularly that the object of the legislation and the objective, I might say, that he had in mind was to interfere, not with what might be termed legitimate combines, but only with such as were likely to operate detrimentally to the public interest. Further I noticed that he said that at the present time there was no legislation by which the government could properly deal with circumstances arising out of, perhaps, an abuse of privilege or power on the part of large combinations of business. It is from that angle that I desire to examine this legislation. I may say that I took advantage of the advice the Prime Minister gave, when he introduced this legislation, to give it careful study, and as a layman I rather hesitate to enter into what might appear to be somewhat of a legal argument, because I claim no right or no particular ability to do so. I have examined it as

4 p.m.

a layman, I might say as an accountant, because that is my profession. I have examined it with care and with, perhaps, some right to pass an opinion after careful study. I want to examine it before the House as it appeals to me, with reasonable brevity and at the same time with a desire to impress upon the House in particular one or two points which, in my estimation, characterise this legislation, and warrant me at least in opposing it.

The crux of the whole bill is to be found in the interpretation clause, clause 2—in the description or interpretation there set forth of what a combine is in the eyes of this legislation. I intend, by the way, to divide this into three or four heads and to deal with them very briefly as I proceed. I want first to make as clear a presentation of the facts as I can, and later on I purpose arguing the points. In the first place, clause 2 defines a combine as being one of such business organizations as

—have operated or are likely to operate to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, whether consumers, producers or others.

I ask the House to bear that word "others" in mind, and let us examine it briefly. Who are "others"? Let us assume that a group of businesses find it desirable to combine, think it is in their interest and in the interest of their business that they should combine. They do so. Some of them may not enter the combine. It easily may, and very often does, result that the combined businesses operate at a lower cost, give better service, are more efficient and stabilized, and because of that they undersell the so-called independent firms or firms that stand out. These are "others" who are injured by the combination, although the public may be distinctly benefited. In this I am not drawing a bow at venture, but I am describing what has happened time and again during the past twenty-five years. Under this legislation as it now stands, such a combine, such a combination, is declared to be an offensive institution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but he has used words which indicate that the class of combination referred to would not come under the legislation at all. If what he says is true, namely, that a certain combination would really operate to the benefit of the public, that would put it out of the class referred to in the definition.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not wish to be impertinent to the Prime Minister; but if he will wait a moment, I purpose showing that that is precisely what the legislation does not say. As regards this particular portion of the definition, I submit that two words in it prevent the very object to which the Prime Minister refers. For instance, the registrar must interpret this. If a combination operates to the detriment of consumers, producers or others—and "others" is not defined in any limited sense—then under this bill it is a combination that is detrimental to the public. And furthermore, the word "likely" introduced there gives a very wide scope for interpretation solely by the registrar; that is, the registrar is the sole judge whether or not this combination is likely at some future time to be detrimental to the public interest.

But that is not all upon which I rest my argument. I take the next portion of the interpretation clause. It further describes "combine" to include:

—the relation resulting from purchase, lease or acquisition by any person of any control over or interest in the whole or part of the business of any other person.

How is that clause likely to operate? Supposing we have a group of, say, A. B. C and D. If A acquires a portion or the whole of the business of B and as a result of that combination C and D suffer, then under this bill the registrar must find that this is a combination to the detriment of consumers, producers "or others," as is set forth earlier in this clause.

Then it also deals with any agreement, etc., "designed to fix a common price of re-sale." This is a very vital point. This covers any agreement or undertaking between a manufacturer and a sales agency whereby the price of resale is fixed. Under this proposed legislation such an institution would be declared by the registrar to be detrimental to the public interest. Let us look at this for a moment. We know, at least I am pretty fully persuaded of it myself, that many manufacturers of this and other countries, enjoying the highest possible standing with the public, fix the price of their goods. The price is printed on the label or stamped upon the article itself, and the article is sold from one end of the country to the other by all dealers at that fixed price. The result is to stabilize its distribution and to maintain a price at a reasonable figure to prevent the avaricious retailer or agency taking advantage of a shortage at any particular time and exacting a higher price for it. I was shown the other day a statement by the Ford Motor Company which very carefully and fully illustrates this. They point out that they have all along fixed the price of their cars and parts to all their

sales agencies, and these agencies not only sell the article at this fixed price but give certain services in addition. I think everybody here who drives a Ford car knows what splendid service the Ford agencies render. I do not drive a Ford car so I have not had the advantage of this thorough service. These agencies sell on a commission of 20 per cent. This may seem high, but it is pointed out that it includes service. The net result of it all has been that during the last few years the Ford car has actually dropped in price until to-day it is selling for about $100 less than in 1914. That is merely one illustration; there are scores one might give of how the fixing of the resale price by a manufacturer usually, and I might say generally, is in the interest of the public; and yet under this proposed legislation this practice would be demed a combine detrimental to the interests of the public.

Then—and this is of particular interest not only to manufacturers but to others—this clause describes a combine as one which enters into an agreement for

> —lessening competition in, or substantially controlling manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, storage, transportation, insurance or supply.

I can bring forward several illustrations of what may happen under such a provision. I shall give these briefly because the moment I mention them the facts will be present in the minds of my hon. friends. Take, for instance, dairies. In Ottawa there is the Ottawa Dairy. I think they have some competition now, but for many years they were without any competition, and yet I recall that at the time the cost of living investigation was held by a parliamentary committee in 1919 it was shown beyond all peradventure that the Ottawa Dairy, while a distinct monopoly under this clause, did operate in the interest of the public. My right hon. friend will answer all this I know by saying, "Then it does not come under this measure." But the registrar is forced to so interpret under this clause. The clause to which I am now referring is an undertaking or an agreement or a contract substantially controlling competition and the purchase, sale, etc., of an article. In the city of Vancouver there is another illustration of what might happen under this measure, for if it were in force the Producers' Dairy would be challenged. This company, organized and owned by the producers of milk in the Fraser valley, in other words, by the dairy farmers, supplies milk to the public at a moderate price; yet they were challenged by the independent dealers. Under this bill that dairy company could be effectively challenged, and in my estimation the registrar would be bound to declare it to be a combination detrimental to the interests of the public, or to the "producers, consumers or others." Then we have the formation of a wheat pool, which would be for the purpose of eliminating competition—in the wording here, for the purpose of "controlling the purchase, barter, sale, storage, transportation." After listening, as we have, for several years to the disclosures of the difficulties and extra costs now imposed by the present system, no one will question that if another system could be worked out it would be in the interests of the public; and yet if it were done it would, as I have said, come under this clause, and the registrar, if he were appealed to, would have to declare it to be detrimental to the public interest. Then again take the Fruit Union of the Okanagan. There, perhaps, you have a more striking illustration than anywhere else of an organization deliberately formed for the purpose of controlling the price and distribution of their products; and yet, under this clause, it would be a combine. I merely give these illustrations to bring home to the House the significance of this interpretation clause.

Now I turn to what is my chief criticism of the bill, that in effect it declares to be a crime that which is, without question, ordinary, sound business sense. I have already intimated that, during the past twenty-five years in particular, there has been a growing tendency for business to get together to eliminate useless competition. By that I mean vicious competition—not competition in service, but competition which simply seeks to slay a competitor. There has been an endeavour to eliminate useless competition and to build up associations of kindred businesses, thus reducing overhead and executive charges, improving the efficiency of distribution and stabilizing both prices and production. Without such combinations there is a tendency to over-production during periods of prosperity, with recurring periods of depression and under-production. This is one of the greatest problems facing economists to-day. It is cropping up everywhere. It has cropped up in the Agricultural Conditions committee in the Banking and Commerce committee. In the consideration of any of the great problems of the day this question is the most perplexing one that arises. Yet through the medium of many of the large combinations of business in this country that evil has been, I will not say elminated, but reduced, and the stabilization of both production and

distribution has been secured. Now, why should we seek to erect that into a crime?—for that is what parliament, in effect, does, and it is the feature of the bill above all others that I object to. I believe, Sir, that this bill is raised upon false premises. Any given action is not a crime simply because parliament may choose so to describe it; it must in itself be a criminal act. The judgment to which the right hon. Prime Minister has referred is filled with extracts from decisions of the Privy Council and of eminent jurists throughout the Empire, not only in the case of the Board of Commerce, not only in the case of the Wholesale Grocers of Ontario, bnt in the case of Austrialia vs. the Adelaide Steamship Company and many others. It is set forth most clearly that merely to declare, through the Criminal Code, a thing to be a crime does not necessarily make it a crime—and that is what I particularly wish to emphasize to-day. The act of combination is not an offence. The act of combination and the most rigid advantage taken of it is not an offence. But if a group of business men or others—and this applies or ought to apply to all classes alike—deliberately conspire to injure competitors; if the object of the getting together is to effect injury to others, then you have an offence, then you have a crime. On the other hand, where the combination or the getting together is purely to promote the interests, if you like, of those combining, there is no crime and there should not be said to be a crime; because, as I have stated, and as I intend to insist, the country at large usually benefits from such combinations.

Reference has been made to section 498 of the Criminal Code, and I want to deal with that aspect of the question for a moment, because I regard it as very interesting and very important. It is true that Chief Justice Meredith does in his decision question section 498 of the Criminal Code is intra vires of parliament. I am not as able to discuss or elucidate the point as others here who have legal training, but I hope that what I say will lead them to a closer examination of the whole question. In that decision and in the decisions of the Privy Council it is emphasized that section 498 of the Criminal Code was inserted to give this parliament jurisdiction. Let me put it a little differently. Parliament has jurisdiction over criminal matters, but not over property and civil rights, the latter belonging to the provinces. Parliament declares, through the criminal code and in words very similar to the interpretation that I have read, that "it is an indictable offence" and so on, against those who "conspire, combine, agree or arrange with other persons," and so on, "to unduly limit transportation facilities" and so forth—similar language to that contained in this bill. It is the erecting of the combination into a crime that the Privy Council and Chief Justice Meredith object to. They do not say that the conspiracy should not be legislated against in the criminal code. Let parliament make such provision in the criminal code that it can deal with deliberate conspiracies for the restraint of trade, and so forth; let them make it perfectly clear that it is the conspiracy they are after—then I think parliament will have rendered good service to the public. I submit to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), as I would to the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) if he were in his seat, that careful examination of this bill will show that its adoption would place the government in virtually the same position that the Board of Commerce Act, that section 498 of the Criminal Code, is in to-day—without relieving, without changing or improving the condition throughout the country.

Then, the bill is inquisitorial in its character. It gives very wide powers to registrars. The Prime Minister has pointed out that under the provisions of the bill certain investigations will be held by one nominated as a registrar. This is a preliminary investigation to enable the registrar to declare whether or not the combination complained of is a combine under the terms of this act. He carries on his inquisition or his inquiry secretly; in other words, it is a star chamber proceeding. I appeal again to the good sense of this House; if there is one thing more than another that is necessary to subdue unreasonable combinations, it is publicity, not secrecy. In the second place, I submit that any bona fide business that has not been carried on with any intent to injure others should not be subjected to a secret or any other kind of inquiry. The only business that should be interfered with, harassed, inquired into, is a business that has committed some offence, a combination that is wrong. My right hon. friend pointed out, laying some emphasis upon it—and he made the same statement before a very large body of citizens who waited upon him a few weeks ago—that unless a combination had done wrong they need fear nothing under this act. But he is asking parliament to give to the registrar powers beyond those of the courts of this land; he is enabling the registrar to inquire secretly into any business or any concern complained of. Why, there would be no difficulty at any time, anywhere, day or night, summer or winter, to

get six citizens of Canada to complain against some institution. I do not say ignorant people, but uninformed people, are very prone to complain of businesses or institutions wherever they may be. Six uninformed, irresponsible individuals may ask for an investigation. The registrar proceeds to investigate. He calls for all documents, contracts, books and so forth of the company. He can step into the office, examine into prices, obtain any information he demands. All that he asks for must be produced; the concern which is the subject of inquiry has no recourse but to give up everything that is demanded pertaining to the secrets of its business. I submit that one rival desiring to get information regarding another rival's business, perhaps more successful than his own, perhaps underselling him on the market, would find it the simplest thing in the world to get that information through such an institution as this.

Mr. CARROLL: That is where private investigation comes in.

Mr. STEVENS: Not only is the registrar or prosecutor not sworn to secrecy, but the minister or the registrar or the commissioner —it is so set forth in the bill—may disclose any part or all of the findings. I want my hon. friend to note that. I object to this private investigation, I am absolutely opposed to it. The registrar or a commissioner has the absolute right to determine the portion or the whole of the investigation to be disclosed, and to whom it can be disclosed. If one person desires to obtain the secrets of his competitor and stands in well with the commissioner, if he has pull—shall we say?—with the registrar or the minister, he can get a copy of the results of the investigation and no one need be the wiser. I submit that no such power, no such privilege, should be given to any one, two or three persons.

Let me turn to another phase of the bill. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has said, and I expected him to say it, that under this bill he is taking certain powers; in clause 23 and clause 24, I think it is. Those powers are as follows: If a combination or a concern seems to be taking advantage of the tariff to unduly enhance prices, under this bill the Prime Minister says, the Governor in Council may for the time being place such an article on the free list. He has all that power now, and I wish the House would follow me in this particular. Not only in regard to this, but as I have already pointed out in the Criminal Code we have almost the identical power set forth in this bill, with but slight amendments to make them conform to the judgment of the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of Ontario. Under the Inquiries Act we can make the inquiries where it is considered to be in the interests of Canada and of law and order to do so. But in the Customs Tariff, section 12, I find a clause that is almost identical with the one inserted in this bill. Let me read it so that parliament may be seized of the powers already invested in the government. Section 12 of the Customs Tariff reads as follows, beginning at subsection 2:

> 2. Whenever the Governor in Council deems it to be in the public interest to inquire into any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement alleged to exist among manufacturers or dealers in any article of commerce to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers in such article at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court or county court in Canada, to hold an inquiry in a summary way and report to the Governor in Council whether such conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement exists.
>
> 3. The judge may compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them under oath and require the production of books and papers, and shall have such other necessary powers as are conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purpose of such inquiry.
>
> 4. If the judge reports that such conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement exists in repect of such article, the Governor in Council may admit the article free of duty, or so reduce the duty thereon as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in the article, if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article.

There is absolute power to deal with this matter—no need whatever of this legislation. Furthermore, I will say this to the Prime Minister: If this legislation were to pass and it were found desirable to admit some article free, unquestionably his Minister of Justice would invoke section 12 of the Customs Tariff and not the clause in this bill.

I would point out another difference. In this bill before us it is proposed to entrust all this very, very wide power to whom? To a registrar or a commissioner. In the customs tariff it provides that the government may empower a judge of the various courts—an infinitely fairer, an infinitely better method of deciding an important point of that kind—and at the same time it preserves the rights of the person so inquired into.

The next point referred to by the Prime Minister was the revocation of a patent if it was found that by the use of that patent an abuse existed. I would again bring to his attention that during this session we have passed a Patent Act, and in that act at great length and in detail we provided against all of that. It is there. So parliament ought to

be seized of this: In the Criminal Code, in the Inquiries Act, in the Customs Tariff Act, and in the Patent Act all of the powers asked for in this bill are now fixed, and fixed in the proper place, fixed in a manner that protects and will protect the interests of the public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to sum up very briefly what I have said, not to weary the House with further detail. I oppose the bill: First, because a combine is usually prompted by efforts for efficiency and economy, and generally results in better service, the stabilizing of prices and the uniformity of supply. Second, because for persons or corporations to combine for mutual benefit is not in itself a crime nor should it be so declared either by inference or specifically. Third, the crime of conspiring, to injure other persons or to interfere with trade should be dealt with under the criminal code, and if the code as it is now drafted is not exactly fitting to the case sections 496 and 498 should be amended so as to fit.

My further objection is that the bill is inquisitorial. It will, if enforced, harass business without serving any useful purpose, and if ever there was a time when business should be free from interference and from that type of inquiry that simply disturbs and harasses it, that time is now. I venture to say that business of all kinds throughout the length and breadth of this country is struggling under the burden of taxation, under the burden of laws that really are going back, as it were, to the Middle Ages, and this would only be an added burden to the carrying on of business.

All that is sought for in this bill is much better provided for in the Criminal Code, the Inquiries Act, the Patent Act and the Customs Act. These acts with slight amendments constitute the proper medium of treatment and provide all the needed machinery, so that this bill merely duplicates powers, confuses jurisdiction, and multiplies public cost without adding one whit to the public protection.

Lastly, assuming the object of the bill to be the exposure of criminal interference with trade, profiteering and the conservation of the public rights, I submit, Sir, that no such end will be attained under this bill. On the contrary it impedes and harasses legitimate business development, it will victimize the innocent, and at the same time it opens innumerable avenues of escape for the guilty. In that regard I again remind the House that similar legislation to this has been repeatedly declared ultra vires of this parliament by the Privy Council and is called in question by this important judgment of Chief Justice Meredith. Therefore, why should we invite further litigation to determine this point when we can escape all that by, as I have already mentioned, insisting upon the real offence, namely, the conspiracy feature, and dealing with it under the Criminal Code.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I believe this legislation is intra vires of this parliament and that no better legislation has been introduced here for half a century. The present bill is primarily and mainly, I think, for the protection of the consumers of Canada and it is from that aspect that I am going to discuss the subject. Various efforts have been made in the past to bring within reach of the law, persons who combine to enhance the prices of the necessities of life, but I do not think any of that legislation has been effective. In the past, in enacting laws against combines and monopolies, parliament did not take power to see that the law was enforced, and that persons who violated its provisions were penalized. The buck was passed to the legislatures and to the attorney generals of the provinces, and the Dominion statute contained no provision for making the law effective. In 1919 there was an attempt to legislate on this matter, but it was not of a nature at all akin to the present measure, and I believe our courts have declared that certain parts of that statute are ultra vires of this parliament. The Prime Minister this afternoon, in answer to my question, gave us the assurance that in the opinion of the Department of Justice the present bill was intra vires of this parliament; I am going to take it for granted that such is the case until the highest tribunal in the land has declared to the contrary.

I am in perfect accord with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) when he states that all combines are not bad, and that combinations of business interests in this country have done a great deal to benefit not only the producers and the consumers but the nation as a whole. Combinations of capital have done much to lessen the cost of certain articles which are among the necessaries of life in Canada, and to that extent the combination of capital is a splendid thing. But when capital combines to enhance the price of the necessaries of life, when it combines to take the last cent out of the consumers of Canada, then I say that such a combination should be declared a crime by this parliament, and I want to congratulate the government on bringing down legislation with that object in view. My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) I think, is somewhat astray in con-

cluding that all combines would be declared criminal under this bill. It has no such intention. The interpretation clause says—

Mr. STEVENS: I did not say that they would all be declared criminal. I said that in view of the interpretation clause the registrars would be forced to declare them combines, which is all that the bill does. The bill does not deal with the criminal feature of it at all.

Mr. CARROLL: But the registrar would not be forced to declare these associations as combines.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: At any rate, he would not be forced to investigate a concern which is not a combine within the meaning of the bill. As a preliminary the registrar will take means to assure himself that the concern is not such a combine as the bill has in view. For example, if six persons go to the registrar with a complaint, he may demand of the business firm or company concerned the right to look over its books in private. That is a proviso with which I am strictly in accord. The manager of the firm shows his books to the registrar, and I am presuming that neither this government, nor any other government which may be in power in Canada, will appoint registrars who are not honest and honourable. Now, the registrar will go to the managers of this business firm and ask them, in a quiet manner, to produce their books. Then I feel assured that if it is not a combine, such as this bill intends chasing and hounding to death—and I hope that course will be pursued—the managers will be very glad to produce their books when the registrar in the course of a few hours can inform himself whether the concern is such a combine as comes within the four corners of the proposed statute. This procedure ought to cover the objection taken by my hon. friend. But the hon. member can refer to the interpretation clause and what will he find? He will find this:

> (a) The expression "combine" in this act shall be deemed to have reference to such combines immediately hereinafter defined as in the opinion of the registrar or any commissioner have operated or are likely to operate to the detriment of or against the interest of the public—

And so on. The whole of these provisions must be read together. It is not necessary to show, for example, that there is a merger or a monopoly in order to bring that concern within the provisions of the act; that merger or combine or monopoly must be operating to the detriment of the public. My hon. friend has fallen down in his argument by ignoring that provision of the legislation.

Mr. BAXTER: What public?

Mr. CARROLL: I need not tell my hon. friend for St. John and Albert that "public" is a very well-defined expression. Further down in the clause there is included in the definition the limiting of facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any commodity. But they must be doing this and operating against the public weal in doing it. In all these cases you must go back to section (a) of the act before coming to a conclusion that a trust, a monopoly, or a combine, or a transportation business, is a combine within the act, which this bill declares a combine.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member should in his argument, in all fairness, read the words "whether consumer, producer or others" which qualifies this provision.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member is getting away from the argument I am presenting. However I will come to the question the hon. member has asked. I do not know exactly what significance that word "others" has. I will be quite frank with the hon. member, because I think in this country we are either consumers or producers, and as a matter of fact we are all consumers.

Mr. BAXTER: Is an insurance company a consumer or producer?

Mr. CARROLL: The people making up the company are consumers.

Mr. BAXTER: But the company?

Mr. CARROLL: The company may be a consumer.

Mr. BAXTER: Take a transportation company.

Mr. CARROLL: The members of a corporation may be both consumers and producers. The general manager of a company who could be prosecuted under this act is a consumer or producer. However, that may be exactly the class of institution which the word "others" covers.

Mr. BAXTER: Is a banker a producer or a consumer?

Mr. CARROLL: If the hon. member has any questions to ask, I will sit down. I do not like to see him in his seat mumbling questions which I cannot understand. Usually when an hon. member has anything to say he rises.

Mr. BAXTER: I will apologize to my hon. friend for asking questions which he cannot understand.

Mr. CARROLL: That is very clever, no doubt. That is one of the cleverest things I have heard from the hon. member in his whole career in this parliament, and I have heard him say a good many things. Now the word "others" may have reference to the class of trade to which my hon. friend for St. John referred. But suppose it means, what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) says, other concerns in the same business. My hon. friend for Vancouver Centre has seriously argued that, if there were a small concern in Hamiltion, engaged, say, in the manufacture of ploughs, it was right, just and equitable that another large concern in that city should combine, or should try by any underhand means or method, to put that small concern out of business? Does my hon. friend think that would be a fair measure of justice to give to the small manufacturer in this country?

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member is stating my own argument. I argued that if, by conspiracy or underhand means, such a thing as that were done it should be punished under the Criminal Code, but if it were done by competition, as it might be done under this act, there would be no crime.

Mr. CARROLL: No crime?

Mr. STEVENS: No offence.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member must know that this parliament is absolutely supreme in making crime. They can make almost any action of man a crime if they so desire.

Now my hon. friend talks about the privacies of the investigation by the registrar, and says those privacies are wrong. In another instance he calls them star chamber methods of doing business. I want to say to my hon. friend that I believe after the registrar has gone to the institution and made a personal investigation of the documents and so on, any further investigation should be of a public character. That far I agree with the hon. member. I am in hopes that the registrars will be men of such calibre that, having made a personal investigation on the premises, as they are allowed to do by this bill, and finding no evidence which will make the concern investigated a criminal under the act, there will be no further inquiry. I believe that all further investigations should be of an absolutely public nature and that the public should have access to them. My hon. friend for Vancouver Centre says that he has read the bill. He is a serious student when he takes up any question and his studies are serious, as everyone in the House knows, but I think he is mistaken or misled when he attempts to show the House that the registrar is all-powerful in so far as the whole situation is concerned. What are the facts? The registrar investigates. There may be counsel for the government and counsel for the combine which is being investigated. The evidence is taken, and the court has all the functions and powers of a court excepting that it does not pass sentence. My hon. friend and the House must not forget the fact that the registrar has no authority to come to a conclusion. He passes the matter on to the minister, and the minister decides if there is sufficient evidence to have the person, firm or corporation indicted under the Criminal Code. If the minister thinks there is sufficient evidence, he so advises the attorney general of the province, and the attorney general, while there can be no pressure brought to bear upon him to draw an indictment or lay information, may bring an indictment before the court, and the person, if person it be, or corporation, if corporation it be, accused of the crime, has the same rights before that criminal court as any other citizen of Canada. The accused may go before a jury or may elect to have a speedy trial befor the county or district court judge. If the attorney general does not see fit to proceed with the investigation, charge or trial, the solicitor general, within six months, may, off his own bat, proceed to bring home to those people their crime.

I do not think my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre wished to mislead the House, but I want to show that this registrar has nothing in the world to do, except to make a fair investigation, to pass the papers, so to speak, to the minister who has charge of the matter, and if the minister is of opinion there is something to investigate he passes the case on to the attorney general. If the attorney general does not act, the solicitor general may proceed with the case and lay a charge. My hon. friend says that all the cures for the present situation in Canada are to be found within two or three statutes and he mentions them. He mentions section 12 of the Tariff Act, he mentioned the Patent Act and the Criminal Code. If my hon. friend will read section 497—

Mr. STEVENS: 496 and 498.

Mr. CARROLL: —he will find an altogether different state of affairs from that which

appears in this particular section. For example, take first the procedure. There is nothing in the Criminal Code which makes it incumbent upon this parliament or this government or any future government to prosecute offences under that act. The whole thing is left in the hands of the attorney general of the province. Under this bill we have the machinery which will surely ensure at some time, even though it be late, an investigation into a combine or conspiracy in restraint of trade. When we talk about conspiracy in restraint of trade, do hon. members in this House believe it is restraint of trade for example, if several wholesale dealers get together with the retailers in the various places where they are selling their goods, and say "Here we have a corner on something. We have a corner. in this particular vicinity, in potatoes, any kind of vegetables, any necessity of life. We are, it is true, getting a big profit now, but we are going to extract 10 per cent more from the pockets of the consumers." Is that a restraint of trade? I say, it is not a restraint of trade, and those sections of the code do not touch dealers who may act in that way. That is one of the things that the consumers of this country are concerned with, namely, that there is a conspiracy, if you will, but not a conspiracy in restraint of trade—you cannot call it that—between the wholesalers and retailers of this country to maintain prices.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. membeer think such an act would be permitted under paragraph (c) of section 498 of the code?

Mr. CARROLL: I doubt if it could be reached by that section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it could not, it certainly could not under this legislation.

Mr. CARROLL: That is an opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no doubt about it.

Mr. CARROLL: I doubt very much if it could. It is, however, to the procedure that I am referring in the present instance. There is no doubt in the world to-day that there must be conspiracies to keep up prices of certain commodities in this country. There is no doubt that such conspiracies have existed in the past, and if this legislation is properly enforced, it will be a very great blessing to the great mass of the consumers of this country—and we are all consumers.

My hon. friend speaks about the remedies that are supplied in this legislation, having an existence already, for example, under the Patent Act. I do not know that we can have in this country too many remedies against a man who, having secured a patent, misuses it to the detriment of the public. While I have not had time to go into the clause of the Patent Act dealing with this, I would say, notwithstanding that fact, that it is necessary to have this particular item incorporated also in this legislation, enforced as it will be by the government of Canada.

My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) speaks of the powers of the Tariff Act. I did not even have time to read section 12, I think it is, of the Tariff Act but if my hon. friend will look over it again, he will find that there is a good deal of distinction. While in the Tariff Act the bodies and persons who make an inquiry are mentioned, this is adding another body to inquire under that act it is adding a body which, I think, can make the inquiry much more readily than can a judge of the Exchequer Court or the Supreme Court. My hon. friend is not a lawyer, but I am sure he knows something of the delays which surround courts of law in various actions which may be brought before them. In this case we have a simple method of investigating; and if there are trusts and combines, which are doing things which are to the detriment of the people of this country, another method of bringing them to justice is not going to hurt any person, but it is certainly going to help the consuming masses, if the law reaches out to persons who are taking the last cent unduly, and, as the bill says, to the detriment of the public.

My hon. friend had also something to say regarding property and civil rights. It is true that the legislatures of our provinces have what we may call absolute jurisdiction over property and civil rights. That, however, has its limitations. If this parliament undertakes to deal with something within its authority and, by chance, encroaches upon property and civil rights in a province, then this parliament has the right to pass that legislation. That is the consensus of opinion which one may gather from reading opinions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in connection with this matter. But we are not so much concerned in this case with property and civil rights as we are with trade and commerce, and the matter of trade and commerce comes four-square within the authority of this parliament. It is trade and commerce specifically at which this legislation is aimed, and if it encroaches, to some extent, upon the matter of property and civil rights in a province, yet this par-

5 p.m.

liament has absolute power to pass such a measure. While I do not put myself as a lawyer on the same plane as the Deputy Minister of Justice, I think he is absolutely right in his opinion expressed to the government, that this government has power to pass the legislation in question.

I did not intend taking up so much of the time of the House in connection with this matter. I have some criticisms to make of this bill, and as I said, one of them is the criticism which the hon. member for Vancouver Centre made. That criticism is as to the public nature of the inquiry, the court inquiry held by the court registrar or commissioner, not the private inquiry which he may make into a man's business by going to his house, or shop, or store. Again, the minister should not have the last say on this question. The minister has the last say whether or not, in his opinion, sufficient information has come out of the registrar's investigation to entitle him to ask the attorney-general of a province to prosecute. From the minister's decision in that matter there is no appeal as the act is at present constituted. I would suggest that there might be an appeal to the Governor in Council, because two heads are better than one. For instance, the minister having control of this measure may or may not be a lawyer. He may not know what weight should be given to certain evidence. In his particular position in life, he may not be trained to know exactly what certain evidence means. If the Minister of Justice is not the minister referred to in the context of this bill, there should be an appeal to or a consideration, if one is asked, by either the Minister of Justice or members of the government as a whole. I have received various communications from people, not only from my part of the country, but as far west as the home of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, and they are all of one opinion, that if this legislation is properly administered, it will be a great blessing to the people of Canada who do not have large bank accounts, in other words, the masses of the consuming public. Two or three investigations, and two or three indictments brought in against people who are active in a propaganda to extract every cent possible out of the consumers, will waken the big business people of this country to a sense of duty and responsibility, and they will not, in future, do things which will cost them in the vicinity of $20,000 or $25,000.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): This bill proposes to deal with one of the most important matters that has come before parliament this session, particularly in its relation to the everyday commodities that the people have to buy, and it is from this viewpoint that I wish to discuss the bill.

The history of combines in Canada, is the history of the tariff—one evil has been produced by the other. Oil refining was protected by the tariff and was controlled by a ring as early as 1879. Mr. John Charlton, then a member of this House, said that "tariffs were bound to breed combines," and no prophecy concerning the National Policy has ever proved more true. He cautioned the House then that the tariff would speedily bring monopolies, trusts and mergers into existence, and that they would not be easily broken up. He said it would take more than one verdict of the people, more than one general election, to loosen the deathlike grip which these monopolies, trusts and mergers would fasten on the people of this country.

Well, combines, trusts and mergers did develop. Since Mr. Charlton's warning, legislation has been repeatedly enacted by parliament, ostensibly to check the rapacity of these organizations. There was a measure of this kind passed in 1889, another in 1897, still another in 1907, and the last in 1910—all to no purpose. At the election of 1896 our free trade party got into power; the original National Policy party—or as I like to term it, the trade restriction party—of that time was overthrown and in its place came a professedly free trade party. For fifteen years this free trade party held power, but the trusts, combines and mergers gained daily in monopolistic control of every commodity, and to-day these predatory organizations are more securely in control in every particular than they ever were before. I say in every particular because there never was a time when the manufacturing and distributing of all the commodities the people use were so completely dominated by classes of men, many of whom should never be in possession of the power which they exercise to-day, keeping, according to their way of putting it, the trade of the country in the proper channels. The trusts to-day have more complete control in this country than in any other in the world, including the United States, where these combinations first originated. I assert there can be no dislodgement of these monopolistic organizations, nor any effective control over them, so long as our present protective tariff

with all its amendments stands on our statute books, or while there continues to be the same community of interest between the politicians of business and the politicians who sit in this House.

Now, this evil has gone on unchecked ever since Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878 in a speech at Hamilton told the manufacturers he would try to meet their wishes if they would tell him what they needed. He was leader of the opposition at that time and of course was not able to invite the manufacturers to council at Ottawa. But this he did on his return to office, and since that time the manufacturers and others who form combinations for their own benefit have had plain sailing at the expense of the consumers, notwithstanding all the anti-combine legislation that has been enacted and the successive changes of government,

In 1881 the cotton manufacturers, who for two years previously had received increased privileges from the government, met together and organized a complete union and at once agreed to advance their prices. Prior to this combination the industry had been paying "only" about 30 per cent in dividends; since then some of these cotton concerns have paid very much higher dividends. All kinds of industries, large and small, were soon organized with the same end in view—enhancement of prices. By 1889 they were so numerous and aggressive that there were complaints in parliament about the way consumers were being victimized. Indeed, one Liberal member who drew attention to this new development declared that the interests of these combines and the government supporters were so closely linked together that the government would be hampered in dealing with the evil. At that time one combine in Toronto actually put up for sale among its members the privilege of tendering, without competition, for the supply of coal to the Dominion and Ontario governments.

It was plain to both parties that these combines were brought into being by the protective tariff, so to offset the agitation against trade restriction an act was passed by the Macdonald government for the suppression of combinations in restraint of trade. Obviously the politicians responsible for that act in 1889 never intended it to be anything more than a mere make-believe for there could be no conceivable reason for the manufacturers dickering with the politicians for a high protective tariff when an effective measure on the statute books would have prevented them taking full advantage of such a tariff. Now I predict the government will have hard work to persuade the people that this bill is ever intended to do anything more than were the bills of their predecessors. No combines were broken up by the act of 1889. In 1897 too the Liberal government, then newly elected, anxious to appear before the country as desiring to carry out some of its pre-election pledges according to the 1893 platform, enacted sitll another anti-combine law. There was performed in this House at that time perhaps the greatest farce that was ever staged in the Dominion. The Conservative party, then in opposition, feigned to be frightened by the bill, and well did they play their part. Sir Charles Tupper declared it to be legislation of the most vicious kind and that it was undemocratic in that it gave the minister or the council too much power. But both the government and the opposition knew that the bill was the greatest political joke ever played on the people. The Liberal government had no intention of seriously assailing any trust or combine, indeed they never had after the conference with the delegation of manufacturers on June 18th, 1896, shortly before the general election.

Now, they added this anti-combine legislation to the Tariff Act, but they made no provision for its enforcement by any officer of the Dominion government. After it had been in force for some thirteen years, there was, be it said to its credit, one case—just one solitary instance—of a reduction in the tariff because of proceedings against a combination in restraint of trade. But it cost the concern that laid the information $1,800 to prove its charge; and I never knew of a subsequent case. As evidence, too, of the hold that the protected combines were exercising over the Dominion legislators, I have only to point out that the screws were tightened on the consumers of this land at different tariff revisions, 1884 and 1894, when heavier import penalities were imposed on the consumers while the free list began to swell for the manufacturers. This destroyed, I think, all argument in favour of the tariff as a means of creating employment or of creating a home market. After all, it is in the years from 1900 to 1914 that we must look for the greatest development of the trusts and combines as well as the ineffective attempts to obviate the evils that this development brought with it. The act assented to in 1910, known as the Combines Investigation Act, proved useless, as did its predecessors; the process was too unwieldy.

The legislation now proposed would seem to be effective in that it makes it a criminal offence for any person to assist knowingly or be privy to combines operating to the public

harm. I see there is also a registrar to be appointed who shall be the chief officer through whom proceedings may be instituted. But even this will not avail, as I will show. Whether combines or agreements in restraint of trade flourish in this country to the detriment of the public may admit of some argument. But I am wondering where the Prime Minister means to begin in connection with this bill, since all the business of the country, whether financial or industrial, or, particularly, relating to the distribution of all goods, is operated or controlled by combines, mergers and trusts. These control the manufacture, distribution and prices of everything the public need to use, and there is no getting away from under their lash as long as the tariff, with its anti-dumping provisions and its latest amendments, stands on the statute book as it does to-day.

The Prime Minister would be well advised to withdraw this bill and at the same time abolish some of the existing legislation that hands power to the combines, trusts and mergers. For instance, the dumping clause as it stands to-day delivers the consumers over to the combines to do as they please with them. It is impossible now for an importer to know what duty he will have to pay. I know of one case where a retailer who last year bought goods in the United States and paid the duty on their entering this country was assessed under the anti-dumping clause for an additional amount because he was not a jobber or a wholesaler. A considerable quantity of his goods was retailed out before the anti-dumping law was applied to him—it makes a difference who the importer is. As if this were not enough, an amendment was made to the Customs Tariff Act in the closing days of the last session giving the minister complete power to place any price he likes on any natural products that enter too keenly into competition with any Canadian concern. That amendment completely delivered the consumers of this land into the hands of the jobbers, the wholesalers, and the retailers; the provision was made entirely in their interests. The anti-dumping act has closed up the trading activities, so far as agricultural implements are concerned, of one of the greatest co-operative companies that was ever formed in the Dominion. The anti-dumping act as it stands to-day with its amendments is a piece of galley slave legislation. It is impossible under it for a co-operative company to import anything for distribution in a co-operative way, because no co-operative company is recognized as a jobber and it is required to pay duty, not on the invoice price of the manufacturer, but on the retailer's price. In fact, the minister can do as he likes, and I say as long as these provisions are on our statute books, any anti-combine legislation we can bring in of the nature of this bill will be futile.

The anti-dumping law is legislation that with one stroke forms into one great combine every distributing concern in the country—and the government asks us to believe that it can introduce legislation that will tend to lower the cost of living and to control combines. I, for one, cannot believe it. I do not think there is any sincerity in this matter, when the present tariff system is left entirely untouched—the very legislation that gives the combines all the power they need. If there is one thing more than another that this country needs to-day it is that people shall have freedom to purchase their commodities where they please. But there has sprung up between the producers and the consumers a combine whose rules are absolute, a combine which is recognized under the law of this land, which is recognized by the tariff system of this country, because in the Tariff Act the words "value for home consumption" are interpreted according to whom the importer happens to be. That is, only a jobber is allowed to import on the invoice price of the manufacturer. If a consumer or a co-operative company, distributing in a co-operative way, imports, the words "value for home consumption" are interpreted to mean the retail price in the country of origin, which is an injustice. Under such conditions, Sir, this proposed bill can give no relief; any investigation is bound to prove fruitless. The Customs Act is interpreted in favour of those who still hold the lives of the people in bondage through high prices.

Now, clause 7 of the bill enacts that the minister himself shall decide whether or not an investigation shall be proceeded with. The decision of the minister is final. There can be no appeal or review. So the same minister who is now interpreting the anti-dumping clause in the interest, as I have shown, of the trusts and combines is to decide whether or not an investigation shall be made at all, and his decision is not subject to appeal or review. If this government with the help of the opposition put through, as it did on June 22 last, an amendment to the Tariff Act that closed up the very last gap of liberty to the consumers of this land, I ask what credence will the electors give to the government in the enactment of this proposed bill? I say that this proposed bill can give no relief under such conditions. The Customs Act is

interpreted in favour of those who still have the power. Take that amendment of June 22 last. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) declared in his original budget speech that this anti-dumping amendment was to be left out as it was an unnecessary interference with trade. Just what pressure from the politicians of business was brought to bear on the present cabinet between that time and June 22 last when the Minister of Customs moved his amendment, I do not know; but there is a chance now for the whole Liberal party to free itself from all suspicion by doing something tangible, something that will give the people themselves the power to deal with these trusts and mergers in a way that will be effective.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I rise not for the purpose of urging violent opposition to the spirit of the bill as now brought down, because I am quite satisfied in my own mind, in fact I am certain, that the people of Canada are quite satisfied that the Prime Minister would bring down no legislation that was not imbued with a spirit of equity and right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MARLER: I hear some hon. gentlemen jeer. However, that is my opinion, and it is the opinion of the rest of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the evidence?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Everything.

Mr. MARLER: It has increased very largely since the time my right hon. friend is alluding to. However, I did rise for the purpose of stating that I do not think that the manner in which this bill is worded does carry out the spirit in which it is brought down. The bill is intended to aim at trusts, combines and mergers which are unfair or injurious to trade. I read the bill in quite the contrary light as aimed at practically all combines, trusts and mergers, whether they be fair or whether they be unfair. That, I am perfectly sure, is not the spirit in which the bill has been brought down to the House at the present time.

The history of this bill has been explained briefly not only on its first reading but also again to-day, and what that history really comes down to is this: that the Combines and Fair Prices Act, which is more or less dependent on the Board of Commerce Act, not having functioned properly, and repealing, as it does, the Combines Investigation Act of 1910, the only actual legislation in force at the present time on the subject is Article 498 of the Criminal Code. In the explanation on the first reading of this bill it was stated that some effective machinery was necessary so that Article 498 of the Criminal Code could be put into effect for the purpose of the investigation of combines, mergers, and such like, and the punishment of those who may have been involved therein. That, I take it, is the necessity for the bill at the present time.

I am quite aware that on a motion for the second reading of the bill now before the House is not the proper time or place to urge amendments, but I do wish to urge on the government and on the Prime Minister in particular this fact, that the business world in parts of Canada is very much concerned over the bill as brought down, and I think that it will stand very careful scrutiny and very careful study, not with the object of not having it put on the statute book in the spirit in which it is intended to be placed there, but rather with the object of eliminating certain objectionable features which at the present time business interests think are very deleterious to their interests. I want to make it perfectly clear to every hon. gentleman in the House that in speaking to this bill I do not defend for a single moment any combine, any trust, any merger or any agreement of any kind or description which is injurious to trade, which is unfair or burdensome to the public. Let me make that perfectly clear in the most emphatic language that I can use with politeness in this assembly; let there be no mistake about it. But I also desire to state in equally emphatic language, in the most emphatic language I can use, that I do not think legislation should be placed on the statute book at the present time which will brand combines, business agreements, mergers, trusts and business arrangements of that description as combines in the unfair sense in which that word is used; in other words, I do not think that business agreements as they exist at the present time should be called unfair combines unless first of all they are proved to be unfair. If we immediately start out and state that every combine is unfair, every business interest, every trust unfair—I know that the bill does not intend to say that—but if we start out presupposing that, the business community will never know for a moment where they are.

Probably if there is any further debate on the bill at the present time the cost of living will be urged as being attributable to combines, trusts and mergers. I think I am right in saying that the public mind has for many

years associated the high cost of living with the existence of combines, trusts and mergers so-called. I do not think that that is quite right. Perhaps in a few isolated cases a trust or combine may increase the cost of an article of commerce, but on the whole I do not think that is the case.

Mr. HANSON: You do not agree then with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock)?

Mr. MARLER: I have not heard the Minister of Labour speak this afternoon.

Mr. HANSON: Have you read any of his speeches in the last campaign?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a free party.

Mr. MARLER: I do not remember reading any of them but I am perfectly certain that what he intended to imply was right and proper, and if my hon. friend draws an improper conclusion that is his own fault.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "I have not seen so great faith, no, not in Israel."

Mr. MARLER: My right hon. friend would be exceedingly fortunate if such great faith existed on his side as exists on this.

I was going on to state when I was interrupted that I do not think that combines, mergers and trusts so-called have increased materially the cost of living, because when one comes to think of it a combine, trust or merger of various interests more or less spells efficiency, more or less brings about the cheapening of production, and bringing about the cheapening of production brings about the fact that more labour can be employed. I read with a great deal of pleasure the speech which the Prime Minister made when Minister of Labour in 1910 when that act was brought into effect. I see my hon. friend the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) smiling; my statement apparently gives him a great deal of pleasure. I think, perhaps, it would do my hon. friend much good if he read the speech over again and became imbued with its spirit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot give me the credit for the smile, it came from my left.

Mr. MARLER: I apologize to my hon. friend. I see that he is not prejudiced against what I am advising him to read. However, at that time the Prime Minister spoke as follows:

> Similarly while combines and trusts may have had the effect in some cases of increasing prices, they have not always had that effect but sometimes an effect entirely different, and I would like the House to understand that in introducing this legislation no attempt is being made to legislate against combines, mergers, and trusts as such.

Later on in the same address he stated:

> Another point I would like to make clear is that trusts and combines may not be injurious, that in some respects they may be profitable. That is a point that has been raised. This legislation is in no way aimed against trusts, combines and mergers as such, but rather only at the possible wrongful use or abuse of their power, of which certain of these combinations may be guilty.

I have not the slightest doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the present bill, as brought down, fully intends to carry out and fully intends to emphasize what the Prime Minister said twelve years ago as regards combines and mergers. But the point I desire to bring before the House is this: I do not think that the bill as drafted and brought down does carry out that spirit in effect. Part of the legislation which has been spoken about to-day is section 498 of the Criminal Code. Anyone reading that section can come to but one conclusion and that conclusion will be this, namely, there must be wrong intent in the making and the prosecution of any combine. In other words the wrong animus must be pre-existent before a combine is inquired into and called an unfair combine. Now, I claim that section 2 of the present bill does not clearly show that a combine has to be unfair, that its animus has to be incorrect before it is investigated. The words of this section are certainly very broad, and I do think that qualification of the section should be made before a business, or a merger, or a trust can be called a combine. In other words it should be made clear beyond peradventure that the animus of the combine itself is wrongful before an investigation takes place. I do not think the wording of that section, as I have said, is very clear.

Now, we must all freely admit in this House that in business life there are combines, there are mergers, there are trusts, there is fixing of prices, there are trade agreements. All these things must exist in commerce. Commerce could not go ahead unless there were such agreements. The manufacturer would never know where he was, the producer would never know where he was, the consumer would never know where he was either. These trusts, mergers and combines—providing the animus behind them is correct—should be allowed to go on unheeded and not be inquired into. Because, as a matter of fact as business affairs now stand business is only on the up grade. Every investigation that is made impedes business, every return

that a business house has to make simply increases the cost of production. Business is already overtaxed and I claim, Mr. Speaker, that business at the present time—in so far as it is possible to do so, in so far as it is possible in fairness and equity to the public—should not be disturbed by further investigations unless those investigations are essential, unless those investigations are necessary, unless the animus is first of all determined to be wrong. In other words, I believe that before any investigation is made wrong doing or wrong intention should be proved on the part of that business.

Approaching nearer to the words of the bill it does appear to me that it has been framed in such a way as to call for action on the part of someone who was absolutely fair-minded in every way, who understood industrial disputes, and who was imbued with a spirit of honesty and right. Under the provisions of the bill six people can come forward and demand an investigation. I will come to that question again later on but what I want to make clear at the present time is this: Six people can come and demand an investigation. Now, if everybody in this country of ours was imbued with a spirit of fairness there would be no question to be raised at all. But unfortunately, and I think I must say this, I do not think that the mentality generally—I am speaking of the mentality not in the way of a sense of mind but an attitude generally—of people towards business affairs, towards large business, is the same as it was many years ago. There is without doubt a spirit abroad of more or less jealousy of success, a desire more or less to pull down when it is seen that a business has been successful by reason of operating it for many years in a fair and equitable manner. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that that spirit is abroad. That spirit did not exist before the war in exactly the same manner as it exists to-day—I must say that. I find the attitude of many people in business affairs appears to be very much different. Although it is true, I might say in passing, that the war was supposed to purify us, that the war was fought for democracy and to make the world safe, I have not yet been able to find where that purification or that desire for democracy in order to make the world safe comes in, although it should have come in on account of the suffering that took place and the service that was rendered during the struggle. What I say is that there is an unnecessary carping criticism of successful business methods in Canada at the present time. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I admit where a trust is injurious and is shown to be injurious a business merger is wrong. The point I desire to convey is that where a business has been successful by hard and honest work there is a distinct carping criticism of it. I will say this further: Almost from time immemorial in the ways of commercial and business life there have been agreements. These agreements have been recognized and have continued to be recognized. Nevertheless the spirit is abroad at the present time, I take it, that would think nothing whatever of tearing down a business that had been properly built up, of tearing down an agreement that had been in force for very many years.

No doubt this act was carefully prepared, and I believe that in bringing down this act the government has no intention whatsoever of trying to destroy any business of that description. It has one intention and one desire, a perfectly proper desire—to cause investigations of trusts, mergers and agreements which are injurious, unfair and burdensome to the public. It is the desire of the government that those agreements should be investigated and put a stop to and that those responsible for such conditions should be punished. That I say is perfectly right, but at the same time I do not think that a business which has gone ahead in a fair, honest, equitable way in the face of the whole community should be touched or investigated or subjected to more inconvenience than business is subjected to at the present time—because the more business is disturbed, the greater is the cost of carrying it on and the slower will be the process of reconstruction which our country so much needs at the present time. The more business is disturbed the more does the lack of stability get abroad in this country, and if there is anything we want it is stability, in order that we may progress in our ordinary business lives.

Now, Mr. Speaker I would like to take up in a very brief form the bill itself, and to discuss, as I understand them, certain provisions as they appear in it, and the procedure which is involved. The first step is the complaint, and the second is the preliminary investigation to find out if an actual investigation should or should not take place. The third step is the actual investigation and the fourth step is the subsequent action by the Attorney General or the Solicitor General as the case may be. I wil take up each of those steps very briefly.

The first is the complaint as provided for under section 5 of the bill, subject to the amendments which the Prime Minister has suggested to-day. That is to say, instead of "any one person resident in Canada," the act

will be amended more or less along the lines of the 1910 act; so as to provide for investigation on the complaint of six or more persons, British subjects, resident in Canada, of full age, and so on. That I admit is a distinct improvement to the section in the bill as it stands now. But can we, in fairness, Mr. Speaker, place any business in the hands of any six people in this country? Can we not at any time get together six people who would make a complaint about any business, and who would cause an investigation to be then and there made? If the section, which is the crux of the whole bill in defining a combine distinctly stated that the only combines and the only trusts or mergers which were affected were trusts, combines or mergers which, either prima facie or by some reasonable means were shown to be injurious to trade or burdensome to the public, then the present objection that I am urging might be quite unfounded, but as the bill now stands it means—and it can only mean one thing—that six people taken from any part of Canada can demand an investigation at any time of any business at all which they think is a combine or a restriction of trade. It does not make any difference what the business is, it does not make any difference what the registrar thinks, it does not make any difference what a commissioner under the act thinks, or what the government or anybody else may think—those six people, can bring about an investigation by doing what, Mr. Speaker? All they have to do is to file an application under section 5 of the act, and the application states in general terms simply the name and address of the applicants, the nature of the alleged combine, and the manner in which and the possible extent to which the alleged combine is believed to operate against the public. Now it does not take anyone with a very high degree of skill to conjecture up in his own mind any difficulties at all, in order to have any six of these people lay a complaint of that description.

I say again, Sir, that I do think there should be sufficient qualification in this act, in some manner or of some description, and I repeat particularly to the government and Prime Minister that I do not criticize the spirit of the act at all, but I do criticize the machinery and the wording. I say that that clause should be amended in such a way as to provide that those six people whoever they may be, should show more reasonable or just cause of facts before they can, by a mere writing, by a mere declaration placed in the hands of the registrar, say that this business or that is a combine, and that this business or that should be investigated. It is all very well for six people, under a solemn act of parliament, to stand up and say that my business or anyone else's business is a combine. That is a stigma, it is not a name that any respectable business expects to be called, because the word "combine" is not used in the ordinary sense of the term, but as something which is unfair and unjust. Here we have likely to be placed on the statute book— I hope it will not be placed there—a section which will give six people the right to state that any business is a combine.

There is another point Mr. Speaker, which comes up under this section of the act, and no doubt the government has considered it to some extent. Does the government realize how many demands, or how may allegations, or how many so called applications they will have under an act of this description? I venture to say, Sir, in the conditions which are in existence at the present time in this country, and which I have alluded to, that there will be thousands of applications under this act. I believe that six people who are discontented and jealous of some other man's business will say "That man is making too much money, let us tear his business up, let us have it investigated and see if a combine exists or not." It is not an unnatural thing for six people who are not endowed with all the pleasures or the money that they would like in this world, perhaps finding themselves very pinched, to be more or less jealous of success, because they are are not as fortunate as others. I do not think I would blame them, and I do not think anyone would blame them. But here is the provision of the act and here is what it means, that six people can get together, and at any time ask for an investigation of this alleged combine. I believe the government will find, under this act which is being brought down in its present terms today, that they will have, not hundreds but thousands of investigations on their hands which they never expected for a moment.

Mr. MICHAUD: Has the registrar not to declare that he is satisfied with the application?

Mr. MARLER: I was coming to that point. It was my next point. Perhaps if it is not discourteous to my hon. friend I will answer that after recess.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MARLER: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was defining the

procedure to be effected under the bill relating to the investigation of combines. I had previously stated that in accordance with the procedure laid down in the bill, there were apparently four steps. The first was the complaint. The second was the preliminary inquiry in order to ascertain if a more detailed investigation was required. The third was the detailed investigation under which a finding or no finding was made as the case might be. The fourth step was the prosecution under the offence as so committed, at the instance or with the assistance of the Attorney General or Solicitor General, as the case might be. I had taken up the first of these steps, namely the complaint, as set out in clause 5 of the bill, and I had defined at some length the reasons why I thought clause 5 of the bill did not actually convey the intention the government had in bringing this bill down. It is not necessary at the present time to repeat or to recapitulate the remarks which I made before the House rose.

I will, therefore, pass on to the second step, namely, preliminary inquiry which the registrar is required to make after the laying of the information, or more properly speaking, the laying of the complaint under clause 5 of the bill itself. Clause 6 of the bill is imperative, it is not permissive. In other words, when a complaint is laid by the six persons as they are designated in the amendment suggested by the Prime Minister to the bill in question, the registrar shall then and there cause an inquiry to be made into the alleged combine or alleged restraint of trade, or any of the other causes set out in the definition of a combine under clause 2 of the bill. As I say, that action of the registrar is imperative on the complaint being laid. It is optional for the registrar to make a preliminary investigation, if he thinks fit, even without a complaint being laid. If he believes a combination exists, he may then and there go ahead and make the investigation himself. It is quite true under the succeeding clause—clause 7 of the bill—if the registrar finds that the complaint is frivolous or vexatious, no actual, definite inquiry takes place. In other words, possibly no offence would be found under this legislation. The point I desire to make now is this, that an investigation or a preliminary investigation must, in any event, take place in order that the registrar may ascertain whether the allegations made by the applicants in their complaint are or are not well founded, because, without making that investigation into the business, merger, trust, call it what you will, it will be utterly impossible for the registrar to say whether the complaint is frivolous or vexatious or not.

Mr. CARROLL: Would an investigation into the books of a company or combine at its office be sufficient?

Mr. MARLER: I think very likely it would be quite sufficient. I was coming to that just in a moment. As I say, the registrar would be required to make that investigation. The point I made in my remarks this afternoon, was that I thought if there was no title, or no evidence, or, in fact, nothing to show whether an actual combine existed in a particular business or trust, that business or trust, as the case might be, should be left severely alone. In other words, because six people complain and file documentary evidence—and this is only documentary evidence —under clause 5 of this particular bill, I do not think that business should be immediately stigmatized as a combine, in secret, it is quite true, perhaps not in public, nor that it should, as it would, be put to the expense and annoyance of an examination. it will therefore mean that any business is subjected to an inquiry of a more or less searching character on the complaint being made.

Now, why should not something like the following procedure be adopted? Why should not these six selfsame camplainants be called before the registrar and asked to state their case as to the existence of the alleged combine? Then if the proofs which they propose to adduce are considered sufficient by the registrar to justify an investigation it could be proceeded with. I do not claim that no investigation should be made, but I do think that the condition precedent to making even a preliminary investigation should be the production of evidence in proper form by the complainants to show that wrong has been done, and thereupon such wrong can be righted in due course. As the bill stands at present the mere production of documentary evidence alone, without any questioning of the complainants at all, leaves no option to the registrar but to conduct an examination of the business complained of. I humbly suggest to the government that the acceptance of my suggestion would cure a good deal of what at present appears defective in this particular section.

As I have said, the registrar must make an investigation to determine even if the complaint is frivolous or vexatious. That provision, I think, so far as is practicable, should be absolutely removed from the bill. In other words, even at the risk of repetition, I do think just cause should be

shown against any known combine, merger or business, call it what you will, before the preliminary investigation takes place at all. Of course, if upon investigation the complaint is found to be frivolous or vexatious it is dismissed; there is nothing more to be said about it. But if the complaint is found not to be frivolous or vexatious, subject to the qualifications I have already referred to, there is no reason why a thorough inquiry should not be made. That brings me to the next step—the actual inquiry.

This brings me back to section 14 of the bill. There are various other sections relating to the same subject but it is not necessary for me to take them in detail at present because we are only speaking in general terms and I am sure that any suggestions made to the government in the interim will receive careful consideration. But the bill clearly stresses what I think is a consistent element of publicity. It is true that the registrar may or may not conduct the preliminary investigation in private; but he may make it in public, and I do think that publicity should be avoided until it is found there is just cause for investigation. If after the complaint is laid an examination of the six complainants discloses that there is reasonable grounds for a preliminary inquiry, then by all means proceed with that preliminary inquiry; but do not let any part of such inquiry be conducted in public until the registrar finds there is just cause of complaint against the alleged merger or combine in restraint of trade. I would respectfully suggest to the government that the bill be made imperative in that regard—that there be no publicity during the preliminary inquiry. I cannot state this point in too emphatic terms. What would happen if this was not made definite in the bill? A complaint might be made against a business, and whether such complaint was good or bad the preliminary investigation would mean a tremendous amount of publicity which many a business could ill afford to be the subject of. Therefore I repeat, Sir, that this section should be amended so as to make it imperative that the preliminary inquiry be conducted in private until it is found that a searching investigation is justified.

Another section of the bill to which I wish to draw attention is No. 34, which reads as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to combinations of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees.

In any remarks I have to make with respect to this section I wish it to be abundantly clear to every hon. member that I see no possible objections to combinations of workmen and employees for their reasonable protection. I for one believe that labour should be given its just rights precisely in the same way as capital is given its just rights. After all, there are practically three elements, I take it, in the relations between capital and labour: capital, labour and the community itself. All are interdependent one on the other, each must be given its reasonable and just rights. But why is it necessary in this bill to exclude the operation of its provisions against combinations of workmen or employees. I do not believe that any combination of workmen or employees would ask to be excluded from the operation of this bill. I cannot for a moment conceive that any labour body would be afraid of having its organization investigated. Therefore I do not see why labour organizations should not be included in this bill the same as any business organization, and I would ask the government to take this point under consideration also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at some length as regards this bill, and I have stressed several points, the principal being these, and I will not detain the House very long in recapitulating what I have said. I do think that section 2 is not sufficiently distinct; in other words, I think the section should be made so abundantly clear that no combine or merger which is not actually operating in restraint of trade or in any other way doing wrong should be subject to inquiry at all.

My second point is that the bill as a whole should recognize that there must be combines, trusts and mergers and agreements, and that it is not these combinations or these agreements that are wrong. it is the animus which is behind them. In other words, if there is wrong behind any of these agreements, let the wrong be investigated; but the animus should be proved to be wrong before the investigation is ordered. I stressed that, Mr. Speaker, to some considerable extent.

My third point was in regard to the way in which a complaint may be laid. I suggested there that six persons could possibly lay many complaints and that the government might have a great deal of difficulty in looking into all the complaints which might be made under this bill, and I do believe that many more complaints would be made than the government has any idea of.

The fourth point I raised was that the complaint should first be examined into, that the complainants should be called before the registrar and their evidence examined before any inquiry was instituted.

My fifth was that the preliminary inquiry should be invariably conducted in private,

and that no publicity should be allowed until a finding adverse to the combine was made by the registrar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say in reference to this matter, but if the Prime Minister will not think me impertinent for making another suggestion, it is this—and it has been in part covered by the remarks I have already made: Business is only now on the up-grade in this country, and I hope the government will not do anything which will not allow it to proceed or which will not allow it to become stable in every way. I do not like to make any remarks which would probably draw a discussion or even a criticism from some of my hon. friends opposite, but I have frequently heard it stated in this House, not out of it: "What has the government done? It has done nothing."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARLER: I am glad to hear the "hear, hear" from the other side; I expected it. Let me tell my hon. friends this—

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is doing nothing twice.

Mr. MARLER: Well, my right hon. friend has also endorsed what the hon. gentleman sitting behind him says. The opinion of my hon. friends, in that respect, is very much in the minority—I am waiting for them to laugh. I am urging that the government to go on the even tenor of its way is the most admirable policy that could possibly be followed at this time, because the country of all things wants stability, tranquillity; they do not want any sky-rocketing, any spectacular policies.

Mr. HANSON: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. MARLER: Certainly; I expected it.

Mr. HANSON: Does he think the country wants this bill?

Mr. MARLER: I have been arguing that to my hon. friend all the afternoon. I premised—

Mr. HANSON: Damning it with faint praise.

Mr. MARLER: I premised my remarks by saying that the spirit of the bill was admirable in every way. The bill as brought down is a basis for discussion, nothing more or less.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman means that the bill is all right, only for the sections.

Mr. MARLER: My right hon. friend knows perfectly well that I made no such remark. The remarks which I made earlier in the day my right hon. friend probably regarded as not worth following, but if he had followed them closely—and I had hoped he would have; I had hoped that hon. gentlemen opposite would possibly have derived a slight amount of knowledge from my remarks on this bill—he would have heard me say definitely that the spirit of the bill was admirable but that the operation of the proposed measure and the procedure under it could bear amending, and that the bill as it stands is brought down as a basis for discussion.

When interrupted I was going on to say that the people were satisfied to have the government continue along the even tenor of its way and to have it avoid spectacular policies. I would therefore urge that some of the clauses of the bill be redrafted in such a manner as to carry out the spirit and intention of the bill itself.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have listened this afternoon and this evening with a good deal of attention to the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Marler) who has just taken his seat. I always listen to his speeches with a good deal of attention, because he studies a case before he speaks on it and he usually delivers a very thoughtful address. However, as I listened to him to-day, damning with faint praise, as somebody to my left said a few moments ago, this bill, I found myself wondering which he was endeavouring to do, to praise it or to damn it. He removed from it so far as I could see, its heart and lungs and body, and left the rest for the government, with his approval. So far as I could find, there was only one part of it with which he agreed, and that was the title.

I take very much the same attitude, Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend takes. I have listened to the other speeches; I have given some study to the bill, and I think I voice his opinion as well as my own when I say that it is unnecessary, useless and interfering legislation. In saying this, Sir, I do not wish to be misunderstood. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) in his able speech, pointed out that he did not wish to be taken as supporting trusts, combines and mergers, and I presume it is a good attitude for me to take at the beginning of the remarks that I propose to address to the House. I may say frankly that I have not been the subject of any lobbying on this question, nor have I received even a communication of any kind in regard to it, with the exception of the ordinary circulars that I think every hon. member has received, some for and

some against the bill. I am opposing the bill in a general way, not from the legal point of view but from the general point of view that we have in this country to-day too many laws. We have laws made by this Dominion parliament, laws made by the provincial legislatures and municipal by-laws of various kinds. In fact, our statute books are cluttered up with laws of all descriptions, with most of which the people are not familiar. We are practically being legislated to death, and it is time we called a halt. Too much paternalism is being exercised, not only by this parliament, but by other legislative bodies throughout the country, and I submit that it is time to let the people do a little thinking on their own behalf. When you get on the statute books a great many laws of various kinds with which the people do not agree and of which they make, to a certain extent, a joke, you bring about a disrespect and a disregard for law which is not in the best interests of the country as a whole. I noticed some time ago in a United States paper the statement of an American senator that it was time that his country proceeded not to make more laws but to unmake many of the laws which they had already enacted. I believe the same sentiment might well be expressed in Canada. The other day I was travelling on a train from the West, and I sat in the smoking room with a number of travellers, all strangers. An hour or two was spent by most of them—there were seven or eight—telling of the different methods by which they got around the liquor laws. It was a standing joke, and laws that are made a joke by the people are not in the best interests of any country. I repeat that such a law as that which is now proposed cannot be any more useful than other laws of past parliaments have been which had the same purpose in view, and that in adopting measures of this kind we are cluttering up our statute books with unnecessary and useless legislation.

An unfortunate feature of much legislation that is brought in is that the human element, the personal equation, is forgotten by the legislators; they have the impression that any law may be put on the statute books irrespective of how the people feel toward it. Moderation and sanity are just as necessary in lawmaking as they are in personal and public life. It is true that demagogic appeals, irrational and irresponsible in their character, are continually being made to the masses of the people, and that laws are very often enacted as the result of those appeals. But if we accede to all requests for laws of all kinds we will establish in Canada the same type of bureaucracy which has been established in Russia and which is not doing that country any good.

I submit that this law will lead to inquisitorial investigation into private businesses, which in a great many cases would be unnecessary. It is time to leave business and industry alone, because, as has been stated by the hon. member who last spoke, we are in a time of depressed business conditions, a time which is not opportune for the bringing in of legislation which will interfere with industry generally and which can have no other effect than that of interference.

In regard to the question itself. In the first place, is this law needed? Anyone who reads section 498 of the Criminal Code will see that practically every branch of business covered by this proposed legislation is covered by that provision. It is true that some amendments might have to be made to that clause to make it more operative than it has been in the past, but at the same time I believe it has been just as operative in the past as this legislation will be in the future if it is put upon the statute books. At any rate it should not be necessary at the present time, and in the present financial condition of this country, to establish practically a new department of government with a whole staff of civil servants to look after the carrying out of such legislation as this. I believe we have in Canada to-day all the civil servants we need for the carrying on of the business of the people. I well remember the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in a speech made in this House last year giving figures showing how year after year as the business of the country went on the cost of civil government had increased over the year previous. This legislation if it is carried out, will create a whole staff of commissioners and registrars from one end of this country to the other, and will simply be another addition to the expense of civil government without, to my mind, accomplishing the intention of the act.

In addition to that, large corporations are needed in the business world of to-day. They are needed because of the competition which is present among the different countries of the world. After all, the wheat board proposed by my friends to my left is nothing but a large combination of the same sort. It is a proposed organization for the purpose of the handling by one body of the wheat produced in the West so that we shall be able to compete in the markets of the world in that commodity. It is really a proposition along exactly the same lines as any of these organizations which are proposed to be investigated

by this legislation. The same is true of the fruit co-operative societies of British Columbia, and of some of the co-operative selling organizations of other sections of the country. Therefore, if that type of organization is necessary for the handling of the grains, for the handling of the fruit and other farm produce of this country—and I do not dispute that perhaps it is—that type of organization is all the more necessary in connection with large manufacturing plants and large industries of various kinds. Not only that, but organizations of that kind exist in all nations, and therefore have to be combatted by organizations of the same kind in countries which are in competition with them. All large organizations, even the largest trusts, do not take advantage of the opportunities they might take advantage of. I remember reading a short time ago The Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page, and if I remember correctly he made this statement; that during the war the time came when the necessities for oil were so great that he took it upon himself to deal with the Standard Oil Company, the greatest oil corporation in the world, on behalf of the British government and also the American government to a certain extent, and he points out that he got the finest type of co-operation from that company. Not only that, but although that trust had the opportunity of taking a large amount of money out of the coffers of the different Allies through control of the oil and gasoline that was needed by them, they did just the reverse, they cut down the price saving millions of dollars to the Allies in that regard.

We have in free trade England, and I mention this because the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), who is not in the House at the moment so far as I can see, this afternoon blamed the whole injury to the life of this country to trusts, which he said were caused by the protective tariff—in free trade England we find trusts, mergers and combines of all kinds. I have here under my hand a report of a committee on trusts which was appointed by the British parliament in February, 1918, and reported in April, 1919. It was appointed for the purpose of looking into the advisability of bringing in just such legislation as this and in its report there is a list a page and a half long of different trusts and organizations in one line of business alone with which the Ministry of Munitions had to deal in Great Britain during the war. I will deal with that a little more fully in a moment.

Large organizations, large combines of that kind are necessary, not only because of competition with other countries, as I mentioned a moment ago, but because, and it is mentioned in this report, they are able to prevent absolute bankruptcy of the smaller corporations when competition, not only internal but external, is becoming so severe that unless the smaller organizations unite and work together they will be forced into bankruptcy. Instances are given in this report of just such a condition of affairs.

Then there is the argument of the lower cost of production, cost of buying, and overhead costs. There is another important point, and in this line we have not progressed very far in Canada, and that is scientific industrial research. We have made but very little progress in this country so far as that very important branch of industry is concerned, because it is in a sense a branch of industry at the present time. It is pointed out in an appendix to this same report that it is a factor of the utmost importance that these large organizations can carry on a type of industrial research which cannot be carried on by the smaller organizations.

Then there is the question of export trade, which I mentioned a few moments ago, greater general efficiency, and finally the point made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) as to the standardization of parts. He mentioned the Ford Motor Company. Would anybody in this House contend for a moment, that if it were not for the size and strength and specialization which takes place in that organization it would be possible for it to turn out an automobile of the same quality and price as the Ford motor car at the present time? Certainly it would not be possible. So standardization of quality, standardization of parts, and specialization all add to that general efficiency and all cause a lowering in cost providing always, of course, that the organization is not permitted to take too much advantage of possibilities which may offer because of the power of the organization. But I submit, Sir, that we have now on the statute books legislation to prevent them taking advantage of that power. I am going to quote just three or four passages from this report which I believe should be of interest to the House. The first paragraph which I quote from this report of the committee on trusts is from a statement made to them, and which the committee quote apparently approvingly, by some of the organizations with which they deal. This is the only quotation of that kind. The rest are quotations of the committee's own statements:

Where price associations exist, all members having to quote the same price, the competition among the manu-

facturers, parties to the association, becomes one of quality, and one direct and important result of these price associations is undoubtedly a tendency to rise to a general higher level in production in this respect.

Then comes a page and a half of different trusts with which the Ministry of Munitions had to deal, and regarding them the Ministry of Munitions make a statement synopsized as follows:

We were furnished with detailed reports through the various departments of the ministry with regard to their experiences in dealing with these and other associations. To a very general extent these experiences appear to have been of a character satisfactory to the government. Considerable advantages were recognized in dealing with combinations and associations for war purposes. It was found that the influence of larger-minded and more moderate men had a beneficial effect upon the attitude of the trade as a whole, that the best technical advice was more easily available, and that on the whole the trade associations, and especially trade committees created for war purposes, were of the greatest assistance to the ministry.

A little further on there is another statement made by this committee,—and by the way on this committee was one of the men in England who looks upon the capitalistic system, as it is called, as a failure; I refer to Sidney Webb. I shall quote from him in a moment because he made a separate report although he signed the committee's report. This is from the full report.

It was alleged of one association that it had endeavoured to fix very exorbitant prices, and that arrangements for the control of prices had been discovered which had in fact led to a rise of prices to an excessive extent. These were, however, individual cases, and generally the officials of the ministry appeared to be of opinion that the associations had made for more economical production and for an improved quality and variety of output, and for a very beneficial interchange of technical knowledge, and that, although most associations regulated prices, the consumer in general had not suffered through such regulations.

No more favourable report upon trusts and mergers could be made, to my mind, than is contained in that statement. A little lower down there are two more statements which I wish to quote. This is one of them:

There was a general agreement among representatives of associations before us that one of the beneficial results of the formation of associations sufficiently powerful to control and maintain prices in the home market was that it enabled British manufacturers to extend their output by selling their products at a lower price, or even at a loss, in foreign markets.

I quote that because of its interest to my hon. friend for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) I am sure, and probably to others in the House, who blame the protective system for the fact that occasionally home producers sell more cheaply in the foreign market than in the home market. And yet they state here that this extensive production under free trade enables them to sell their goods more cheaply in the foreign market than in the home market. Then they say a little lower down:

By securing remunerative prices in the home market they could make a successful bid against foreign competition in the export trade. They had a fund, a fighting fund, for the special purpose of subsidizing members who found it necessary to sell at less than an economic price in order to cut out foreign competitors. That might be called meeting dumping by dumping, but he would not agree that British firms dumped in the aggregate much more than foreign firms. They had dumped in Belgium as reprisal against Belgium dumping here.

These quotations show that the Ministry of Munitions in England, and the English government generally found large organizations, large combinations of industry, of advantage to them during the war.

Now, Sir, I have practically finished and I wish to point out in closing that in handling this matter in England this committee recommended that the whole question be handled by the Board of Trade, which is a department of the government in England just as the Department of Trade and Commerce is a department of the government in this country. They suggested bringing forward some form of legislation akin to what was in force in this country, or in New Zealand, or most of the other countries which form the British dominions, and they quoted the act of 1910 which was in force in Canada; but they leave the matter to the Board of Trade with the suggestion that a tribunal might have to be formed to handle it if the Board of Trade upon investigation found it necessary to do something to that effect; I am synopsizing the matter very briefly.

Now I wish to make one more quotation The supplementary report was made by Sidney Webb, whom I mentioned a moment ago, and three others. Mr. Sidney Webb is a gentleman who spoke of "decay of the capitalistic system" in a recent book which he wrote. While he agreed with the foregoing report and signed it—his name is attached to it—he considered that an addendum was necessary and I am going to quote one passage from it, signed by him and three others.

We do not suggest that any action should be taken to prevent or obstruct combination or association in capitalist enterprise. Apart from the experience that no such interference can be made effective,—

I should like to repeat this:

Apart from the experience that no such interference can be made effective, we have to recognize that association and combination in production and distribution are steps in the greater efficiency, the increased economy, and the better organization of industry. We regard this evolution as both inevitable and desirable. It is, however, plain that the change from competitive rivalry to combination calls for corresponding developments to secure for the community, both safeguards against the

evils of monopoly, and at least a large share of the economic benefits of the better organization of industry which it promotes.

That is praise of the whole system of large organizations. Therefore, I think it is well worth while reading because of the fact that Sidney Webb, and the other three members who agreed to the first report make the statement.

That, Mr. Speaker, is all I have to say on the question except to repeat that I consider this legislation at the present time is unnecessary and that if it is carried out, if it is put into force. I do not think it will be of any more use than the legislation which is now in force in the criminal code. I believe that industry and business in Canada is in such a shape at the present time that there should rather be a desire to leave it alone than to interfere with it unnecessarily.

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, if there has been any doubt in the mind of any hon. member as to the effectiveness of the proposed legislation it is successfully answered by the quantity of literature which has been sent to the members of this House by those who have been profiting in the past and have now something to fear. I have been struck with the amount of eloquence poured out in order to whitewash these combines. I have no hesitation in saying that great combinations are necessary and that they can manufacture more efficiently and more cheaply. But that is not the trouble complained of. The point is that these combinations, or some of them, have been abusing their powers. I believe that this is an epoch-making day in the history of the present session. Now for the first time we have an opportunity, and the House is being put to the test, of passing legislation which will really have a kick in it. For many years past combinations of such a character have been growing up that at the present time we can buy no article the price of which has not been fixed arbitrarily. That is the reason we are suffering at the present time.

One hon. member opposite spoke in favour of standing pat and allowing things to remain as they are. I can assure you that I am not going to make an address of a "blue ruin" or "dry rot" character; but I have a great deal of sympathy with those who have tried to put the actual conditions of agriculture before the House. There is nothing gained by minimizing or exaggerating, when describing the conditions that prevail. To me the greatest optimist is the one who grasps and grapples with the actual problems before him and tries to solve them. There are such problems to be solved and that is why something effective in the way of legislation ought to be enacted at this time. Combinations have been making progress in methods of getting around legislation, of devising ways and means of extracting a greater share of profit than they are entitled to, and legislation by this parliament has not kept pace with such devices. Notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary I believe the proposed legislation to be a sincere effort to apply effective measures to prevent these combinations continuing to operate in the future as they have done in the past. Some years ago I read, in connection with American history, where an effort was made in congress to bring about more sanitary conditions in factories, to prevent child labour, and other reforms. The same arguments that we have heard to-day were then offered. When the vote took place it stood 30 for the reforms to 190 against. Four years later that vote was reversed, and the 30 had become 190. The reforms which were sought at that time were then placed on the statute book. After they were placed there everybody realized their value, and to-day nobody in the States would think of doing away with those reforms. The reform contemplated here will meet with similar opposition.

In regard to the matter of competition, we looked to competition to regulate prices in the past. When competition prevails, such legislation as this, as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) has said is not necessary. But when competition has been strangled, as has been the case for many years in the past, something to regulate price is necessary, and I assure hon. members that if something is not done to regulate price, even those who fear this legislation, even the manufacturers, and even those who have been forming these combinations and reaping the profits, will find that the hard times will be reflected on themselves, and that they will become the sufferers. In fact they have already begun to feel the pinch and if they turn a deaf ear, and talk about standing pat when those conditions of unrest surround us, when there is need of some effective action, they will find that conditions will get worse. However, I hope I am wrong. Some people prophesy that we are now on the eve of better times. I am afraid not.

In regard to resale prices, the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) seems to uphold these organizations that have been selling at resale prices. I think the special committee on Agriculture had a little to say about that. Some witnesses gave evidence before the com-

mittee and one witness stated that he was selling an article at $1.75 and making a very good profit, but his competitor in the same town objected because he was selling it 25 cents less than his own sale price, and the result was that the manufacturer absolutely refused to provide him with any more of those goods. That is the way the resale price works out. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre stated that they have been able to stabilize prices. They certainly have. Look at the Imperial Oil Company; they have stabilized the price of gasoline at about 55 cents a gallon in Canada when the same commodity is selling on the other side of the international boundary line at 25 cents. True there is a very slight difference in the size of their gallon.

Mr. STEVENS: There is no duty on gasoline. Why would a man pay 55 cents a gallon in Canada, if he could buy it on the other side for 25 cents?

Mr. MILLAR: He would not make much if he had to drive 125 miles to save the 25 cents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the hon. member think the combination of the Imperial Oil Company is stronger than that of the Standard?

Mr. MILLAR: Perhaps when the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is speaking, as I hope he will a little later on, he may be able to explain why gasoline is selling for 25 cents on the American side and 55 cents on the Canadian side.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never encountered that myself.

Mr. MILLAR: Well I have. I have known it to be selling for 25 cents in the United States and 52 cents and 55 cents in Canada at one and the same time.

There is one section in the bill which puzzles me. It would appear to me to be difficult to find out whether a combination is guilty or not until investigation is held, and from the wording of the bill, as far as I can understand it, those combinations that are not operating against the interests of the people of Canada do not come within the jurisdiction of the registrar or inspector. I may be wrong in that, but it would seem to me there might be some difficulty there. The hon member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) has stated that we have at present too much legislation. I can understand that statement coming from those who fear legislation. Even if we have too much legislation on the statute books, that is no reason why a bill that is really going to be effective should not be passed. I fancy that is an objection that is put forward among others in the circulars and newspaper clippings that have been circulated. I received some of them myself. It is a part of the howl of those who fear they are going to be injured by the legislation.

Referring to the statement that we have too much legislation, and that we should proceed along the even tenor of our way, let me point out that some time ago the United States went a good deal further in curbing combines and mergers than it is proposed to do by this bill, and certainly very much further than Canada has ever gone. During the time Roosevelt was President of the United States the legislation that was placed on the statute books and enforced very vigorously was most effective and far-reaching. He took some of those large combines by the throat. He did not treat them as though those organizations were working for the welfare of the people and that they were all good. I remember reading a conversation between President Roosevelt and a representative of one of these combines who argued with him and said "Well now, you should not be hard on us; did we not provide $60,000 for your campaign fund?" "Yes," replied Roosevelt "but I understand you also provided $70,000 for the campaign fund of my opponent". "Well" said the former "that may be the case". During Roosevelt's regime he enforced a law such as is proposed at this time with such vigour that these organizations were curbed, and the good effect of that legislation has been felt, I believe, up to the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the sake of the hon. member's seatmate (Mr. Evans), perhaps he will admit that Roosevelt was a very strong protectionist.

Mr. MILLAR: The mind of the right hon. leader of the Oposition usually runs true to form, but in this particular case I think he is running off at a tangent. I do not think that has any effect whatever. Perhaps when the right hon. gentleman speaks he might explain, if the combines operating at the present time are not to the detriment of the country, why it is that gasoline is selling at 30 cents a gallon in Ottawa and selling at about 50 cents out in the West. Having been away from home some little time, I am not just prepared to say to a cent what the price of gasoline in the West is, but I think about 50 cents. Why is that so? There is a great deal the right hon. leader of the Opposition will have to explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the hon. member ask me to explain it? I am not in office.

Mr. GRAHAM: Everybody knows that.

Mr. MILLAR: I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition among others was asking questions and seemed to disagree with me; that is the reason I asked him to make the explanation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not on that point.

Mr. MILLAR: Reference has been made to the wheat board as being something that might be classed as a combination that would come under this act. Well, I cannot conceive, from the spirit of the act as explained in the address of the Prime Minister, and from the wording of the act, that any harm would come to the wheat board. An investigation would show that it was not intended to operate to the detriment of anybody. It was intended merely to prevent combinations from extracting from the producer a great deal of what he has a right to. But I assure the House that whether the wheat board becomes operative or not, the investigation into the lake shippers' combine and the investigation into the ocean shippers' combine will give plenty of opportunity for the operation of this bill if it is placed upon the statute books. Reports have not been issued; but the evidence has been brought out before the commission, and without the slightest doubt there is a combine that could be dealt with by this bill if it becomes law.

Let me say just a word or two in regard to unrest. It would be well at this time if hon. members would make an effort to find out the real cause of the unrest. We have been approaching this matter too much in an argumentative spirit, one trying to show that a certain industry was not getting a square deal, was getting the raw end of the deal, and others showing very little sympathy for it, saying: "Do not whine about it; we do not whine; why do you whine?" That is rather a dangerous course for those who are well-fed, who have been profiting from the producer and who have no reason to complain, because they have been getting the best of the deal. It is dangerous for them to take that cold-blooded, and I think I might even say, insolent attitude of "quit your whining and go to work." Much that has been said in this House might well have been left unsaid, because, as has been pointed out, this might injure the country in the matter of immigration; but unfortunately, it has been necessary to say what has been said, because it seemed to be impossible to enlist the sympathy of this House and have hon. members realize the gravity of the situation, so that they might come to the point where they would get together and endeavour to find a solution. That is the reason why some of our members have assumed that pessimistic attitude.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not all true.

Mr. MILLAR: An hon. member says: "it is not all true." I assure the House that what has been said is only too true, I am sorry to say, and I regret that we have been forced into this position where we have had to speak very plainly about those adverse conditions.

In the measure that is now before the House, an opportunity is afforded of giving effective redress; it is a measure that, if put into operation, will cause confidence to spread over the country. I am quite convinced that if those who have been suffering realize that the government mean business, that they are going to enforce this measure, and that combines that have been charging too much, that have been taking a greater share of the profits or, to put this in another way, a greater return for the services they are rendering than they should, are going to be dealt with effectively, the consuming public will be filled with confidence. This will give them, as it were, new life. Let me point to one measure that has already, I might say, given new life to the stock industry, just to show the House how effective this measure can be made. The removal of the embargo on cattle going to the Old Country, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) said a few days ago—and I agree with him—has given new life to the stock industry of the West. I assure hon. members that if this measure passes, if it is properly enforced, it will find a great deal to do; in fact, there seems to be work for it everywhere. But the moral effect will be very great. Hon. members may not believe this; some hon. members are inclined to laugh and say: "Oh, the agriculturists are always whining," but if hon. members keep on saying that, I assure them that they are taking a dangerous course. We may not always whine. We have in this country a strong foreign element, and sometimes it is necessary to keep them in curb. If the House and the country continue to take that attitude, an attitude of, as I said before, cold-blooded insolence, we may come to a time when there will be more unrest and more real trouble than we have had in the past. I would just give hon. members fair warning. Hon. members may laugh at this if they like; but that will be the effect. I am very glad to see that the

government has brought forward a measure that gives promise of redressing many of these evils. I know it will not be easy of enforcement; as a matter of fact, I foresee this difficulty. When the commissioner or registrar undertakes to decide whether a combination is selling for a greater price than it should, the matter of price is relative. If he takes the income of many of our people, amongst them the agriculturists, he may well decide that the combine is getting too much; but if he will take comparison with others who are drawing good salaries, he may well decide that the combine is getting enough. I do not know how that will be decided; but, because there are difficulties in the way, I do not think is any reason why the effort should not be made. People and parliaments stand at their best, they are in their greatest glory when they are accomplishing that which seems almost impossible. This seems a difficult task; but I do not think it is impossible, and I certainly will give it my hearty support.

Mr. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Millar) in connection with this bill, used the impression, "if it was an effective measure." We seem to have had before a few effective measures like the one that has been presented to the House. In 1919, under the Union government, there were introduced the bill for the establishment of the famous Board of Commerce and the Combines and Fair Prices bill to prevent abuses and to reduce the cost of living. We know what the result of that legislation was. The act was in existence for just a few months when one after another of the gentlemen who were on the board resigned, contending that, under the bill as it was drafted and even with the powers that were given to them, they were not able to enforce the legislation. Under the old Laurier regime, there was introduced the act of 1907, and the bill which is at present before the House seems to be very much like a repetition of that act which fell into disuse and apparently was enforced against only one big organization of the United States which was doing business in this country, with the result at that time that there was a slight modification introduced into their way of doing business. Apparently, however, there were in this country other combines or other similar institutions; but the act was not directed at them, and the people did not resort to the means put into their hands to have an investigation into those organizations. The motive underlying the bill is undoubtedly a good one. The Prime Minister and the government want to do what is fair and right by the people, and undoubtedly this measure is introduced in redemption of the pledge contained in the Speech from the Throne, to wit:

> A bill will be submitted to you to safeguard the interests of consumers and producers from undue enhancement of prices or unfair restriction of trade by combines, monopolies, trusts or mergers.

I would draw the particular attention of the House to the phrase, "undue enhancement of prices." But although this bill is drafted with the intention of safeguarding the interests of consumers and producers from undue enhancement of prices or unfair restriction of trade, I am afraid that it will fail of its purpose unless it is amended in several particulars. Far be it from me to criticize the bill in a spirit out of sympathy with the policy of the government. I endorse the action taken by the government and congratulate the Prime Minister on the introduction of this bill, which is but another evidence of his desire to better the condition of the working classes and those engaged in a small way of business and to protect them against the big interests. However, it is apparent from the constructive criticism which we have heard from the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) that the bill if allowed to remain in its present form will not accomplish what is intended.

I find several objections to the bill as drafted. In the first place, I am afraid that the provision against the fixing of a common or a resale price by merchants, traders, or manufacturers would unduly hamper our domestic trade without curing the abuses which the bill is directed against. To carry out this provision would mean intermeddling and interference with the conduct of business and would bring about exactly the opposite result to that which the government has in view. I believe our industries should be given every encouragement and should not be dealt with unjustly —in fact they should be treated just as fairly as the public whom we wish to protect.

Another defect in the bill is that any person of the age of 21 is empowered to lay a complaint, but nothing is said as to whether he must be a British subject. No doubt this is an oversight on the part of the draftsmen, and will be corrected when the bill is in committee.

The definition of the word "combine" in the second section in my opinion is objectionable. The definition is neither precise nor scientific in its terms and it is impossible to ascertain from it what really is a combine within the meaning of the section. This definition should be recast in order that we may have no trouble when the bill becomes law.

It will be remembered that in the case of the Board of Commerce the law was tested in the Supreme Court and found to be unconstitutional. I am afraid we may have similar trouble here unless we go through this bill very carefully and all our time and trouble will have been wasted.

Another defect to my mind is that the bill does not appear to contain any provision that the person laying a complaint shall give a guarantee of his good faith. All he has to do is to simply write a letter to the registrar and the machinery of the law is set in motion. In all proceedings in our criminal courts when a complaint is laid regarding a matter of minor importance the complainant must appear before the magistrate and give his reasons for believing that he is entitled to the redress that he is seeking, and, moreover, he must deposit five dollars. Under this bill any person who may have a grudge against his employer can either personally or by letter set the law in motion. I think there should be an amendment requiring the complainant to make a sworn statement before the registrar, rendering the procedure similar to that required in ordinary criminal matters. Furthermore, I think where the word "opinion" occurs in this bill it is objectionable. As I said before, there ought to be some reasons given by the complainant as in ordinary criminal proceedings. When a person lays a complaint in our criminal courts we always take the trouble of asking him if he has good reason to believe that his complaint is justified. In this particular instance I think the bill should be amended accordingly in order to protect the public at large, and I do not think it would be going too far to require a security from the person who invokes the law, such security to depend on the nature and gravity of the complaint that is laid. As was suggested by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, I think it would be well to follow the wording in the old law, which provided, if I recollect correctly, that only upon at least five persons alleging a series of breaches of the law could the machinery be set in motion. One single case of too high a price should not be ground to justify an investigation. Where there is a series of repeated infractions of the law they become injurious to the whole community, and thereupon the law should be put into force.

Sections 5, 6 and 9 do not appear to me to be very plain; indeed, reading them in conjunction with section 10 I see no reason why a third investigation may not be ordered. I think it should be made very clear that a preliminary investigation before a registrar or commissioner must be made of every complaint, unless this discloses reasonable and proper grounds for believing that the complaint is well founded, no further steps should be taken; if reasonable and proper grounds are disclosed, then a commissioner should be appointed to thoroughly investigate the complaint. But as the bill now stands there appears to be nothing to prevent the registrar or commissioner from holding two or three investigations on the very same matter.

The question of secrecy has been touched upon by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. I do not think the bill is sufficiently clear on this point. It is all very well to investigate the affairs of any industrial or business concern. But I do not believe that the law sufficiently protects these people; I am not sure that persons or firms appearing before the commissioner would not suffer considerably through the exposure to the public of their business affairs, their business methods, and so on.

I notice also that although this law follows in certain respects our criminal procedure it does not give to the accused or to the person who appears before the registrar or commissioner the rights given to one who appears before our courts. I do not see anything in the bill which gives to the person brought before the commissioner or registrar the right to be represented by counsel. It would, in my opinion, be a denial of justice to have the law passed in that form; I submit that there should be provision under which any person who is charged with having violated the law should have the right from the outset to bring in his own lawyer and have his interests properly protected. There is also a clause in the bill which states that evidence may be brought in in the form of affidavits. That is altogether against the practice in the province of Quebec—I do not know how it is in the other provinces—because one who is a party to an action in our province has always the right to hear the witnesses on either side, to cross-examine them and test their veracity. As the bill is drafted, anyone charged with violating the provisions of this law would not have that right if an affidavit only was produced.

I do not see in the law any provision for appeal. I regard it as very necessary that the accused or the person brought before the commissioner should have the right of appeal if the decision is adverse to him. In section 498 of the Criminal Code, which at present protects the public in regard to these

matters, there is provision for appeal, and I think that in this law we ought to have a similar provision to what is contained in Article 1012 of the Criminal Code of Quebec, which enables appeal to be taken from conviction.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have not so much objection to the bill as it is drawn as I have to what is not contained in the bill. The principle of the proposed law is a good one, but it would seem as if it had been conceived and put before us with, perhaps, too great haste, and if we discuss it a little longer we shall probably be able to bring out its defects and devise the necessary amendments for its improvement. The first thing that ought to be done is, in my opinion, to remodel the definition and to provide that only persons who are British subjects shall have the right to avail themselves of the provisions of the proposed law. It should be provided also that the complainant shall state under oath that he has just reason for believing that the law has been violated. There should also be a provision to ensure that the evidence adduced shall not be made public and thus injure or prejudice the interests of the person who is charged with violation. And, as I said a moment ago, the right of appeal should be provided, thus conforming to the provision contained in Article 1012 of the Criminal Code of the province of Quebec.

Lastly, I find no mention made in the bill as to who the commissioner is going to be—whether it is to be an official of some department, or otherwise. The law does not state whether or not the commissioner shall be a lawyer. I do not want to speak on behalf of my own profession, but it is the experience that when a person other than a lawyer is appointed to such a position the law has not always been carried out as it should be. I believe that the registrar or the commissioner ought to be a competent lawyer of at least ten years' standing and experience at the provincial bar, in order that justice may be done to all and that the interests of none may be prejudiced.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that it would be specially interesting to those who were engaged in the process of production, and to the consumers. Yet I fancy that a great many of the labour people, who constitute the great bulk of producers of the country and who are decidedly consumers, will not consider that in this bill we have anything that really is vital or that will adequately meet present needs. I was delighted a little while ago to hear the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) quoting Sidney Webb in favour of combinations. Undoubtedly we must recognize that the greater number of the labour people and the socialists, both in this country and Great Britain, are in favour of combinations. They do not fail to realize the evils existing in connection with combinations as they are at present, but they do recognize the inevitability of combines. In tracing the development of our present industrial system, we believe that this is one step forward and that we are now in a position where we shall have to take, in the near future, another step forward. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River did not elaborate the position taken by Mr. Webb and the other Fabian socialists. He did not quote from Mr. Webb's latest book, "The Decay of Capitalist Civilization," in which Mr. Webb points out that we have been travelling for a considerable time along the line of the concentration of capital in the hands of a comparatively small group; that this system is failing to fulfil the primary function of meeting the needs of the people, and hence is on its trial. Mr. Webb is far from taking the attitude of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River that we should let well enough alone; with other Fabian socialists, and I think with the workers generally, he says it is inevitable that we should take another step and that in the immediate future.

We recognize that the combinations we have in industry and commerce to-day, as well as in finance—the latter a later development—are largely the outgrowth of the industrial revolution that took place in Great Britain one hundred and fifty years ago. When the factory system came into existence and the individual workman gave up his little home workshop and went into the factory, we entered upon a new period in the development of industry, the period of combinations—and we cannot avoid the consequences. In those early days of the new age when the machine threatened to take the very bread out of the mouths of their children the workers in desperation threatened to break the machine. They thought that this was the only way of attaining their end. They learned in later days that what they should have done was to have gained possession of the machine. Now there are those who fearful of the combinations, of the elaborate organization which has been set up on the basis of the physical machine, would try to break up the combinations, break up the elaborate organization. We take the ground that such a policy would be as fatal as the machine-smashing policy of

one hundred and fifty years ago. It is impossible for us effectively to break up these combines. The only possible thing for us to do if we want really effective action is to take hold of them and carry them one step further until we have such a complete combine that the public through its various organizations co-operative, municipal, provincial and federal, will be able to use it for its own purposes.

The Prime Minister said that in this age of competition combinations are necessary. I submit that if this can be called the age of competition it must be pointed out that it is competition of different groups and that constantly these competing groups tend to combine into larger units, so that after all the earlier age of individual competition has passed by. This is essentially the age of combination, and in so far as we still have competition it is indicative of incomplete development. It may be true that to-day we need combinations of the different warring groups; it is only because we are in the process of development, and we must inevitably face the formation of larger and yet larger combinations.

The Prime Minister says that he does not seek to prevent just combinations, but what does he mean by just combinations? Who is to decide what is just? I am not using the term just; that is the Prime Minister's term; I am not using the term unjust. The fact is that we have to deal with an existing institution, a combination, and we do not get very far by saying that it is just or that it is unjust. It is in its very nature a form of industrial organization which gives power to a limited group, and as the process goes on, the power becomes so great that the public welfare is threatened.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) said that he was desirous of eliminating useless competition. Again the whole question is raised as to what is useless competition or when competition may be useful. Are we not here again face to face with the fact that competition represents a transitory stage, and that we look forward more and more to combination, co-operation taking the place of competition. I take it that our stand on this question must be that competition is inevitable, and the Prime Minister and the government, however sincere in introducing a bill of this character, are attempting to do what is in reality impossible. I do not think there is any state in any part of the world that has attempted to curb the natural development of combinations that has found it was able to do so effectively. Probably the hon. member for Vancouver Centre showed sufficiently how difficult it is to administer legislation of this character. Inevitably as you try to curb combination you come into contact with others who are perhaps less advanced in their combination, and so conflict is sure to result. Our position is that combination is not only inevitable, but that the thoroughgoing regulation of it is futile. I should like to quote what is probably as good a statement of a popular criticism of the principle of the bill as could be found. The writer of this editorial, which was circulated throughout the West, is trying to show that arbitrary power would be given into the hands of the government through the registrar. He says:

> If the registrar is to have power to decide what is an unfair price it follows that he must have the authority to say what is fair price. This is the logical working out of the proposed act. Are the men and women who produce or sell potatoes, milk, bread, magazines and the thousand commodities that are in daily use prepared to have a government official set their prices for them?
>
> Is there a man to whom the public would be willing to hand over this power? Is it fair to any man to ask him to make decisions of this nature? What kind of a job would the registrar have? Are there such supermen in the country? If there are, might they not be employed in other and more consequential departments of the government service?

That sounds reasonable, but when we come to consider the situation as it is about us at the present time we shall have to confess that very small groups and, in some cases, single individuals do as a matter of fact decide what these prices shall be. I have known a good many towns where the price of milk is decided by one company. I have known a great many towns throughout the West where the price of meat is decided by one corporation. I think that nearly all of us can point to article after article where the price is decided by one individual, and the trouble is that to-day that individual is responsible to no one but himself or his company. He is not in any sense responsible to the public at large. If we are to have combinations, let us have combinations that we can control. Let us have combinations and let us appoint officials to administer them who will decide their policies with a view to the public interest.

The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) was very much afraid of having six people placed in a position where they could bring any charge or set in motion the machinery for having an investigation. Now it does seem to me that we need not worry about that. I take it that in other matters one individual can bring against another man a charge of the most serious nature. He can say that a man is suspected of being guilty of murder. If he has information that leads him to believe that, it

becomes his duty to give that information to the state. I do not know that most of us are in danger of being accused of murder because that course is open to any citizen. The fact is that if there are no abuses these charges are not likely to be laid. I do not object to the suggestion that was thrown out recently that we have these matters brought seriously before the public by way of an affidavit or something of that kind. But in any case the humblest individual in the state ought to be able to invoke the protection of the state against any of these big interests. I think I am voicing the opinion of a great many people when I say that to-day we are more afraid of the big combinations with all the prestige which they possess and all the money that is behind them than we are of the irresponsibility of a few individuals who perhaps for some private grudge might bring forward some charge that was baseless. After all, if the charge is baseless, provision is made in the bill whereby it can be investigated in a preliminary way by the registrar, before it goes on to a more thorough investigation. If the charge is baseless why should any firm or corporation fear the fullest and freest investigation? The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) would like also I believe, to take away the safeguards to labour which are contained in section 34. This section reads as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to combinations of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees.

That section is much along the line of existing legislation and simply seeks to protect the workmen from action which unfortunately has been taken sometimes in the past to prevent them from organizing. In the old days professional workers had a right to combine. No one ever questioned that right, and we have combinations of lawyers, doctors, newspaper men, authors, and so on. But when the workers some one hundred years ago, began to combine it was a different story. It was said they had no right to combine, no right whatever, and so later on certain special legislation had to be introduced to safeguard their interests. I should like to ask why the workers should not be allowed the fullest right to organize? That right is in fact guaranteed under the Peace treaty of Versailles. Why should they not have that right as much as business and professional men? We have the Canadian Manufacturers' Association—a great combination which is exercising a tremendous influence and very largely, I maintain, influencing the fiscal policy of this country. We have railway associations which, according to the reports of the recent commission, appear to have exercised their combination in such a way that there has been a very real restraint of trade. We have shipping combinations at the present time. We have a banking association which is distinctly a close corporation. We had even mentioned here on the floor of the House a newspaper combination. I cannot see why there should be any objection whatever to allow the fullest right to labour employees, of any class whatever, to combine and, in my opinion, if it is necessary to do so their interests ought to be effectively safeguarded.

There are one or two points in the bill which I should like to criticize, points which some have criticized from the opposite angle. The Prime Minister says that information, in connection with proceedings under the bill, will not be made public. I should like to ask why not? Why should there be any secrecy connected with these investigations? It seems to me that in such a provision we are, perhaps, going back to the ideals of an earlier state of industry when industry was essentially private and almost personal in its character. None of us want men to come into our homes and pry into our private affairs; but a great modern business is by no means a private enterprise. When there are a large number of people associated with it, it thereby becomes public, and the public have definite rights in regard to what is going on in connection with it. The Prime Minister said that publicity would do more than penalties to remove evils. I believe that is true. Why then should we not have the very fullest publicity in connection with this matter? In connection with this feature I was reminded of a treatment of this question which was given nearly ten years ago by ex-President Woodrow Wilson. May I be permitted to quote several paragraphs from his work "The New Freedom" which seem very pertinent to the point under discussion.

> We used to say that the ideal of government was for every man to be left alone and not interfered with, except when he interfered with somebody else; and that the best government was the government that did as little governing as possible. That was the idea that obtained in Jefferson's time. But we are coming now to realize that life is so complicated that we are not dealing with the old conditions, and that the law has to step in and create new conditions under which we may live, the conditions which will make it tolerable for us to live.
>
> Let me illustrate what I mean: It used to be true in our cities that every family occupied a separate house of its own, that every family had its own little premises, that every family was separated in its life from every other family. That is no longer the case in our great cities. Families live in tenements, they live in flats, they live on floors; they are piled layer upon

layer in the great tenement houses of our crowded districts, and not only are they piled layer upon layer, but they are associated room by room, so that there is in every room, sometimes, in our congested districts, a separate family. In some foreign countries they have made much more progress than we in handling these things. In the city of Glasgow, for example (Glasgow is one of the model cities of the world), they have made up their minds that the entries and the hallways of great tenements are public streets. Therefore, the policeman goes up the stairway, and patrols the corridors; the lighting department of the city sees to it that the halls are abundantly lighted. The city does not deceive itself into supposing that that great building is a unit from which the police are to keep out and the civic authority to be excluded, but it says: "These are public highways, and light is needed in them, and control by the authority of the city."

I liken that to our great modern industrial enterprises. A corporation is very like a large tenement house; it isn't the premises of a single commercial family; it is just as much a public affair as a tenement house is a network of public highways.

When you offer the securities of a great corporation to anybody who wishes to purchase them, you must open that corporation to the inspection of everybody who wants to purchase. There must, to follow out the figure of the tenement house, be lights along the corridors, there must be police patrolling the openings, there must be inspection wherever it is known that men may be deceived with regard to the contents of the premises. If we believe that fraud lies in wait for us, we must have the means of determining whether our suspicions are well founded or not.

I do not think there is anywhere a better statement of the character of modern industry and the necessity of having these big corporations wide open to public inspection. I do not see why we should talk any longer about business secrets; developments have carried us beyond that stage. The member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) in criticizing the bill said that combination ought to be considered a crime only when there is a combination to deliberately injure competitors. It strikes me, although I am not a lawyer, that that is rather a novel position. It would seem that in many departments of law injury does not have to be deliberate in order that it should be made a crime. Why, we have even such a phrase as "criminal neglect" to condemn people who under certain circumstances do not do anything at all; but it is recognized that they should do something. Now, if we have a combination that has the effect of injuring the community surely that is a good reason why that particular combination should be made a criminal one. I do not know a better statement of the case than was given by the Prime Minister himself when he said that private rights cease when they involve public wrongs. So then in each case we come back to the question as to whether any particular form or association is in the interests of the public or is contrary to their interests. We find that through the course of years, with no particular guilt on the part of any one, we have arrived at these great industrial, commercial, financial institutions which we call combines, mergers and trusts. I take it that we are not here to-night blaming the individuals who, perhaps, have had a larger share of initiative and have organized these big combinations. We are not saying that the combines should not have been organized. They probably represent a distinct step in advance of the old unorganized stage of society, the old free competition that used to exist fifty or a hundred years ago, but on the other hand no one can consider their social effects without realizing that they have placed in the hands of a very small group of individuals an immense power, not only in this country, but in all countries. There is to-day a life and death struggle as to whether the industrial, commercial and financial organizations that have grown up in the last hundred years will be supreme and control even our political organizations, or whether the political organizations which grew up under an earlier system of production, are going to adapt themselves with sufficient rapidity, and are capable of asserting their control over the newer industrial organizations which now rival them in power. I take it that to-night we are helping to decide that struggle. If this House is true to the people that it represents, it will definitely set itself to attack our great problems. I welcome this bill because it gives a certain measure of publicity, because it calls public attention to the evils which exist and to the necessity for further action. I cannot become tremendously enthusiastic about it, because it is negative in its character, it simply seeks to stem the inevitable incoming tide of greater combinations. I could hope that in some way we could recognize the good that lies in combinations, in the formation of larger industrial and social units, and that as a House we could begin in a democratic way, to operate these larger units.

Mr. ALBERT FREDERICK HEALY (North Essex): The constituency I represent, containing as it does somewhere in the neighbourhood of a hundred thousand people, has within its borders special manufacturers who, through the course of building up their business have fixed prices and claim that, in order to carry on their business in the way they have built it up, they must continue to fix prices. This bill, as I read it, does not say that the manufacturers must not fix a retail price, but it does say, in the words of the Prime Minister, that when they do fix that retail price, it must not be to the detriment of the general public. Now what is the present law on the

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

subject? In reference to the Board of Commerce Act of 1919 and the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1922 the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that both these acts were ultra vires. In reference to the bill before the House to-night, I hope the Prime Minister will ask the Deputy Minister of Justice to be sure that the proposed bill is not ultra vires of this parliament. It would be in my opinion a very grave injustice to the people of this country if after this bill was passed, and after many attempts to enforce it, the discovery should finally be made that this parliament had no right to pass such an act.

I agree absolutely with the general principles of this bill, but I do not agree altogether with the way that it may be enforced. In the district I represent we have large manufacturers who have built up their plants. I refer, for instance, to the Ford Company which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). I wish to thank them for advertising the constituency from which I come. Both of these hon. members paid a visit to that constituency during the last campaign. I am glad to say we will welcome them at any time. I hope that they will come and definitely settle in my constituency, but of course, I will not guarantee that they can come back here, representing that constituency. I wish to thank them for advertising the great Ford Company of Canada. This company, after twenty years' experience in business building up, that wonderful organization, and building up on a fixed policy of a resale price from the dealer to the public, have produced a manufacturing concern that to-day, using the highest-priced labour in the world, is turning out the lowest priced motor car in the British dominions, and they are further attempting to increase their production to such an extent that these two factors shall be brought closer together, and surely, Mr. Speaker, that is something worth working for, when the money made can be turned to the benefit both of the consumer and of the man who produces the article and supplies the labour.

So I think that concerns such as this,—and I have taken it as an example—are rather worried over the proposed legislation, which contemplates the appointment of so many registrars. The bill does not say that these registrars shall be experienced in law. As this bill stands at present, a registrar may be any amateur who is appointed by the minister. If we were to have the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the present Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) in power forever, I do not think this country would have much to fear from this provision. If the registrars are to do any work under this bill, if this bill is to be of any benefit to the country, they will have a large quantity of work to do, and we shall have to have registrars in all sections of Canada. There may be one in the Yukon, there may be one in Prince Edward Island; there may be one in British Columbia, and any six individuals in any one of these provinces, or, for that matter, in any city, can ask that, for instance, the company about which I am talking shall be investigated. I see in this bill nothing to prevent six individuals in each of a number of towns throughout the country, asking for an investigation of the same company at the same time. From the way in wihch this measure is drawn, I cannot see that a registrar would be justified in preventing such an investigation from going on in different parts of the country at the same time and of the same corporation. I can see that such registrars might arrive at different conclusions, and I can see that when the question came before the minister for final decision, he might be in a very serious frame of mind how he should decide. Therefore, if at all possible, these registrars and also the commissioners should be men trained in the law. I believe the people of this country and, in particular, of the province of Ontario are sick and tired of having regulatory laws put into force by amateurs. We in our constituency suffered terribly from amateurs attempting to put into force a certain law. The thing was a nightmare. This country is, perhaps, tired of anything that smacks of uplift legislation, anything that has a tendency to appear as muck-raking legislation.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) mentioned this afternoon a certain combination in this country, and I hope when this bill is put into force, one of the first combinations to be investigated will be the newspaper combination. I say that not with the idea at all of criticising newspaper men. I noticed that a partcular combination was spoken of, and I know it is a combination of about twenty-nine men who absolutely control the telegraphic news of this country. This combination was known as the Canadian Press, but I believe the name was changed. Not all the members of this newspaper association agree with its practice, because in a case that I was interested in a member of the association from Quebec, Mr. Gagnon—I have not the pleasure of knowing this gentleman —another member from Toronto, Mr. Irving

Robertson, and another member from London, Mr. Ford, stood out and said that they did not believe this association should take the stand they had taken in certain cases. This association, as I say, is a combination of about twenty-nine of the daily newspapers; the weekly newspapers are not in the combination, and they do not get the telegraphic news. This combination is and has been subsidized from year to year by the people of Canada to the extent of $50,000 per year, and this has been done under several governments. I am not quite satisfied that if we are going to pass legislation in restraint of combinations, the people of Canada should continue to subsidize any organisation which absolutely takes it upon itself to keep a newspaper out of any particular city or town. I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the House this combination, because I think it is an outstanding combination in this country that needs investigation. I am quite aware, of course, when I make these remarks about this association, that there is no doubt at all of what they will think of me; but when a man is appointed by the people to represent them in parliament, when he sees something that he thinks should be remedied, he should have no hesitation whatever in getting upon his feet and saying what he thinks about the matter.

I agree with the general principles of this bill. I believe manufacturers and business men are just as honest as any other class of citizens in this country. I suppose there are amongst manufacturers and business men the same proportion of crooks—perhaps no more and no less—as there are amongst professional men, newspaper men and farmers. Therefore, I believe it is necessary to have legislation to catch crooks wherever they are, and to punish crooks when they are caught.

If in the opinion of this government, it is necessary to have legislation in this form, I am willing to subscribe to it and to vote in favour of it. But I hope the Prime Minister may see his way clear, so that business concerns such as the one I have described, comprising those who are trying to specialize on certain articles, to increase production and to lower prices to the consumers, may, if possible, be left out of the investigations that may be necessary under this legislation. Unless investigation is absolutely necessary for the general welfare of this country, these concerns should not be bothered by any such inquiries as are provided for in this measure.

As regards the penalty clause, a corporation is only fined, and there is no opportunity of imprisoning the master mind of such an organization. If they are powerful and wealthy enough, a fine of $25,000 is not sufficient punishment, and in each of these organizations some officer should be made responsible who will take the gaol sentence, in case they are found guilty, just the same as any other porch-climber or burglar would go to gaol in case of an ordinary theft. This bill does not provide for any such punishment; it provides simply for a fine in the case of a corporation, and we all know how simple it is for a person to change into a corporation. That change can be effected under both provincial and federal law in a very simple manner, and then of course there is no one left to take the gaol sentence, and a little fine will settle all the trouble. I say "a little fine," because it is considered little to the interests concerned.

The point I want to make is this: If the law is necessary it should be made drastic enough to really punish the guilty; if it is not necessary it should not be placed upon the statute books. I agree that some such law is necessary, but I do not think it should be just in the form of this bill. I believe that the form of the bill can be changed in such a manner that legitimate business will not be worried, while combinations detrimental to the public interest will be punished. Another danger that may arise under this bill, as I said before, is the multiplication of officials. If it were possible to confine the administration of this proposed law to our courts, many of the objections as I see them would disappear.

In conclusion of these brief remarks, Sir, I wish to say that I do not think it is wrong for a man to attempt to criticize the form of proposed legislation the principle of which he is willing to support. When I entered public life one of the determining factors for my action was my absolute confidence in the Prime Minister and his cabinet and since I have been a member of this House I have seen and heard nothing to lead me to abate my confidence in the slightest degree. I still have the most absolute confidence that the Prime Minister is trying to do the very best he can for the people of this country, I also fully believe that the members of his cabinet are actuated by the same motives, and while I object to the form of this measure, if after due consideration by the Prime Minister and his cabinet they cannot see their way clear to amend its form, then, although I shall regret their inability to do so, I shall still subscribe to the general principle embodied in the bill and give it my support.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to offer

a few remarks on this measure. I do not intend to administer anything in the way of criticism of its provisions one by one. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, if I find myself unable to agree with the printed bill I will not be able to glorify its authors with the same meek humility and partisan credulity of some hon. members. I was indeed amused at the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler). He reviewed the measure, took one feature and then another, showed to his own satisfaction that they were wholly wrong, told us that the bill aimed at repressing evil and unjust combinations, but that its actual provisions had the effect instead, of repressing good combinations; but notwithstanding all that was wrong about the bill, he was quite certain that it proceeded out of a pure and holy source.

When the resolution was before the House I reviewed very briefly the history of our anti-combine legislation so called. I am going to ask the House to bear with me while I do so again, because although we may take this section and that section and say it does not read as if it would be effective, or that it does, yet we cannot get a comprehensive view of the real question we are discussing except in the light of the history of this legislation from the earliest times.

Hon. gentlemen talk of agreeing with the principle of this bill, and then end their speeches without the slightest indication of what they conceive the principle of the bill to be. I was indeed anxious to learn from the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Healy) what is this principle as to which he expresses such profound approval, in the presence of which he is going to vote for the bill, no matter what its form—in other words what its provisions may be. What is this sacred, sanctimonious principle?

Mr. HEALY: A square deal to everyone in this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, if such is the principle of the bill how is it that it does not do this for the hon. gentleman's constituents, the Ford Company?

Mr. HEALY: I believe it does in principle and in final result, but it is the form of putting it in operation that I criticize.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the difference about the form if the result is all right? Where does this kind of talk get us? I think it was Mr. Balfour who stated that the most foul smelling of platitudes was this continual talk about "a square deal and justice" with no reference to specific enactments.

This bill, to my mind, instead of being a measure seeking to get concrete results is a measure distinctly seeking to avoid them. I believe a recital of our legislation will show that wherever in the past we have had provisions that really stretched forth and caught somebody they are left out of this bill, but everything is here which is going to pile harassments, vexation and expense on legitimate business; that is all in the measure—investigation after investigation, circle after circle, but never any goal.

In 1888 parliament sought first to enact anti-combine legislation and a committee sat to work out some effective measure. It was passed in 1889, with amendments in 1892 and, I am inclined to think, a further amendment later, all of them as to the wording varying the original act in very slight form. The act of 1889 constitutes what is now clause 498 of our Criminal Code. In 1910 parliament enacted the Combines Investigations Act supplementary to that provision of the Criminal Code, which provision has been in our law ever since it was enacted in 1889.

The Combines Investigations Act had for its object the investigating of such institutions as six persons alleged to constitute a combine. "Combine" was defined, but not in the terms of this bill. The definition of the word in this bill I will deal with later. It is taken almost verbatim from the definition in a subsequent act. The Combines Investigations Act, however, proved to be aimless legislation, it proved to reach out to no real result.

Hon. gentlemen have spoken—the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), I remember particularly—about the law's delay, the procrastination of our courts, and he pleaded for a measure like this that gets at investigation in a simple way and, according to his idea, more expeditiously. Well, under the Combines Investigation Act, the provisions for investigation under which were much the same as this, there was only one investigation. Instead of being expeditious the investigation lived out the whole length of the dying days of one government and well through the young virility of the next and ended in nothing but mist. I refer to the investigation into the United Shoe Machinery Company. It provided for investigation, provided for the summoning of witnesses—all sorts of inquisition—and finally provided for a verdict. Then, if there was to be any punishment, if there was to be any injunction, if there was to be any variation of practice on the part of the "combinester," the whole process had to be gone over again

before the criminal courts. I have briefly defined the Combines Investigation Act. This act is not in every respect the Combines Investigation Act. I have at least given the whole result of that act; there was no other prosecution under it.

Before I proceed to the next piece of legislation let me remark this: There have been numerous prosecutions under our Criminal Code. Under what is now section 498 there have been numerous prosecutions in our criminal courts, successful prosecutions too; and what is more, there have been civil proceedings which have been determined upon the provisions of that section of the Criminal Code. I believe that section has been a comparatively effective and useful section, though I do not contend for a moment that it could not now be amended with advantage. I will refer to this sentence again later.

Now I have dealt with the initial legislation—section 498 as it is to-day; then the Combines Investigation Act in 1910. The next legislation was in the form of two bills passed in 1919, assented to on the 7th of July of that year, one of them the Combines and Fair Prices Act and the other the Board of Commerce Act. The Combines and Fair Prices Act defined a combine I think in every particular the same as it is defined here; if there is any change it is a very trifling change. The Combines and Fair Prices Act then proceeded on the assumption that combines were not necessarily against the public interest, were not necessarily wrong, might even be beneficial; and it proceeded to define the powers of a board in the way of curtailing the activities of wrong combines, altering their methods, preventing malpractice, and so forth. It proceeded to establish it as a crime for any company or any person to do what it was, after investigation, forbidden to do by that board. It stated as well that the being privy or party to a combine as defined by the act, was in itself a crime. The Board of Commerce Act covered another sphere, namely, the fixing of profits. What I want to emphasize as the outstanding provision of the Combines and Fair Prices Act is that it established a board with power to prevent and power to compel. It vested in that board the right to prevent any company or combination of companies, which had been established before it as carrying on practice detrimental to the public interest, from continuing those practices. Within that board rested the power to order them to do this, the power to order them not to do that. I do not think legislation in any country ever went further. Whether it went too far or not there is a difference of opinion. Those times, however, were different from these: then profits were being made; then business was extremely active—we are living in different times to-day. I am emphasizing this: that the Board of Commerce under the Combines and Fair Prices Act had effective and final power to deny certain practices existing or to compel certain things to be done necessary to compliance with the law and make the combination no longer against the interests of the public. Of course the Board of Commerce as well had power to exhibit its findings, its evidence, its returns, and its documents before the attorney general of any province, thereby inviting the attorney general, if he thought fit, to conduct prosecution within that province before the criminal courts.

We now come to this legislation. This legislation establishes a board, but the name is changed; there has been a rechristening. A man is to be appointed called a registrar, and then around him at different times and different places there may be appointed commissioners. For all practical purposes I think it is fair to say that the registrar corresponds with the chairman of the old Board of Commerce and that the commissioners correspond with the puisne commissioners of the Board of Commerce. They have certain powers; and what are those powers? Now, I want to address myself to those who, without, I think, very thorough inquiry into the measure, have assumed that there are some teeth in its provisions. What are the powers of these men? They have power to investigate, yes; they can investigate, in private, or in public if ordered by the minister. They can lay the result before the minister, and if the minister is not satisfied he can order them to make further inquiry, and presumably they go on and inquire again. If he is not satisfied with the next report he can order another inquiry and they can proceed around the circle once more. But after they have done all their inquiry, in public or in private; after all are completed, they cannot order anybody to do anything or to stop doing anything; they have no executive power. Those attributes which the Board of Commerce possessed, the functionaries erected by this legislation are stripped of altogether. Well, what can they do? They report to the minister and the minister can lay the facts before the attorney general of the province. The old Board of Commerce could do that, but the old Board of

Commerce could as well say what in the future should be right as respects a certain practice, what should be done and what should not be done. The functionaries erected here have no such power at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend, when he is speaking of the Board of Commerce, if he would tell the House what particular functions of the board were declared to be ultra vires of the federal parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am coming to that—and I will guarantee to come to it, too; I will not avoid it. They can expose the facts before the Attorney General as the old board could. There is this in addition—from memory I do not think it was in the Board of Commerce Act—that if the Attorney General of any province declines within three months to act, the Solicitor General himself may lay an indictment, on the relation, it says, of anybody over twenty-one years of age. I pause only to remark that the addition of that clause is pure surplusage, if indeed, I should not describe it as pure sham, for the reason that without any clause at all the federal Attorney General can lay an indictment, the Solicitor General can lay an indictment, can enter a prosecution. He does not need any clause of a new act to do that. May I remark once more before going further that all this power of inquiry that is supposed to be such a tremendous step in advance leads nowhere, that after it is through it does not end in anything, your registrar having no power to order anything done or to stop anything being done. But the whole of it could be done without any new statute whatever. It could be done under our Inquiries Act to-day. I repeat, there is not a single thing that may be done under this legislation that the government is not already competent to do under legislation that this House passed years ago.

Now, my hon. friend says—and perhaps this is as good a time as any to refer to the interjection—has it not been shown that in certain respects the Board of Commerce had power beyond the jurisdiction of this House to give? I admit that, and ask hon. gentlemen to reflect that the late government accused, for campaign purposes, of course, of being the ally of the interests and big business, in its legislation did not content itself with mere power of repetitive inquiry; it gave the board power to act, and gave it power even beyond the power of this parliament to give. That was our offence, if offence there was. But let us see just what was the effect of the Privy Council judgment. The Privy Council judgment, and I do not know that I am particularly competent to define its limits before this House—I will give it in my own words as I understand it—the Privy Council judgment really does not assail or impugn Part One of the Combines and Fair Prices Act. The Privy Council judgment in so far as it impugned the legislation aside from its criminal provisions stated that this parliament had not power to erect a board which would make regulations affecting trade and commerce merely locally, thereby invading the sphere of civil rights. In a word, when we are making regulations as to trade and commerce they must be general regulations, and any board we erect can only enact general regulations affecting the trade and commerce of the whole federal country. We cannot go into the milk business of a town. We cannot go into this special trade and apply regulations there which are really an invasion of civil rights. The Privy Council said more. It said: While you are doing that, getting into civil rights under the guise of trade and commerce law, while you are doing that you cannot validate your legislation by merely declaring that to violate your legislation is a crime. When you are in a sphere in which you should not be, you cannot make yourself right by declaring an offence against your legislation to be a crime. You canot use your criminal jurisdiction as a mere ancillary of what otherwise would be ultra vires legislation. So far the Privy Council went and no further.

Now I venture to suggest this: Within the limits of the Privy Council decision there is nothing at all to prevent the enactment of general regulations by this House or by any board created by this House affecting trade and commerce, and there is nothing to prevent the declaring anything to be a crime under our Criminal Code so long as we do not do it merely to establish the validity of some other legislation which really affects civil rights or invades some other sphere which we have no right to enter. Very well. I only observe this in conclusion on the constitutional phase. In so far as this legislation makes something a crime which is defined here—I refer now to section 26—it is at least very doubtful to my mind, and I say it with all deference to the Deputy Minister of Justice, whose opinion I would like to have read, it is very doubtful to my mind if that clause is within our constitutional powers; but I do not purpose to argue the point.

I want to argue this for the moment. We must have criminal legislation. We must

protect our rights to enact effective criminal legislation. I am glad to know that that right has not been in any way overthrown by the judgment of the court of appeal in Ontario in the Wholesale Grocers' case. I find on reading the judgment that it has not been. We must preserve our right to enact effective criminal legislation. Our section 498 is good legislation. Perhaps it can be improved. I venture to give this as my opinion: There is no use going any further unless after you have got your board you are going to give that board power to enforce its findings. If you attempt to go further than criminal legislation, by erecting boards to inquire into this, that and the other thing, you are only placing a sham before the people of this country unless you are prepared to go on and give that board power to enforce by general regulation of trade and commerce its own findings as a result of its investigations. This is exactly what this bill does not do. It pretends to go farther, but it only gets into investigation and inquiry, and when it is through with that it is nowhere. The board has no power to make good its findings, no power to enforce its rulings, to deny practices or to compel practices. In a word, it has no executive power at all. When the investigation is through the whole thing is through, and all that it can do is to expose the facts to the attorney general. All this might have been done under the Inquiries Act if such were worth while. But I venture to say again the Criminal Code provisions will be more practically useful left alone. Improve them if you will; make them wider if you will, but leave them there as Criminal Code provisions. Do not provide for an array of official and for mere investigation. The code will be more useful as it is than supplemented by an investigation. Why do I say that? Because I believe an investigation that has no punishment attached to it, no orders that can be enforced, instead of being a deterrent is really a buffer between the offender and punishment. It really gives a man a second chance. It gives him all the case of the prosecution, and thereby enables him to prepare his defence against the time when he gets into a court before which he may be punished. If I were the worst criminal in the country I would not want anything better than to have an investigation first, with all the cards of the prosecution on the table, and then to be given my chance before an effective tribunal after. I would think the criminal far more likely to be punished if the prosecution had the same rights as he and all went to the criminal courts together. That would be more likely to lead to effective punishment. It is more likely at least that there would be a verdict of guilty.

In the United Shoe Machinery case I venture to say that if an indictment had been laid under the code in the first place there would have been infinitely greater chance of success than there was after all this circuitous investigation followed by an indictment later on. The United Shoe Machinery Company were made aware of all that was complained about, of all the arguments of the prosecution. They were made aware of everything they had not to do if they wanted to avoid prosecution, and all they had to do was to make this little change or that and all would be right. It will be the same under this bill. We will have investigations; we will have all sorts of vexatious inquiries. We will have burdens and expense put on business, but we will not have any real restraint. We will not have any effective curtailment of what are declared to be practices to the detriment of the public interest.

I want to try to make a little clear something that I was arguing a moment ago. I put it this way: I do not believe that this definition of a combine, as contained in section 2, is of any value whatever to the purposes of a real prosecution afterwards. It is of value if you have a board which has power to declare what is right and what is wrong and to prevent what is wrong being done. If you have that it is all right. Now let us see. This definition of a combine admits that combines may be good and they may be bad. A bad combine, it says, is one which operates against the public interest. Very well. A board investigates and finds that such and such a practice is against the public interest and therefore it is a bad combine. All well and good. If that board then has power to say "You cannot do that any longer" well and good. The old act said that; the Combines and Fair Prices Act said that; and the board said to the company "You cannot do it any longer" and if the company did it again then it was a crime per se; it was a crime to disobey the orders of the board.

Now, I come to apply this definition to this legislation. The definition, let me repeat, says: "A combine is a combine by business interests that works to the detriment of the public" and it adds "to consumers, to producers and others." It is a combine that works to the detriment of the public and it is undertaken to find out whether such is the case or not. Wherever a registrar finds out that it is he so reports to the

minister. The minister agrees and then what happens? The matter then goes, or may go, to the criminal court; it canot go anywhere else, the registrar not having the power to stop it or make an issue of the case at all. If it is his opinion that this is a combine which works to the detriment of the public the case goes before the court. The court does not follow the opinion of the minister or the registrar, not at all. You must then convince the court that this is a combine which works to the detriment of the public. The fact that the minister and the registrar have been convinced does not get you anywhere at all. It may be their opinion; it may not be the opinion of the judge, and if it is not, not only has the prior investigation resulted in nothing but even if all the facts disclosed were correct the whole thing is a futility.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my right hon. friend say that if the commissioner has reported that the combination, for example, has been taking advantage of the tariff that the Governor in Council may not then proceed either to reduce the tariff or eliminate it altogether?

Mr MEIGHEN: I am very glad the Prime Minister mentions that. I intend to refer to it but I do not want to get away from the point I am at until it is clear. The bill as brought down said that a combination was something that was detrimental to the public in the opinion of the registrar. Those words are now omitted. I do not see that it makes much difference because what is left in the bill really amounts to the same effect anyway. The registrar if convinced that there is a combine which is detrimental to the public will report to the minister. Presumably the minister will be convinced of the fact as well, and they expose the facts, we will say, to the attorney general. The very same facts come before the court and the judge does not need to be affected in the least by the opinion of the minister or the opinion of the registrar. He may feel that that combination is not detrimental to the public, and consequently, even though all the facts are correct and even though the company goes there and admits the whole thing, there will not necessarily be any conviction at all. There is just as likely to be a conviction if there had been no investigation whatever. I think there was a greater likelihood of a conviction because the accused person would not have the advantage of knowing the whole case of the prosecution in advance. Consequently an analysis of the proposed legislation convinces me that it is futile and a sham, as such legislation necessarily is, unless it empowers the registrar, the board, or whatever authority you may provide, to determine what is right and what is wrong, and to prevent what is wrong and to order what is right.

Now the Prime Minister says "Yes, but here is a clause that gives the Governor in Council power to wipe away the protective tariff, to wipe away the duty that protects the industry." He might have added "Here is another clause that gives it power to cancel a patent." But these are all in the statutes now, perhaps not worded exactly the same but the wording can be changed. One is in the Tariff Act. The other is in the Patent Act or in the Tariff Act. The government could have acted upon those. For that matter it is in the Combines and Fair Prices Act which is the law of the land to-day; we do not need a new statute to put that clause through. Competent legislation already exists in the Combines and Fair Prices Act which is the law of the land to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is declared ultra vires.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not that section—and in the Tariff Act. You do not need all this preliminary investigation travelling over territory again and again. Let me repeat: All this legislation is simply running in a circle. It is another circle you have to go round; it is just another stump round which you can chase the flat-footed fiend of monopoly. It is nothing more and nothing less.

The Prime Minister argued, both in introducing the resolution and in his speech on the second reading to-day, that now the criminal code provisions cannot be put into effect because the Board of Commerce Act—I think it was the Combines and Fair Prices Act though—says there shall be no prosecution under the code save with the consent of the Board of Commerce. He says there is no Board of Commerce, consequently there can be no prosecution. In that he is right. But you do not need all this machinery to get over that difficulty. If he does not like the Board of Commerce Act let him repeal it. Repeal the Board of Commerce Act, then the code is there clear and in full effect. Also the Prime Minister has his tariff clause, his patent clause; he has everything except this cumbersome machinery expensive to business, provocative to business, burdensome to business, harassing and vexatious. He has everything except some worthless machinery and the power to appoint a whole army of officers the exercise of which can only have one result, namely, to reward the faithful of his party.

Now, I suggest that the Prime Minister may strengthen his criminal code provisions if he desires. It is quite possible—indeed I think it is likely—that the experience of the years would enable us now to make wider and better the provisions in the criminal code. I think in the criminal code we ought to say what is wrong and what is right. Let us make a clear definition so that men will know what is wrong and what is right, because unless we do we really do not get the effective results. Having done that take ample power to throw off the duties, take ample power to cancel patents; and when the Prime Minister has that, he has everything that is required. If he feels that he ought to go further there is only one way of doing so, there is only one way that is of any value, and that is to give to the board that makes inquiry power to give effect to the findings. If the Prime Minister does that he will really be giving teeth to his legislation. I am not urging him to do it. I do not want to be misunderstood at all—I am disposed to believe that in the present state of business in this country there is no immediate need of a drastic provision of that kind—but unless he does that his legislation is a sham, it is simply circuitous circumlocution, and is a positive burden and expense to business. Consequently, I do not feel that I need bow before the principle of this legislation. Its principle is simply to erect offices and to appoint officers to fill them, but to end up with the supposed culprit given a second chance, a better chance than he would have had if there had not been this legislation.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): I am under some obligation to the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) who appeared anxious this afternoon to ascertain where the Minister of Labour stood in regard to this particular legislation. I think therefore it would be entirely improper if I did not allow my position to be known. I think also that my position in regard to this particular legislation should be known, from the fact that my hon. friend for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) seemed to refer somewhat disparagingly to the intent underlying this particular bill which is now before the House, and he seemed, as I understood, to imply that if the House could not, in accordance with his views, deal directly and entirely with the cause that they should not undertake in any way to deal with or regulate the effect. That was the understanding which I gathered from my hon. friend's remarks. For the information of my hon. friend for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) may I say that some three years ago I intimated where I stood in regard to combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers detrimental to the interest of the public in Canada. I said:

> Business men living under the protection of the tariff have got to know each other so well that price fixing agreements, and all sorts of agreements and arrangements, are the rule rather than the exception. * * * Not all of these are reasonable or proper * * * The public, unorganized as the sands by the sea, requires a protector against the super-organization of modern business.

I stand here to-night to gladly re-affirm my continued belief in that declaration, and to indicate to my hon. friend for York-Sunbury and others who are inquiring that I stand exactly in the same position to-day as to what should be done in regard to unfair combines, monopolies, trusts or mergers. I would not, however, Mr. Speaker, have one hon. member in this House draw the conclusion from anything I might say that all combines, all so-called monopolies, all price fixing arrangements, and all re-sale price arrangements are detrimental to the interests of the public. I do not believe any such thing. I have not believed that was the case, and, believing as I do, I regard this legislation as drafted generally, with some slight amendments that were suggested by the Prime Minister to-day, as legislation that will not and should not in any way embarrass any business, any combination or any resale price arrangement that is in the interest of the public. But I think, on the other hand, that any combinations, or price fixing arrangements or monopolies that are not working in the public interests know it full well to start with. My experience, if it has been worth anything to me in matters of this kind, is that they know full well that they are exacting the pound of flesh and that they are going beyond reasonable limits in certain cases in exacting unfair prices, or in imposing unfair arrangements on the people of this country. My hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), in his opening remarks, referred to the fact that he was not a lawyer, and that therefore he could not deal with this legislation or with combines legislation as a lawyer. He indicated to the House that he was an accountant, and as such would deal with this legislation. Well, I will crave the same privilege by dealing with this legislation as a brakeman, with some knowledge of what the people of Canada desire and demand in respect to a discontinuance of some of the combines that have throttled the prosperity and advance-

ment of Canada generally in the years gone by, and that may be in evidence at this present moment.

Mr. BAXTER: What are they?

Mr. MURDOCK: That would appear to be a consistent thing for some one properly authorized under the law to investigate and determine, without either my hon .friend who inquires "what are they," or myself passing a snap judgment.

Mr. BAXTER: May I ask the minister if it is the case that he does not know a single instance of a combine in Canada today that ought to be repressed by law? Will he take that position?

Mr. MURDOCK: My firm and positive conviction is that there are several combines in Canada to-day that should be regulated.

Mr. BAXTER: Will he name them?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The sugar combine.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not at present sufficiently familiar with the sugar question to advise.

Mr. HANSON: What about Dominion Textile?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend for Vancouver Centre started in on section 2, of the proposed bill No. 54, and expressed great surprise and interest as to what the words "or others" meant. He appeared to argue—and I think other hon. members have also argued since—that surely the words "consumers and producers" were sufficient, and that the words "or others" were not necessary. It may be of interest to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre to know that those words are copied identically from the act of 1919 which was passed and placed upon the statute book of Canada by him and his associates when they were in power, and it appeared at that time to be necessary that this language should be used—

> The expression "combine" is used in this act with intended relation to articles of commerce, and it shall be deemed to have reference only to such combines immediately hereinafter defined, as, with relation as aforesaid, have in the opinion of the Board of Commerce of Canada * * * operated, or are likely to operate, to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, consumers, producers or others.

Now, the Combines Act of 1910 did not contain that provision, but in 1919 the government in power, when they were placing on the statute book a law that was heralded broadcast from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast as the last word in protection for the consuming public of Canada, proceeded to place in that section the words "or others," and let me, as one lay gentleman to another, give my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre my version of why those words "or others" are there. It came to my attention some two or three years ago that these words "or others" were very necessary on account of the business in which such "combinesters" were engaged, that if those words "or others" were not there, they would be able, with legal advice, to prove conclusively that they were neither a producer of the thing they were combined to deal in, nor a consumer of that particular thing, and that therefore, the words "or others" were necessary there to include them and every citizen of this Dominion. That is the view of one layman to another in answer to the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. STEVENS: I never asked any such question, and I never argued along the line my hon. friend is arguing. He apparently did not listen to my argument at all.

Mr. MURDOCK: I listened very carefully and patiently to my hon. friend, and I distinctly recall his insistent inquiry why it was necessary to include the words "or others" after the words "consumers, producers." The hon. member for Vancouver Centre undertook to show that this bill was somewhat absurd, because it might be regarded as tending to make a crime out of incorporation and combination for the benefit of the public. I differ entirely with that view, because if we read carefully clause 2 of the proposed bill, it is conclusively shown that only such combinations as are working or conducting their business detrimentally to the interest of the public, need have any fear from the operation of this particular bill. Intimations have come in considerable number from certain, I think, reputable business individuals and representatives of various associations, indicating the belief that something of this sort is needed that will stabilize and clearly define the status of a combination, of a price-fixing arrangement, or of a so-called monopoly that is first, last and all the time working in the interest of the public and giving to the public service at a minimum of cost, and that something is also needed to protect the public from the other sort that is not working in the interest of the public.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In order to make a firm punishable, or the members of a combine punishable, who is to decide that their conduct is detrimental to the interest of the public?

Mr. MURDOCK: The court, and I am coming to that if my right hon. friend can

possess his soul in patience for only a few minutes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does this bill do to hasten the prosecution?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am coming to that if—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is right at it.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my right hon. friend can give me only a little time, I will try to get to that in fair order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is at it now.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not in great disagreement with the underlying cause, as defined or suggested by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), of the things to deal with which we are now here to determine ways and means. I am not in any particular disagreement with him as to what is causing, or what has in a large measure caused some of the things that we are endeavouring, if we can, to provide ways and means to remedy but I must entirely disagree with the thought that it is not proper, because we cannot go right to the root and at the moment do away with the underlying cause, that we should take any steps whatsoever to minimize the effect that is ever present with us to some extent throughout the length and breadth of Canada. There are in effect in Canada to-day conditions that we must for the time being deal with and make provision to deal with, and I now come to what some of my hon. friends have referred to as the "wooden gun" legislation that has been on the statute books of Canada in this respect for some time past. Hon. gentlemen opposite, not only one, but I think, several especially commencing with the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) laid stress upon the fact that the Criminal Code was amply sufficient to protect consumers and producers from all the ills that might come from the formation of an improper combine. My hon. friend must surely know that the Criminal Code is not ready for use to the hand of any consumer or producer in Canada, and it has not been so during the past two or three years.

Mr. MANION: Will my hon. friend permit me to correct him? I did say that; but I added with the addition of necessary amendments. I pointed that out very distinctly and I think my hon. friend will admit that.

Mr. MURDOCK: I accept my hon. friend's statement, although I took down right, as I thought, from his lips, the words "legislation unnecessary as Criminal Code sufficient". I now understand that he meant that the Criminal Code would be sufficient when it was fixed up and put into shape, and when the Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919 were, to all intents and purposes, repealed. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) shakes his head. The word "repeal" from a layman is wrong. They did not repeal section 498 of the Criminal Code, but they made it impossible for any citizen of Canada to utilize section 498 of the Criminal Code against any combine, monopoly, trust or merger in Canada. My right hon. friend will, of course, say that there is still the Inquiries Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I say that all the government has to do, if it does not like the Combines and Fair Prices Act, is to repeal it, and then the Criminal Code is restored in all its original force.

Mr. MURDOCK: I realize, if we can only clear away the driftwood that has been obstructing the vision of the consuming public for the last two or three years, we shall be able to get something that will put fear into the minds of these combines and monopolies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member has said many a time that the Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act constituted a "wooden gun" against monopolies. Will he cite a single new power that the registrars or commissioners are to have under this bill that the old Board of Commerce did not have? He knows that the old board had powers that the registrars and commissioners do not have. Will he mention one power that the Board of Commerce did not have, that the registrars are going to have.

Mr. MURDOCK: The laughable farce or misfortune of the old Board of Commerce Act was the fact that the Board of Commerce had ostensibly entirely too much power. That was the trouble, a power that citizens of Canada high and low could not see the consistency of giving to any board. What power? Power to make an inquiry, power to order an investigation, power to determine guilt, and power up until the time that the criminal was sent along branded to the judge to be sentenced. Entirely improper. The people of Canada very naturally, I think, rebelled at it. Surely it would have been amply sufficient, as contemplated by the measure now under discussion, if that Board of Commerce or another board had had authority to investigate, to look into the

allegations that were made against some combine or price-fixing or resale agreement and to determine whether in its opinion such alleged monopoly or agreement was of substantial and material benefit to the consuming and the producing public; or if it was against their interests; and if found to be the latter to refer the case to a court of competent jurisdiction, such as we have throughout the length and breadth of Canada, to adjudicate and assess the guilt and penalty. That as I see it, and, speaking only as a layman, was the great mistake of the Board of Commerce legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that not mean that instead of the Board of Commerce being a wooden gun it was a machine gun that shot too often.

Mr. GRAHAM: It kicked oftener than it shot.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend is correct in that statement —that is just what would have happened had it not been arranged otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what the arrangement was and who it was with? I am asking him to establish it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You are asking too many questions altogether.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have been intimating to my right hon. friend for the last three years that I would be only too happy to get into the business of establishing some of that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now is your chance. Start right at it.

Mr. MURDOCK: Bravado at this late date, though, does not change the circumstances of what happened in 1920.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I understand by bravado is the saying of something of which the hon. gentleman has no proof. I ask him now to establish his proof. I ask him especially to appoint a Board of Inquiry under the Inquiries Act. He is a member of the government now.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Another commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Appoint a commissioner to go into the facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They laugh. Their colleague alleged—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He alleged that the members of the then government were holding his hand.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is in office to-day—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You do not like it. He is in office to-day and I ask him to establish his allegation.

Mr. MURDOCK: I did not allege; I stated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now make it good.

Mr. MURDOCK: I intimated then that I would be glad indeed to undertake to show what was and what was not done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now is the time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MURDOCK: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You are not getting on very fast.

Mr. MURDOCK: Now, Mr. Speaker, while my right hon. friend dealt with the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919 to some extent, I think it should be dealt with more specifically in order to show just—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Just what?

Mr. MURDOCK: —in order to show that we have not had in Canada, as alleged repeatedly in the late campaign and at various other times, any legislation on the statute books since the Board of Commerce was annulled to deal with a combine, a monopoly or anything of the kind, nothing that a common man could take advantage of, that the plain people—shall I say to use a term favoured by some of my hon. friends?— that the plain people could take advantage of, and now at this particular time when we ask for the enactment of bill No. 54, which provides for the appointment of a registrar whose duty it will be to receive any complaints that are made by the plain people or by the other people of Canada against so-called combines, monopolies, trusts or mergers, we are told by my right hon. friend and his colleagues to go ahead and put some shims under the Criminal Code and fix it up so as to make it fill all necessary purposes. In effect, to you, Mr. Little Retail Grocer, or you Mr. Section Man, or you Mr. Brakeman, or you Mr. Logger in some part of Canada, what does that mean? It means making an

expensive and cumbersome arrangement hidden in the criminal code that will prevent you in a hundred years, unless you are more financially successful than you have been, from getting into court to prosecute a combine, monopoly, trust or merger, from getting anywhere or receiving any consideration in regard to the things that you allege against some concern that is working detriment to you and the other people of Canada. That is what my hon. friend and some of his associates want to perpetuate, an arrangement in the criminal code that cannot be taken advantage of by the ordinary man, that is available for the big interests, for the wealthy at least as they desire, but that will mean nothing, because too expensive, to the ordinary citizens of Canada, whether producers or consumers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. gentleman really mean by that anyway? The criminal code is invocable—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will hon. gentlemen not permit a correction? The criminal code is invocable by merely laying information, and it is the duty of the attorney general to prosecute. That does not cost the informant anything. This is very expensive to him; the other costs him nothing if the attorney general does his duty.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Speaker, I quite realize that what my right hon. friend states is what should be; but unfortunately I declare that it is not what is in effect, and I think my right hon. friend knows, and outside of this House would agree, how impossible it would be for some individual—yes, or for six individuals, to get consideration of any suit that they might undertake to institute against some alleged combine, monopoly, trust or merger.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman know an instance—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman know an instance of anyone laying a charge under the section of the code where the Attorney General refused to prosecute at the public expense?

Mr. MURDOCK: To-night I am not criticizing any Attorney General in regard to any particular case. I have not in mind, I may say frankly, any particular case where that developed. I do know, though, as I am sure my right hon. friend knows, that under all too many conditions, the provisions of the Criminal Code are not available for the purposes of the representations of the poor man, especially where, banked against the aims and endeavours thus contemplated, are, possibly, great sums of money protecting the concern that it is proposed to prosecute.

Another point that was very much stressed by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, the hon. member for Fort William and others was with regard to the one-man representation, which was referred to as unfair and inconsistent. On the opening of this debate to-day the Prime Minister indicated that the one-man arrangement was going to be changed and that an amendment was to be proposed to make it necessary, as in the 1910 act, for six persons to indicate their belief that a combine exists. The act of 1910, which was repealed by the government of my right hon. friend, provided that where six or more persons, British subjects resident in Canada and of full age, were of the opinion that a combine existed, that prices had been enhanced or competition restricted, they might make the necessary representation, But when it came to 1919 and the present leader of the Opposition and his colleagues were fixing up legislation that was to be heralded and broadcasted as the real thing in combine hunting, it was provided in section 6 that any British subject resident in Canada and of full age who was of the opinion that a combine existed or was being formed might apply in writing to any member of the board except the Chief Commissioner for an order, and so on. I want to remind my hon. friends opposite that the safeguard contained in the 1910 statute against the possibility of some individual, for spite or any other reason, making a charge against some concern, was regarded by them as unnecessary; one man was thought sufficient. And now, because in the first text of the bill as brought down one man is specified, my hon. friends lay emphasis on the fact that is in their opinion, improper. I agree that six would be very much better.

One hon. gentleman suggested that the act contemplated the appointment of registrars here and there and everywhere throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Surely the bill must have been hurriedly read if that opinion was gained from it; nothing of the kind is contemplated. The act provides for the appointment of a registrar—one registrar—whose duty will be to receive representations that may be made from time to time indicating the belief of certain individuals that a combine, a monopoly, a resale price fixing arrangement is in effect or about to be put into effect. And when the registrar re-

ceives a complaint of that kind, it is his duty so to proceed as to demoralize and disorganize business? Not by any means. He will read what is conveyed to him as the view of those making the representations, and then, in a quiet and orderly way, he will make inquiries to ascertain what are the actual facts. We have had in Canada since 1906 a registrar of boards of conciliation and investigation under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. That registrar does not authorize the formation of a board in the case of every application made therefor. It has been found in something more than one hundred cases since the passing of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act that the application for a board was based on an improper understanding or ill-founded claim on the part of the applicants, and they have been so advised. The public very seldom know anything about these decisions of the registrar; the correspondence is usually conducted between the parties making the application and the registrar. The registrar, at least at times, consults with the minister to ascertain his view or the view of the government in the matter. In Bill No. 54 exactly the same function is proposed in the appointment of one registrar located in or close to the office of the minister, where he will receive complaints that are made, analyze them and determine whether there is anything in them. He can go to the extent of asking for documents, requesting information, quietly investigating without any thought or intention or desire to disrupt or disorganize business, but only with the view of ascertaining the actual conditions in connection with the business in question, to secure such information for the purpose of conveying it to those who have complained that an improper condition exists. What is fairer than that? What can be more regular or orderly in the matter of stabilizing any legitimate business that is liable to have the charge hurled against it that it is a combine or monopoly and that its operations in that respect are detrimental to the public? Then, if the registrar believes after quiet inquiry that some things in the complaint are not satisfactorily answered, the act provides that a commissioner can be appointed—presumably someone amply qualified to analyze and investigate thoroughly, in fact, to understand, the particular business or concern that is to be investigated—a commissioner presumably amply qualified to deal with the subject that is to be brought under investigation. The commissioner proceeds to that investigation. He takes such means as the act provides to bring out all the facts which the producers and consumers of Canada are entitled to ascertain if there is as alleged a combine or any other business arrangement that is detrimental to the consumer and the producer. He brings out all that information and then makes his report.

My right hon. friend objects right at that point. After the commissioner has ascertained all that it is possible for the lay mind to ascertain—because the act does not provide that a lawyer must have the job every time a commissioner is to be appointed, or say that there are not business men throughout the length and breadth of Canada experienced in all lines of industry who may be just as capable of determining business conditions in effect as a lawyer—after the commissioner has analysed from every standpoint the conditions alleged and has decided that there is in his judgment some arrangement in effect that is not in the interest of producers and consumers and has made his report, what more logical arrangement, what more consistent with British justice could be suggested than that the culprit believed to have instituted a combine, monopoly, trust or merger should be brought before a court of competent jurisdiction anywhere throughout the length and breadth of Canada to plead his case, as he would have a right to do, before a jury of his peers? They decide on the facts presented, and then the judge on the bench determines in accordance with the provisions of this act the penalty to be applied if the verdict is guilty. That is where the Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act fell down. In the first place it undertook, the way it worked out, to make a judge out of a brakeman without any legal experience, to assess penalties, to define crime and say what should be done. This act proceeds in a more orderly way. It recognizes the courts of competent jurisdiction in Canada to-day, and as quietly and as unobtrusively as possible—I repeat that—as quietly and as unobtrusively as possible provides for a preliminary inquiry by the registrar and the commissioner. Why not? Why does some hon. gentleman talk of secret diplomacy and suggest that a secret inquiry should not be made? Is it not reasonable to act on the assumption that the registrar, yea, and the commissioner, when appointed may find that there was nothing sufficiently tangible upon which to base a claim of improper conduct against some particular combine? Why should that particular concern, if things are being done on the level and in the interest of consumer and producer, if fixing resale prices, for instance, in the interest of the consumer, if we want to deal fairly, why should

it be necessary to herald this preliminary investigation from the housetops until the case finally comes to a court of competent jurisdiction for determination? I do not mean, Mr. Speaker, to imply that there will be no notoriety whatsoever before the case gets into court, but I do mean to suggest that to be fair to all concerned there should be as little notoriety as possible given to the preliminary investigation by either registrar or commissioner, for the simple reason that their investigation as contemplated is only preliminary and the concern itself is to have its day in court in the final analysis to show whether it is guilty or innocent of the charge alleged, and which either the registrar or the commissioner may believe. There is no question at all about the final investigation before a court of competent jurisdiction being given sufficient notoriety.

I have, Mr. Speaker, three more pages of references to the remarks of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and as I do not wish to take up any more time tonight I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and the debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Tuesday, May 8, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

The House resumed from Monday, May 7, the debate on the motion of the Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King for the second reading of Bill No. 54, to provide for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in proceeding further with the discussion of Bill No. 54, I would like to refer briefly to what would appear to be a studied campaign which has been carried on in various parts of Canada during the past few weeks to discredit the provisions of the bill. Almost invariably hon. members who have discussed this measure from the opposition benches have, in respect to claims and contentions made, found refuge in that campaign of, I think, entire, but I hope not deliberate, misrepresentation. I want to refer to some of the statements that have been made in that connection. Here is one coming from the jurisdiction of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) which says:

> The Criminal Code of Canada, in one of its sections, has penalties which fit the crimes, known as trusts, mergers and combines, whenever these are in restraint of trade, and does it in a much simpler way than the Premier's bill, as well as providing heavy penalties. It should be sufficient for the purposes without the enactment of legislation that will handicap trade and make burdensome interference with the conduct of private business. The great objection to his bill is that it is wholly inquisitorial, and that "any person resident in Canada of the full age of twenty-one who is of opinion that a combine exists, or is being formed," may start an investigation which, on mere suspicion will subject business men to no end of trouble and expense.

There is a wholesome truth in the old saying that a half truth is worse than a falsehood. Then, we come to another one from the jurisdiction of my hon. friend for London (Mr. White), which says:

> One curious clause makes it illegal to fix a resale price.

It is not true, but it gets over in an editorial just the same.

> In other words, a manufacturing firm which does a national business and advertises from end to end of Canada its products at one price could not fix this price.

Nothing in the bill suggests the accuracy of that statement, unless it could be conclusively shown that the fixing of that price was a detriment to the public, to the consumer, to the producer. Then, this same article pays me a compliment by saying:

> That bold trust-buster, Hon. James Murdock, the Minister of Labour, has machinery he needs now if he will only make use of it.

An absolutely unqualified misstatement of fact, as every hon. member familiar with the legislation which has for some time been on our statute books, knows. Yet that kind of bunk gets over from the Opposition press, and, may I say without disrespect, is parroted by hon. gentlemen from the Opposition benches.

Then, we have another one. Listen to this: It comes from not very far distant:

> The process, too, is simple, the laying of an information before a competent magistrate puts the accused on their defence, creates the opportunity for bringing out the facts, and if there has been guilt, provides adequate punishment. The government bill is of a type that appeals to those who confound fuss with efficiency and noise with progress.

That listens very nicely, to the uninitiated, but it does not fool any hon. member or any other citizen of Canada? Who ever dreamed for a moment of the feasibility of his approaching some magistrate and suggesting that there was a combine detrimental to him or to other consumers or producers, and then

getting proper redress at the hands of the court? All hon. gentlemen know how far he would get. One thing these editorials and various others that might be quoted overlook is the fact that the provisions of the criminal code dealing with combines have been useless since the days when my right hon. friend and his colleagues took good care to make the Combines Investigation Act moribund and of no effect. It has been impossible, therefore, to use the provisions of the criminal code, section 498, in dealing with the most dreaded or contemptible combine that might exist in Canada.

Mr. IRVINE: Would the minister care to state from which papers those editorials were taken?

Mr. MURDOCK: British Columbian, New Westminster, B.C., London Free Fress and the Montreal Gazette.

Mr. CARROLL: What are their politics?

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) will pardon two or three additional references to the statements which he made in his speech on this subject I should like to deal first with this. The hon. gentleman said:

> Now I turn to what is my chief criticism of the bill, that in effect it declares to be a crime that which is, without question ordinary, sound business sense.

With my hon. friend I agree and am ready to assume that condition prevails so far as the great majority of combinations existent in Canada to-day are concerned, and I am ready to charitably assume that many of those combinations are not combines carrying on their operations to the detriment of the public whether consumers or producers, but I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that Professor Alfred Marshall, the leading economist in the world, stated in Principles of Economics at page 447:

> But perhaps the public show too much indulgence to those who argue that a trade combination or a trust is the only means available for securing reasonable steadiness of prices.

Then my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre went on to argue at considerable length as to what might happen to certain dairy industries, and I want to remind him of some of his previous views in that regard. The exact statement of the hon. gentleman was:

> It was shown beyond all peradventure that the Ottawa Dairy, while a distinct monopoly under this clause, did operate in the interest of the public.

Let us read the record to see what was the trend of the hon. gentleman's mind when that particular inquiry was being made. At page 304 of the examination of Alderman W. Guertin, before the Special Committee on the High Cost of Living, I find this:

> By Mr. Devlin.
>
> Q. Do you know anything about the Producers' Milk Company?—A. Yes, they endeavoured to lower the price of milk in Ottawa.
>
> Q. When did they go into business?—A. About 7 or 8 months ago.
>
> Q. This spring?—A. Not this spring, 7 or 8 months ago. That would be last year.
>
> Q. Had the fact of their going into business and putting teams in the streets delivering milk the effect of reducing the price?—A. We found that the fact of their going into competition was reducing the cost of milk. The manager was telling me that they were going—
>
> Q. We will not mind hearsay evidence, but from your own personal examination by how many cents was there a drop in milk?—A. There was a drop, through competition of two cents—three cents I should say because the Ottawa Dairy started by lowering to 11 cents, then the Producers retaliated by lowering to 10 cents, then it was lowered to 10 cents.
>
> Q. What is it now?—A. 10 cents.
>
> Mr. Stevens: You are a mighty lucky city. It is fifteen or sixteen cents elsewhere.

Which would almost convey to the uninitiated or casual reader that there was an expression of regret in the hon. gentleman's language that the traffic was not being made to carry all that it would bear.

I desire now to make some further references to the speech of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. One of his statements was:

> Everything is here which is going to pile harassments, vexation and expense on legitimate business; that is all in the measure,—investigation after investigation, circle after circle, but never any goal.

That was the summing up of the right hon. gentleman in regard to this particular measure. Then he goes further and reviews anti-combine legislation, and states that in 1888 parliament first sought to enact anti-combine legislation and apppointed a committee to work out some effective measure. I assume that that is justification for believing that the right hon. gentleman conceives that there has been as far back as 1888 the necessity for dealing with combines detrimental to the public interest. I happen to have in my hand a copy of the budget speech of 1878, and I find printed as an appendix to that budget speech some illuminating evidence as to conditions in those years gone by, indicating that there was even at that time marked necessity on this North American continent to deal with combines detrimental to the public interest. This appendix refers to an extract from the message delivered by the Governor of the state of New York to the legislature of that state at Albany in 1878. I read a portion of it to show just what it is

the public has been complaining of, and what it is believed this particular Bill No. 54, will to a very substantial extent protect the public from. After noting one of the causes of the currency inflation in the States the governor went on to say:

> At the same time, another great evil was strongly developed; individuals and corporations engaged in various branches of manufacture, taking advantage of the necessities of the government, rushed to congress, and by every means in their power procured for their own benefit the levy of what we call protective duties under the false pretence of raising revenue for the government, but really to compel consumers to pay exorbitant prices for the favoured article thus protected.

So that was regarded in 1878 as being the underlying cause of certain combinations detrimental to the public interest. Then my right hon. friend inquires, in a manner such as no other member of the House could inquire "What is this sacred sanctimonious principle?" and he was very properly advised by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Healy) that what is proposed is a square deal to everyone in this country. I am willing, however, to let my hon. friend (Mr. Healy) take the responsibility of answering that question of the leader of the Opposition, but I shall quote the right hon. gentleman's own words before he became a right honourable. We find that on July 4, 1919, the Combines and Fair Prices Act was before this parliament. Let me quote from Hansard what happened on that occasion:

> On the motion of Hon. Mr. Meighen, Bill No. 167, concerning the Investigation and Restraint of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers, and the Withholding and Enhancement of the Price of Commodities, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the chair.
>
> On clause 2—definitions. "Combine":
>
> Mr. McKenzie: Perhaps the work of the committee might be abbreviated by the minister stating wherein this bill differs from the old Combines Act or is it practically the same?

I ask my hon. friends to follow me closely in this quotation to ascertain where some things came from.

> Mr. Meighen: No, it is very different. I think, however, the committee already has a pretty full idea of the intent and scope of this measure from the discussion in a previous act. I direct the attention of the committee to the clause:
>
> The expression "combine" is used in this act with intended relation to articles of commerce, and it shall be deemed to have reference only to such combines, immediately hereinafter defined, as, with relation as aforesaid, have, in the opinion of the Board of Commerce of Canada (or of a single member thereof acting under authority of and for the purposes of section eight of this act) operated, or are likely to operate, to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, consumers, producers or others and, limited as aforesaid, the said expression as used in this act shall be deemed to include,—
>
> (a) mergers trusts and monopolies, so called.

[Mr. Murdock.]

> That is to say, the scope of the operations of this board as affecting combines shall be directed against such combines as are detrimental to the public interest. In other words, this act recognizes the fact that there may be combines, and there may be purposes of combines, that are in full accord with the public interest, in the interest of the country. For example, combinations of capital, and combinations for the purpose of working together towards increasing export trade. The greater our export trade the better to the country. That is a good, laudable practice and a good reason for amalgamation, because there are times when it can be better secured, indeed almost always, by that means. But if that same combination operates for the purpose of keeping down the wages of its employees, combines for that purpose, or for the purpose of putting up the cost to its consumers, above what is reasonable to those purchasers that is detrimental to the interests of the public, and for so doing a combine comes within the operations of the act and is answerable to this board.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that is fairly good Liberal doctrine and is sufficient to justify the proposal to incorporate practically the same definitions of a combine detrimental to the public interest as are found in the proposed bill No. 54, now before the House. My right hon. friend also states as his opinion, that the Privy Council's judgment really does not assail or impugn part one of the Combines and Fair Prices Act which is now on the statutes books of Canada. In that statement I, as a layman, concur and I think my friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) would also concur. But I want to make some inquiries. If that is so why has it been possible for the people of Canada to be denied the protection accorded by part one of the Combines and Fair Prices Act during all of the later months of the late government's regime? Why was not something done to continue the protection or to appoint some tribunal that would take care of the combines detrimental to the public interest that might exist? We find my right hon. friend on June 29, 1920, twelve days before he had reached the goal of his very commendable ambition to become the Prime Minister of Canada, making this statement in regard to the Board of Commerce:

> Why in the first place, there is a law conferring certain powers and imposing certain duties on a board, a law written and planted on the statute books, known to the board when they took office, a law with the operation of which nobody can interefere, a law which they have the courts of the land at their disposal to enforce.

My right hon. friend, of course, did not intend to make a statement that was incorrect but the statement contained in the quotation which I have given is absolutely incorrect, as I propose and undertake to prove. This was the 29th of June, 1920, and no one knows better than my right hon. friend that the Board of Commerce had been a wooden gun, so far as protecting the interest of the consumers,

the public, and others against unfair combines, for more than four months prior to that particular day. No one could know that fact any better than my right hon. friend, and yet we find him getting up in parliament and making the statement referred to. The reason for that fact is, that four months prior to that date the chairman of the Board of Commerce had resigned—to be exact on the 23rd day of February, 1920—had resigned hurriedly, and from that very moment the Board of Commerce, to the extent of protecting the public against combines detrimental to it, ceased to function under the language of the law. In other words, prosecutions could not be instituted without a chief commissioner. The law has been so framed, whether unintentionally or purposely I do not know. The latter part of subsection 2 of section 9 of the Combines Investigation Act says:

> In the case of an investigation ordered the chief commissioner shall fix the time and place for such investigation, of which the secretary shall notify in writing the applicant or his authorized counsel.

And so as the weary weeks and months had gone by—four long months—without the board being permitted to do anything or get anywhere in relation to the things for which presumably it was paid, we find the right hon. gentleman on the 29th June rising in the House—as he also did last night—expressing surprise and inquiring wherein the board had been interfered with by absolute prevention on the part of certain honourable gentlemen, or by failing to place the board in a position to do things which the Combines and Fair Prices Act, in part one, provided should be done in the interests of the public. My right hon. friend, capable legal gentleman he is, should be very familiar with that fact.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry I am not. Will the minister tell us what we failed to do that the act called on us to do?

Mr. MURDOCK: The right hon. gentleman failed to do anything that the act called on him to do. That is only another very delightful way which my right hon. friend has of dodging the real point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what the issue is. The minister says they could not do anything because they were prevented, and to show that they were prevented he says that the minister would not do what he should have done in order to enable the board to act. I want him to tell me what it was. I do not know. I want him to establish what he says and show that it was our duty to do it.

Mr. MURDOCK: The act, of course, as the right hon. member would try to convey, does not provide that immediately on the chief commissionership becoming vacant, if the board is to proceed to function in the interests of the public as by law intended, a chief commissioner shall be appointed, but the language of the act was so fearfully and wonderfully prepared, either inadvertently or intentionally, that that was the net result, and that fact was called to the attention of hon. members at that time sitting on the treasury benches of paliament, not once but repeatedly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The failure then was to appoint a chief commissioner to succeed Judge Robson. That is what I understand. Does the minister say that, in the absence of Judge Robson, or upon his resignation, the commission as it existed then had not power to act?

Mr. MURDOCK: Exactly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He says what is wrong.

Mr. MURDOCK: The claim that is made—and I am sure my right hon. friend is aware of this, and if not he can get unlimited legal advice to that effect—is that in a more important aspect of the intended functioning of the board, that board was powerless to proceed without a chief commissioner.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. That is not the fact. Although the minister, with all his talents, was on the board, the board was just as powerless before as after the resignation.

Mr. JACOBS: It was a board of the right hon. member's creation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister was not.

Mr. MURDOCK: There is considerable in what the right hon. member says, that the board was practically as useless before the resignation as aftewards. Again, I am not informed as to whether this was inadvertently or intentionally done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member not admit that it was an act of the board committed or performed after the resignation of Judge Robson, that was called in question before the courts, and that the courts in their judgment in no way even referred to the absence of the chief commissioner as affecting the validity of the act? It was just as vaild after as before. It was the hon. member that was wrong—not the act.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend is a little off in his dates and in his facts. He overlooked the fact, that the cause of the resignation was the writing of a letter which, in some way, came to be sent by other members of the staff in connection with a case that was being prepared for the courts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not mention anything about that.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MURDOCK: In other words, it is not correct to state that it was after the resignation of the chairman that facts in connection with the appeal case were prepared and sent forward. It is true there was a completed case, and the courts were ready to go ahead and deal with the case that had been prepared for submission to them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister missed my point. Was it not an act or an order of the board issued after the resignation of Judge Robson that was brought before the courts on appeal, and did the courts not decide it without even referring to the absence or non-existence of a chief commissioner?—showing that the board had perfect power to act after as well as before.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend is aware that there were two cases submitted, the latter case being by consent of the parties for the purpose of testing the validity of the act, for the purpose of clearing up and trying to get somewhere, and to give the government what they appeared to want, and that was the assurance that the Board of Commerce had no right to function in the interests of the public in protecting the public against combines, monopolies and mergers. That is, by every act, what appeared to be the desire of the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What act?

Mr. MURDOCK: Every act and omission to act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Name one of them. The hon member is deceiving nobody by this evasion, except perhaps himself.

Mr. MURDOCK: I will call my right hon. friend's attention to certain actions of his government, indicating their particular intent in regard to certain of these matters. In addition to the presumed and intended duties of members of the Board of Commerce, in the latter part of January, or, to be exact, on the 19th day of January, 1920, the members of the board were hurriedly called to the office of the Minister of the Interior, who desired to convey to them the understanding that they were to be appointed to some additional and new duties. They were to be Paper Controllers for the Dominion of Canada, as the result of the resignation, or pending resignation, I forget which, of the then Paper Controller. What were the facts in connection with this paper control? A price of $80 a ton on newsprint paper had been fixed and continued in effect as applicable to various newspaper concerns all over Canada, when at that particular time, or during a part of that time, the spot market price for newsprint was from $90 to as high as $165 a ton, determined by how hard up some newspaper was to secure the product to get out its issue. As a result of this condition, the switches of the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Mill had been spiked down, and an ultimatum had been served on the Backus company that no more would they be permitted to ship paper across the international boundary until they complied with the language and intent of the Paper Controller's orders. So that was the situation on the nineteenth day of January when we were hurriedly called to the office of the Minister of the Interior to be invested with our new functions and authority.

An hon. MEMBER: Who was he?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Minister of the Interior at that time was the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). On two occasions on that 19th day of January we were called to interview the right hon. gentleman and also the Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice, and then in the evening the intimation was given "Nothing doing just now". That very night, or early the next morning, a trusted and capable civil servant was despatched to Fort Frances, with the result that within a few short days, the spikes were taken out of the switches, and the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company were permitted to send their paper unhindered across the international boundary. The civil servant returned to Ottawa, and gentlemen connected with the then government indicated, by their talk and scowling looks and suggested actions, that they were very seriously concerned about the unfortunate act and disobedience of the civil servant who had gone to Fort Frances to do exactly what he was told to do. Then on the 30th day of January we were again called in and were made full-fleged paper controllers. At the suggestion of and under a Privy Council order prepared by the then Minister of the Interior, we started to carry on that additional farce of fixing a price for newsprint paper to the newspaper companies of Canada at about one-half the price that the market called for. Yet on that particular day would there not have been great clamour and dissent throughout Canada, as there was in certain cases, when it was proposed to fix the price of milk to babies or bread to hungry

people? No, that must not be done; that would be carried by this government across the seas; carried to the Supreme Court of Canada first, where three eminent judges sitting on the Supreme Court benches decided that the contested rights were satisfactory, and by law contemplated and as the Board of Commerce had contended. All a part of the beautiful farce of fooling the public.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me? I have tried to get out—

Mr. MURDOCK: I still have the floor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am aware of that. That is about all the hon. member has. I have tried to extract out of this mass of verbiage something attributable to the government. All I have got is this: He states that the commissioner who went west prior to the appointment of the Board of Commerce as paper controller, was instructed to do what he did by the then government. That commissioner was Mr. Breadner. I tell my hon. friend that Mr. Breadner had no such instructions, and my hon. friend cannot produce a statement of Mr. Breadner that he had.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend can, of course, put what construction he likes on what I say. I stated and I repeat that, self-evidently and without any question, what was done at Fort Frances was what was intended to be done. I say that even in disregard of the attempt of certain hon. gentlemen to fool the Board of Commerce later into the belief that nothing of the kind was intended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I tell the hon. gentleman that I had to do with the matter—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I deny the right, Mr. Speaker—I want to know—Has this hon. gentleman or any hon. gentleman the right to speak of the intentions of men with whom he did not come into contact, whose word he cannot bring in support of his statement, and against the statement of one who actually had to do with the matter? Such conduct is not only infamous; it is of a character I cannot describe in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) rises to a question of privilege. No hon. member in the debates can impute motives, and I would ask that the debate be continued, but without motives being imputed to any hon. member.

Mr. MURDOCK: I gladly withdraw if the right hon. member considers that I was in any way imputing improper motives to him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would much rather that he would make what he says good.

Mr. MURDOCK: The right hon. member last night and again to-day was particularly anxious about making good. He seems to have overlooked entirely what so many thousands of the people of Canada have known for many months, or since the sixth of December, 1921, that the case has been tried and the verdict rendered in regard to the alleged and camouflaged pretence by the late government of providing a Combines and Fair Prices Act for the protection of the consumers, producers and others. The verdict of the people of Canada has been rendered on that subject, and my right hon. friend is very safe in showing bravado now, three years late, in having something investigated, and judgment passed upon it, that all the people of Canada passed judgment on about sixteen months ago.

I want to refer now as fast as possible to two or three other matters in connection with Bill 54, as proposed. The right hon. member last evening stated:

> In so far as this legislation makes something a crime which is defined here—I refer to clause 26—it is at least very doubtful to my mind if that clause is within our constitutional powers.

My right hon. friend and the other hon. members who are behind him, seem to take great objection to this particular new "crime" to be incorporated in the statutes of Canada:

> Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $10,000 or to two yars' imprisonment, or if a corporation to a penalty not exceeding $25,000, who is a party or privy to or knowingly assists in the formation or operation of a combine as defined in this act.

My right hon. friend and those associated with him, as well as certain newspapers in Canada, appear to be much concerned as to whether that particular crime and the penalty therefor can be made effective. If the right hon. gentleman would only look at the legislation which he proposed and upheld some three years ago he would find that it was very much more drastic in its intent than what is now proposed. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, he stated last night that the first part of the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919 had not in his judgment been changed by the Privy Council decision. Further, he said:

> But I venture to say again the Criminal Code provisions will be more practically useful left alone. Improve them if you will; make them wider if you will; but leave them as Criminal Code provisions. Do not provide for any investigation.

That is exactly what my right hon. friend and his associates appear to be afraid of—

an investigation in regard to some particular concern.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that. If the hon. gentleman will read the rest of it he will find that, either in that sentence or in one further on, I state that it is worthless to provide for an investigation unless the investigators are given power to give effect to their findings.

Mr. MURDOCK: Very well. It can at least be noted that the right hon. gentleman rallies promptly to the support of some combine, monopoly or price fixing arrangement that is detrimental to consumers, producers and others. That is the first thought. And he argues, as only he can argue, to show why the re-affirming of section 498 of the Criminal Code would be satisfactory and would give all the relief that is possible or necessary. Now, I just want to refer to a statement made by my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) last evening. That hon. gentleman, it seems to me, was very discourteous to, and inconsiderate of, the rights of citizens of Canada, particularly those who might happen to be section men, firemen, brakemen—men employed in logging operations and others engaged in similar occupations. Listen to the position taken by the hon. gentleman; just see how he classes these people. He refers to "six uninformed, irresponsible individuals" asking for an investigation.

Mr. STEVENS: Just a moment. Will the hon. gentleman read the preceding explanatory sentence in which I distinctly stated that I was not saying ignorant persons, but persons uninformed as to facts.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend in the preceding sentence does say:

> I do not say ignorant people, but uninformed people, are very prone to complain of businesses or institutions wherever they may be. Six uninformed, irresponsible individuals may ask for an investigation.

Well, I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the right to ask for such an investigation was conceded to these "uninformed," "irresponsible" and "ignorant" persons by his government in 1919 when passing thrcugh this House the Combines and Fair Prices Act. I do not see therefore why "six individuals" can now be classed as irresponsible and ignorant just because it is proposed to give under Bill 54 the same rights that were contemplated in that act. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Mr. MURDOCK: Do not do that now, because I may not stop.

Mr. STEVENS: I think they want you to go on.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend and others have made a reference to the alleged numerous investigations that are to be conducted before arriving at a starting point in Bill 54. Let me briefly analyze this proposition so that we may ascertain whether or not that is just the case. The leader of the opposition, as I recall, indicated that any individual could, under section 498 of the Criminal Code, reaffirmed, go to a magistrate and lay an affirmation against some combine, trust monopoly or merger, secure the necessary investigation, and drag that combine, trust, monopoly or merger into court. He actually says a thing of that kind

4 p.m. and expects, I presume, that the hon. members of this House will believe it. My right hon. friend knows, as does every other hon. gentleman sitting behind him, that almost assuredly, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, if an individual undertook to lay information as to the existence of any combine or trust or monopoly or merger, he would not have had the necessary access to the facts that would permit him to make that affirmation in detail sufficiently to ensure the issuance of a warrant or the bringing into court of the alleged combine or whatever it might be. My right hon. friend knows that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend knows—it does not take a lawyer to know it—that you do not need to allege any fact whatever save this, that you have reason to believe and do believe that the illegal combine, or whatever it might be, exists. If that is done, then, unless there is sufficient reason to the contrary, the attorney general will take the matter over and conduct the prosecution.

Mr. MURDOCK: And my right hon. friend would know, of a surety, that there would possibly be, as he suggested by his qualifying remark, a sufficient reason to the contrary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be the fault of the attorney general.

Mr. MURDOCK: Wherever the fault would be, it would be a wooden gun; it would be a thing unavailable to the section man, to the logger, to the small merchant; they could not grapple with anything so large. But entitle these same individuals to some reasonable inquiry to ascertain if the suspicions they hold are well founded, and the result is different. So

this Bill No. 54 permits six individuals to send in a statement of their belief, giving all the facts as they know them. The registrar of the boards of investigation, without any publicity—at least without the publicity that would result should action be taken under the Criminal Code—inquires, presumably by correspondence, or otherwise as he sees proper, into the facts, with a view to ascertaining whether the claims made by the six individuals are well founded.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend permit a question? If it is true that it is impossible to get action under the Criminal Code, how was it that under section 498 there were at least six prosecutions, while under the Combines Investigation Act of 1910 there was only one inquiry, the case of the United Shoe Company, and no prosecution?

Mr. MURDOCK: I would be in a better position to answer my hon. friend if he would tell me when these six prosecutions under the Criminal Code took place.

Mr. STEVENS: I will do so. Rex vs Elliott, 1904; Rex vs Master Plumbers, 1905; Rex vs Gage, 1907; Rex vs Clark, 1907; Rex vs Beckett et al, 1907; Rex vs McMichael, 1907; Rex vs Day, 1905. Then there were several later civil actions in connection with which the provisions of the Criminal Code regarding combines were the deciding factor. Included in the cases were Hatley vs Elliott, 1903; Wampole and Company vs Karn Company, Limited, 1906; Weidmann vs Schragg, 1912; and there were several others. The first seven cases I mentioned were under the Criminal Code, section 498, whereas, as I have pointed out, under the Combines Act there was only the case of the United Shoe Company—an investigation, but no prosecution.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend is entirely correct about the number of prosecutions proceeded with under the Combines Act of 1910; that has not been questioned. As to the prosecutions under the Criminal Code, it would be interesting, if my hon friend and I had time to do so, to indicate to the House just what were the proceedings. For instance, in the case of Rex vs Beckett, 1907, my recollection is that a decision was handed down some eight or nine years later. In any case, if I am not mistaken, it took a great length of time to deal with it, and then the results were practically nil. But is it not reasonable to assume that the plan now proposed is a better one—that of having an inquiry made on the basis presumably, of the good judgment of the registrar? And my assumption is that a peculiarly qualified person should be chosen to fill that position. The registrar would make the necessary preliminary investigation, and if there appeared to be something requiring further attention he would so report to the minister. The minister would no doubt communicate with the Governor in Council, and if it was so decided they would appoint a commissioner for the particular purpose of investigating the alleged combine, monopoly, trust or merger. The commissioner would not, as has been suggested, simply ramble round at his sweet will here and there and everywhere, inquiring into this, that, or the other thing; he would be a man particularly fitted to make that specific inquiry. If after the commissioner had made his investigation it was found that a trust, combine, monopoly or merger existed detrimental to the interests of the public, then the matter would be taken up in a court of competent jurisdiction and if guilt was established the penalty would be imposed.

I want to say just this in conclusion. My right hon. friend has stated:

> Let me repeat: All this legislation is simply running in a circle. It is another circle you have to go round; it is just another stump round which you can chase the flat-footed fiend of monopoly.

How different from the language used by the right hon. gentleman in 1919 when the Combines and Fair Prices Act was being proposed. Then he talked as if he were desirous of protecting the public against unfair combinations, but now he and certain of his associates who have spoken would wish to make it appear that there is the same camouflage in this bill as was characteristic of the Combines and Fair Prices Act. I assure hon. members of this House that if I thought there was any such camouflage in the provisions of this bill as were developed and worked out under the Combines and Fair Prices Act, the creature of my right hon. friend's government, I would oppose the measure with every means at my command. If that were the case I should not be here to claim that by this bill it is proposed to give the plain people of Canada an opportunity to secure redress where there may be in effect combines, monopolies, trusts or mergers detrimental to the public interest.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murdock) who has just sat down except to disagree somewhat with the position he has taken, because he is here to-day as the defender of a proposal dealing with combines which has been introduced by the Prime Minister of Canada, which has been endorsed by his gov-

ernment and endorsed by his party, notwithstanding a number of dissentients from his own followers, for last night there was a kind of backfire from his own side of the House. But he is attempting to deal with the question of the regulation of combines and trusts in this country, and he is approaching it in the conventional way—going by the old formula, and the old formula is no good at this time. It is true that the measure before the House now has all the marks of being pontificial. It is a law passed by parliament, and you must obey it; if you do not, look our for yourself. Perhaps!

We have had legislation of that kind in this House for a great many years; the different acts have all been enumerated. Now as an old member of the House and one who has read something in the past, who has studied this question as best he could from his own point of view, I want to give my experience and to suggest a new formula for approaching a situation of this kind. We have a formula now on the statute books, and we have a formula in the past in the records of previous statesmen in this country. They have a very fine phrase in French, which is very significant. They speak of L'Action Catholique or catholic action, L'Action Agricole or farmers' action or the farmers' kick, something that has punch to it. And the punch must come not so much from the act of parliament as from action by the government of the country, who are responsible for the conduct of public affairs and for the relief of grievances that may happen to come before parliament and are in the mouths of the people every day. I mean by direct action on the part of the government.

I am speaking for six hundred thousand women who are to vote in the next election in this country, and a good many of them are to vote in my own province in a few weeks. I am going to say that the greatest combine in Canada to-day is the sugar trust in Montreal, and it is not to be approached and the grievance is not to be remedied by legislation exactly of this kind, although I am going to vote for this measure because all my life I have advocated the regulation of combines and trusts. I am going to do so mainly for this reason, that an opportunity is being given in parliament to-day by the introduction of this bill to direct the attention of the people to these combines and to the necessity of their removal.

Now what is the thing to do in connection with the sugar trust? I do not exactly say, do what Sir John A. Macdonald did in the past but it has been done in parliament, and to-day there is this big sugar combine in Canada and the women of this country are beginning to organize against it, and they will be heard from within a few weeks. The duty of the government to-day in connection with that sugar combine is to exercise the powers conferred on them as a government. The Minister of Finance is coming down to this House on Friday with his budget proposals and his revision of the tariff. Now what I would suggest—and I make this suggestion to the Prime Minister and his party and to the government—is that their immediate duty in dealing with this sugar combine is to send a straight and short message to the sugar combine in Montreal: If you do not by Friday afford relief to the housekeepers and every citizen of this country who uses sugar, by a reduction of the price, there will be a reduction in the duty on sugar.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): That is practical politics. That is dealing with combines in the way they ought to be dealt with, and that is the only way to deal with them. I have seen these matters brought up in the courts for forty years. I have seen it as a young man, as a member of this House, as a newspaper man. I have seen it and I know where action of that kind always ends. But what you want is a strong man in office. A strong Prime Minister and a strong government in office, with a strong party behind them, who will regulate these trusts and send these short telegrams to these men saying: If you do not have the price changed by Friday, look out! The way to put the fear of God into these men is by direct action of that kind.

Just to give the House an illustration of what a combine is, we have what is thought to be by a great many people a banking combine in Canada. I met an old friend of mine the other day, and he made a reference to the Merchants' Bank and what occurred in connection with it. He said, "Mr. Maclean, if my old friend Mr. Courtney—at one time Deputy Minister of Finance—had been there when the disclosures were made about the Merchants' Bank he would have had the bank directors and president here in Ottawa in ten hours and said to them: If you do not correct this abuse and stop this waste of the funds of the bank, as it should have been stopped, immediate action will be taken." There would then have been a different story in regard to the Merchants' Bank. Action is not in courts: action is in the government and is the thing necessary. The action is in the Prime Minister. The action is in his party, and the action in regard to combines

to-day is to intimate to these men: If there is no relief in the price of sugar by Friday, look out!

I will go a step further. If the sugar combine does not pay attention to the women housekeepers of Canada, and half a million of them are going to vote in the next election, if it does not pay attention to this condition of affairs I would have the Minister of Finance wire to two great banks, the Royal Bank with headquarters at Montreal, one whose president is Sir Herbert Holt, and to the Bank of Nova Scotia with headquarters in Toronto, and I would tell these banks who are behind the sugar combine that if relief is not afforded to the housekeepers and the people of this country, men, women and children, for everyone uses sugar, and a high price is being put on it, then we as the government of Canada will not give you the facilities we are giving you now for rediscount. Provide the money yourselves for the sugar trust. If that did not have the desired effect I would send another telegram to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. I know a good deal about them. I have been more or less a friend of theirs in the past. I believe in protection in this country, but I do not believe in the extortion of trusts. I would send a wire to the Manufacturers' Association and I would say: If this thing is not regulated by the sugar trust, and is not to be regulated by the banks that are behind the sugar trust, we are going to revise the tariff on some other things. The next organizations to be dealt with should be the combines that control textiles, enamelled ware, and other commodities of domestic use. It is no good to say, "We will send you to the courts. We are going to appoint a registrar to hold hearings in private"—as some gentlemen want; and the same thing applies if held in public—"to inquire into the grievances of the public." The government should say, "We are going to find out what are the grievances of the public. We are Liberals and we consider it to be our duty to afford relief to the people. We are to get the public that relief and we are about to get it in a quick way."

Now, as to the sugar combine I want to say something else. That sugar combine wrecked more Canadian capitalists who put their money into the securities of the sugar trust than almost any other organization I know of; and I think if the leader of the government were to ask some of his old colleagues who had experience of the sugar trust they would tell him some surprising things. The situation, however, resolves itself into this—that relief lies more in action on the part of the government than in making laws and appointing judges, sending for the constable and hauling men into court. The great thing is for the government to send out an order that within so many hours this thing, which is very unfair to the public, must end. They are coming to that in other countries. In the United States Mr. Hoover is trying to deal with these questions, and in some respects he is getting relief. Previous presidents of the United States, including Mr. Taft, and their attorney generals, have dealt with this matter and have found that the only effective way to deal with these people is to summon them to Washington or to Ottawa and say "You must do so and so. You may show me if I am wrong and if you do so the government will listen to you. If you cannot, the public are entitled to get relief and we will see that they get it through action on our part in regard to the tariff." Mr. Harding is probably going to take some action along this line when he starts his campaign for the next presidential election in the course of two or three weeks.

Now let me take up another point. It is all very well to say that we will apply the law. The government are making some progress under previous legislation that we had but it was not effective. That is the great thing, it was not effective, and it did not deal with the situation but had the matter referred to the courts. Why, in the great court case of Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce, of which Dickens tells us, how many years did it take to get a verdict? There is a quick method of settling public grievances to-day and it does not lie so much in legislation as in action on the part of the government in power. In short, my contention is that this legislation will not be as efficacious as action on the part of the government if they choose to exercise the power. It is up to them to take action and it is up to the public to make its wishes known when there is an election if the government do not take that action. We must remember that there has been a great addition to the voting power of the country now that women are entitled to vote. The woman has arrived in politics, she is in this House, and she is out in public life to exercise her vote. It is all very well for newspapers to show their regard for women by instructing them in matters of fashion and dress; and giving details of the wedding of the Duke and Duchess of York and the presents received by the royal pair. The real question to the women of this country is housekeeping, and sugar is one of the great items that enters into the question. A sugar trust exists in this country. We are about to revise the

tariff, on Friday next, and I ask what action will the government take on the protest of the 600,000 women throughout Canada who now have votes?

There is a combine—so the farmers tell us—indeed evidence has been given before a parliamentary committee to that effect—in shipping in this country. That combine has treated the farmers infamously in regard to freight rates. Well, it does not need any legislation to regulate the actions of that combine. They now enjoy rights in connection with the canals. Those waterways are owned by the people and they should refuse the shipping trust the use of our canals. Or the government could order the directors of the National railways, which now belong to the people, to reduce rates and thus serve the interest of the public as against the shipping trust. It is not necessary to do that by legislation; it could be done by the government. Action on the part of the government is the effective way to do it. As to the shipping trust I am going to tell the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways something; there is a suspicion in the minds of a great many people that the National Railways are a party to this shipping trust. That ought to be investigated. If that be the case, Sir Henry Thornton has probably come into it by inheritance. If it is the case that there is an understanding between the National Railways and the shipping trust by which shipping rates are maintained, it ought to be made possible for the farmers to ship their grain by railway. Now, the regulation of all this does not lie in legislation. As I have already said it lies in action on the part of the government in controlling and regulating the use of the canals and, at some points, the harbour dues. In a hundred different ways a combine can be reached by the power that is vested in the government when the public are treated unfairly.

Now, as to the alleged combination of the banks: They are up now for legislation, and we also have the question of securing credit for the farmers of Canada which apparently they need. It may be true that that relief is not to come by way of money advanced by the banks, but by way of the creation of new organizations—loan banks as they are called in the United States—or in other ways. It is up to the government to see that practical legislation is enacted along this line and not leave this matter so much to the banks.

I want to give the Prime Minister credit for what he is doing here to-day; he is approaching the question in the legislation that he has brought down. But there is something that follows from that action on his part. Does he know that if he does not make good in these matters he is simply preparing a rod for his own back? That is the point the Prime Minister should bear in mind; he will be judged by what he does, and most of all by what he does in connection with the sugar combine. I am sorry the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is not here. I would like to impress my views upon him, but he will hear of them sooner or later. And the sugar combine will read to-morrow what I have said and they may be shaking in their shoes. I would like to know what that great newspaper the Montreal Star will have to say when it reads that a proposal was made in parliament to give relief to the housewives of Canada from these enormous sugar charges.

I have tried to present the real issue and to show what is to be done. There are many combines. I confess that I am a protectionist and I am glad that Canada has built up her industries by a system of protection. But these industries must be square with the people who give them privileges, and with parliament which passes the legislation that concerns the welfare of the country. There has been great profiteering. There never was such an era of profiteering, some of it under government regulations, as we have witnessed during and since the war. The war is not altogether responsible for present conditions. The profiteering which has taken place since the war has had a most far-reaching effect, and is going to stay with us, not only through our lives, but through the lives of our children, and we are not going to recover until we get down to hard facts and wherever we find a wrong, to right it, and to compel reparations, which is the phrase used now in connection with the war. That will be accomplished by the efficiency, the power, the study and the determination of the government of the day. So far as the present act is an attempt to follow previous legislation, I will give the government credit for it, but let them remember that they are on trial now. It is not the sugar trust that is on trial at the present time so much as it is the government which has introduced this legislation. If it affords some relief the government will get credit for it in the country. The people want relief to-day from the shipping combine, and in the regulation of our national railways, if these are a party in any sense to the shipping combine, and in the regulation of the other trusts and combines which exist in the country. In common with other hon. members of the House, I have been flooded with appeals from the druggists and

other combinations. They have presented a special appeal containing very scientific terms. They are saying "Do not deal with our combine." But parliament has to deal with these combines, and is to-day trying to deal with them. The government has introduced something which is not the real remedy, and I am urging to-day that the real formula for dealing with the trust is by direct action by the government, and that action lies through the tariff. We are going to have the tariff resolutions on Friday and will have a debate next week. We will then hear from the women, and I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will listen in on the wires and see whether he is with the women of this country and is going to fight their battles against the sugar and other trusts, because there are many trusts in this country. These trusts are growing and becoming more insolent and defiant every day. I will tell the House what they are doing, as I see it every day in the committees. The danger in this country is in creating a bloc made of members of the two parties against the national ownership of the railways and against any legislation for the regulation of combines in this country. People ask why should we have three parties in this country when previously we only had two? But you see three parties coming, and they are going to be here for some time. Some people think we are to get rid of them, but parliamentary government is progressing and not going backward. New things turn up. I never was so surprised as when I read in an English newspaper what was going on over there, and read the arguments presented by the best papers in England about the regulation of combines and the building combines that exist. I do not refer to the daily press but to the weekly press.

I am going to close with a reference to a matter which is rather apropos of the present situation. There never was a more sensational week in the history of the New York exchange than last week. Many small investors were closed out; tens of millions of money embarked in stock speculations were lost and will never come back. Queer actions occurred on the stock exchange yesterday, and other things have happened concurrently with the doings on the New York stock exchange. Wheat fell 5 cents a bushel and cotton fell to a much greater extent. The Standard Oil Company has seen fit to reduce the price of gasoline; but sugar goes up, because there is combine in sugar, and there is not a combine in wheat or in cotton. Wherever there has been a combine, or wherever a parliamentary group can be organized irrespective of parties in parliament to protect these combines, it is being done. I do not know what the outcome of those incidents in the New York stock exchange of last week will be. I am afraid there is a great financial crisis ahead of us. It may be arriving now, and we have an opportunity to-day, in dealing with the tariff, to compel the combines which have used that tariff to deal unfairly with the people of Canada, to right these wrongs. On behalf of the people of Canada I draw the attention of the government to the new formula, and the only practical formula for dealing with combines at this time; that is by direct action on the part of the government, and by telling these combines that if they do not give relief they will be forced to do it by tariff withdrawals. They must not depend on the tariff of this country; the steamship companies must not depend on the use of the canals in the country, and the banking group must not depend on the discounting power of the government in connection with re-discounting. They must be told that only those who treat the people fairly in the matter of combinations will have the favour of the government and of the party in power. As I have always been a protectionist and a friend of the manufacturers, I think the statement may well come from me that the only way to bring these men to time in Canada and in the United States is by the exercise of the power vested in the government and in parliament by way of legislation. But there is a still more efficacious way, and that is by the formula which I have laid before the House, namely that of direct action.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I was a little astonished last evening in listening to the very mild arguments that were presented in favour of this bill by hon. members from the other side of the House. In fact, I can almost say that some of them condemned it by the same phrase.

I wish to refer to remarks made by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). I am very pleased indeed to listen to some of the advice and the recommendations that he has made to the right hon. Prime Minister. I hope the Prime Minister will listen to the advice given him, more especially when the hon. member called attention to the fact that a deputation of the women of this country was going to call upon him. If hon. members will notice, the subject under discussion by the hon. member for South York was a very sweet one, and consequently worthy of very great attention. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speech made by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr.

Evans) last evening. I notice a considerable resemblance between the speech of the free trader and that of the protectionist, when they begin to deal with the subject of combines. The only difference I noticed between the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) and the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), is the fact that one would cut off the dog's tail by inches, and the other would take it right off at the root. I have hopes that as days go by, my hon. friend from South York will find a warm reception over in this corner of the House. I do not think we are very far apart. He consoles himself every now and then by repeating that he is a friend of the manufacturers and he is in favour of protection.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am in favour of industries prospering in this country.

Mr. FORKE: We in this part of the House can repeat the formula with a little change. We are in favour of just as much free trade as is possible in Canada, and we are also in favour of the manufacturers so after all I do not think there is a great deal of difference between us.

Last night I heard some discussion as to who the people of Canada were and during that discussion there came into my mind an old phrase which, perhaps, most hon. members have heard. The people generally mean the class of people in whom we are particularly interested. We are all fond of talking about "the people," and perhaps some of us have heard of the tailors of Toole street, who put at the top of their paper "We, the people of England." So I imagine some of us view things along pretty much the same lines. We are all in favour of doing what we believe to be in the interest of the people, only we have different points of view, and it makes a great deal of difference from what angle we view any subject which is under our consideration. I do not think any of us have anything to say against combinations as such. We believe we are living in a day when people are getting together to work for their mutual advantage. At the same time I have no sympathy with the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), when he says that he believes these combinations are only moving toward a time when we shall have what might be called socialism, when it will be one great combine and that will be the state. There is in the Anglo-Saxon nature something that will always prevent such a combination, because deeply embedded in our nature is the feeling that we always want to have something which we can call our own. I do not care how much a person may prove, in theory, the beneficial effects of socialism, it will never find a resting place among the Anglo-Saxon people.

A few words were said last night as regards newspaper monopoly. Perhaps this is one of the most dangerous monopolies that we can possibly have in a civilized country. We are sometimes inclined to criticize, to find fault with the press; but we cannot possibly do without it; it is the only means of information which we have. I can think of circumstances away back on the prairies, where the people living on their farms have only one source of information and that is the daily paper coming to their homes each evening. They do not know aything about what is occurring anywhere in our Dominion, or in the world, excepting through that paper. How important therefore, it is that we should have news of the best description, news that is accurate, reliable and trustworthy. It is so long since I have looked over the Progressive platform, that I have almost forgotten some of the planks contained in it; but I am quite safe because I know they were founded on good and sound principles, and I am pretty nearly sure to come along the beaten path with regard to that. I know there was a plank at the time—and I think it is there yet—that in every newspaper there should be some sort of statement as to who controls its policy and who owns the stock. If we had that information, we could sometimes read between lines and form an accurate judgment as to the reliability of the information contained in a newspaper.

I notice many speakers, whenever they have anything to say about monopolies or combinations, always refer to the wheat board and the attempt that the farmers in the West made to get a monopoly in the selling of wheat. I have given up all hope of ever enlightening some hon. friends as to exactly what that meant, because I do not think we shall ever be able to do so after the months that have passed and the many speeches and explanations that have been made. I will only repeat again that any attempt that was made was simply a matter of stabilizing the price during the season, so that all should reap an equal advantage. I do not think anyone ever thought for a moment that the wheat board would add one cent to the price of wheat in England; the idea was that it would stabilize the price over the different months of the year.

In connection with the bill at present under discussion, I believe it is a move in the right direction. I do not think it will altogether accomplish the ends intended just as long as we have a protective tariff. I know it is usually the custom, when speaking

of hon. members from this part of the House, to make out that we are out-and-out free traders. I want to make this explanation at this particular time. While I believe free trade is the right principle, we must remember that we are up against, not a treaty, not a theory but a circumstance in this country at the present time, and consequently it is necessary that we should have some revenue. Therefore, so long as the tariff is a means of getting revenue, perhaps we have not so much criticism to offer in these days as we might have under other conditions.

I want to say a few words in connection with some combinations that have been working in restraint of the agricultural communities. Not very long ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) a question in connection with the shipment of cattle. We know there has already been an investigation as regards ocean rates, and we are perfectly satisfied and convinced that a combination exists there to take the last cent possible out of shipments of cattle. One of the difficulties we have to meet in agriculture at the present time is the loss of morale amongst the agricultural people. I know they are carrying a heavy load of indebtedness upon their shoulders; but at the same time farmers, as a class, are optimists and, as a rule, they look hopefully toward the future, believing that "man never is, but always to be blest." But at present there is a certain lack of morale from the very fact that no matter what may be their exertions, no matter what crops they may raise, the practical outcome will be the same. I speak from experience. I have raised big crops and small crops; but I have always found at the end of the year's transactions, that matters have been so manipulated that only a bare living has been left to the man who has produced the wealth. That is why we want to get to the bottom of combinations in restraint of trade or for the purpose of taking undue advantage of the privileges they have acquired. I have no doubt that all members of this House are anxious for the prosperity and welfare of this Dominion; but at this particular time I would make a plea for the common people, the working people, who after all are just as essential for the welfare of Canada as are our business classes. Every now and then when any attempt is made to adjust any difficulties, we hear this cry: "It will disturb business." Business, apparently, is regarded as something sacred and holy that you must not interfere with. When I think of the hundreds and thousands of men and women scattered throughout this country who are making their living by daily toil, I am not so tremendously afraid of business; business can take care of itself.

I do not intend to take up any more of the time of the House at present. I will support the bill because I believe it is a move in the right direction. I do not for a moment believe it is going to cure all the evils that exist at the present time. I believe those can be cured only when trade shall flow freely backward and forward in all directions. One of the evils to-day is not the tariff alone. Some people think we look upon the tariff as the cause of all the evils that have overtaken agriculture in these days. The tariff is infinitesimal in comparison with the evils that result from it. In itself it would not be so obnoxious, but it makes possible the very things we are trying to get at and to cure with the present bill. I believe therefore that this is an attempt in the right direction. While it will not cure the whole evil it will at least help to do so, and I am inclined to give it my support. I listened with interest to the very able criticism of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I am always pleased to follow the criticisms of that right hon. gentleman and I admire his ability, his industry and his energy. In this case, however, I think his criticism was peculiarly weak and lacking in power or conviction. Possibly I have said enough.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): A sad but imperative duty compelled me to miss the very interesting debate that took place yesterday, but I have listened attentively to what has been said to-day and have endeavoured to acquaint myself somewhat with the progress of the debate which occupied the attention of the House yesterday. This bill seems to me to be a step in the right direction. I do not propose to discuss it in detail; I think that a great deal of the discussion which took place yesterday might very properly have been reserved until the bill is in committee, when hon. members on both sides of the House will have an opportunity of offering those suggestions which they think fit for the perfecting of the machinery of this legislation. It seems to me that on the second reading of the bill we should discuss its spirit and essence. Is there a need for such legislation as we have before us this afternoon?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: That there is such a need all parties in the House are agreed. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) while he was one of the foremost members of the administration which preceded the present government, placed on the statute books legis-

lation not dissimilar in character. I do not intend here to enter into any acrimonious discussion as to whether that legislation was right or wrong, whether it was well-conceived or ill-conceived, or whether it functioned to the benefit or to the prejudice of the people. The point I wish to make is this, that in the opinion of the Conservative party of that day, called at that time the Unionist party, it was necessary to have such legislation. Any of us who have examined the industrial and economic structure of our country as it exists at this time are all, I am sure, absolutely convinced that the economic and industrial life of Canada is honeycombed with combines and rings of all sorts. I do not think there is any possibility of dispute so far as that is concerned. It has been said that all combines are not bad. That may be true. There may be that rara avis in our economic life, the beneficent combine, the gathering together of manufacturers or middlemen for the purpose of reducing costs of production or of distribution and of giving the benefit of that reduction to the consumer. I would gladly welcome the acquaintanceship of such a combine, and in the words of the president of the Privy Council of years gone by I would desire to give my tribute of praise to any such institution. When I see such a combination as that I shall not be chary in the expression of my appreciation. But I am afraid that a calm and cool survey of the situation will bring most of us to the unbiassed conclusion that as a rule combines are not made for the purpose of reducing prices but of maintaining or raising them. There is therefore obviously some necessity for somebody to control combines. There is only one objection which in theory is perhaps a sound objection to legislation of this kind, and that is that it interferes with the freedom which should characterize human endeavour; and if we lived in this country under a system by means of which trade could flow freely into and beyond our boundaries, then I would hesitate before giving approval to legislation of this sort. But we cannot get immediately that "consummation devoutly to be wished," and while we maintain to any substantial degree the protective principle we have to protect the consumers of the country against the exactions of those people who take advantage of the tariff wall in order, in a circumscribed and comparatively narrow market, to charge all that traffic will bear, to the deriment of the consumer. I think that is the sound answer to the otherwise perhaps sound objection against such legislation as this, that it interferes with people conducting their own business in their own way. That being the case, I think we are pretty well all agreed as to the necessity for the legislation.

[Mr. McMaster.]

I have little to reply to in the remarks made by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) and the leader of the third party in the House (Mr. Forke). With a great deal of what they said I am in entire accord. It is interesting, however, to note that one of the fathers of protection in this country, one of the admirers of Sir John A. Macdonald, who imposed protection on the country in 1878, has had to speak with such utter frankness of what has grown up under the system. The system, he says, is not at fault; the system is a good one. But unfortunately there have been a large number of "growths" around the system. The question, to my mind, is whether a system can be characterized as good which brings about such unhappy results. However, I am not here to seek occasions for difference but to endeavour to find common ground of accord. It seems to me that we should pass this bill into committee of the whole House, or, if the government think it well, refer it to a special committee for further investigation and study. I indicate two courses of procedure, but I do not give my preference to either. But all the representatives of the people in this House should, I think, join in giving the principle of the bill their hearty support. Let no false impression go abroad from this House to any special interests in the country that there is any particular feeling of sympathy in any corner of the House, with those who, placed in strategic positions in the structure either of production or of distribution, propose to take advantage of such positions. Let that be clearly understood. We may differ as to methods; some may incline to one method of procedure and some to another. But let it be understood that the representatives of the Canadian people, no matter what place in this House they may occupy will not stand for extortion or exactions of more than a fair profit in business or in manufacture. Let us get the bill into committee, and, without any attempt to gain party advantage the one at the expense of the other, endeavour to develop the necessary machinery to make the legislation effective. The hon. member for South York anticipated some of the remarks I desired to make in this regard. The resources of civilization are not exhausted when we come to deal with combines and monopolies. Monopoly cannot raise an arrogant head in this country and lead the

5 p.m.

representatives of the people to understand that they, the monopolists, are masters of the situation and that nothing can be done. We control our ports and harbours, and if we find combinations of shippers who endeavour to charge all that the traffic will bear, and to stifle and suffocate the commerce of the country, we can say to them: If you pursue such methods as these, not one ship of yours shall be allowed to tie up at any public wharf. We can say to those who on the Great Lakes pursue such a policy that not a lock on the canal shall open until fair and just rates for the carriage of our natural and our industrial products shall be agreed upon. That is one weapon, and by no means a small one, which is in the hands of the government.

Mr. CALDWELL: What about freight rates?

Mr. McMASTER: I was just coming to freight rates; my hon. friend has anticipated me. The people of Canada own the greatest transportation system, in point of mileage, on this continent. Let it be known that those persons, whether middlemen or otherwise, who refuse to deal justly with their fellow men so far as distribution, the cost of distribution or the cost of manufacture are concerned, shall find it mighty difficult to move their goods on the railways of the people. And, last but not least, there is the tariff. As long as a tariff is maintained as an engine for raising revenue—and in my opinion a very expensive engine it is—let it be known that the tariff shall be used as a weapon to defend the rights of the people against the monopolists and that those who charge unjust and unfair prices for what they are able to produce under the shadow of the tariff wall may find that wall reduced or even cut down altogether, in order that it shall be impossible for them to charge their fellow Canadian citizens more than a fair price for a decent article.

These are some of the methods which I think might be incorporated in this bill. I invite to the support of this bill all those in this House who feel that the economic life of Canada is not what it should be. I do not propose that the government should abandon any rights to control freight rates, to control their ports or the tariff, which they now possess. If the government were omniscient the investigatory portions of this bill might be unnecessary, but as long as governments are composed of human beings they will not be either omnipotent or omniscient. Therefore, is there any more reasonable method to pursue than that indicated under the bill—that there should be investigation, and after investigation, action? Whether the investigation should be carried on just as indicated in the bill; whether the action should not be rather larger, rather broader than as narrow as indicated in the bill, are matters which we can discuss, I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, better in committee than when we are sitting as the House. But I do think that this bill deserves the support of all the representatives of the people. I would be glad to see notice given to all monopolists and combinesters in this country, by the unanimous vote of this House, that the heart and the mind of the representatives of the Canadian people are behind this legislation in order that it may have a fair chance and a fair field to bring about the desired end, namely, not the reduction of prices irrespective of what the goods cost, but a fair deal for the consumer as well as for the producer.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, there will be ample opportunity to discuss the details of this bill when we go into committee, this the second reading is the occasion for discussion of the general principles of the bill. For that reason I am going to say only a few words this afternoon. But, coming from a city that has had a great deal to do with the Board of Commerce—perhaps more to do with it than all the rest of the municipalities of Canada put together because we have had more applications before it—I would like to make a few remarks regarding the proposed legislation.

I would like to help the government in the work they have before them, but I am sorry that they have seen fit to bring down such a bill as that now before us. If you read the bill from cover to cover; if you carefully examine the definition of "combines," "registrar," and so on; if you look into the machinery provided for the enforcement of the act, it will be seen that the general principle of the bill is based on the old Board of Commerce and the Combines and Fair Prices Act. The denouncing of capital is very popular with some, particularly at election time. Personally I would not want to be an employer to-day, having regard to the high taxes and the high prices which are general throughout the country. The lot of the employer or of the capitalist is not an easy one, by any means. I know a great many capitalists interested in private enterprises who work as hard as, if not harder than, any labouring man in Canada, who spend large sums to improve their business, and who in many cases give a lot of their money away to the public. In some respects they are more

sinned against than sinning. I say it is a popular act with some hon. members of this House to denounce from the housetops, trusts and combines and restraints of trade. We had a speech this afternoon from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). No gentleman in the late election went further than he did concerning what would be done to the combines and trusts if he was returned as the member for South Toronto. This subject is a predominant one in Toronto, particularly among the working classes. I may say that the working classes in Canada have themselves done more to regulate the trusts and combines by not buying when prices are increased than all the legislation I have seen. We hear a great deal about the big interests, particularly at election time; it has been said that we on this side are the allies of the big interests, that was said, indeed, by the hon. Minister of Labour himself in the election campaign in South Toronto.

Now, what are these "big interests" that are referred to? They are, first, the transportation and shipping interests; second, the manufacturers and the Manufacturers' Association; third, the banking interests and trusts and combines along these lines. What has the minister done to regulate these trusts during the two years that he has been in office? There is no country in the world to-day in which the big interests flourish like a green bay tree, without let or hindrance, as they do in the Dominion of Canada. Canada is the happy hunting ground for all these American trusts and combines. Take the restaurant trust to-day—Child's, Bowles' and all these places. They are well established in the big cities of the United States, and they have crossed to Canada. They are subject to public regulation in the United States; inquiries have been made respecting them and prosecutions taken against them to bring down the prices, but nothing of that kind has been done in Canada.

It has been said that the party system in Canada has fallen down in its regulation of trusts. I am sorry that this question has been made the political football of this party or that party. In fact, both political parties are in the same boat in this respect; they have done what they could to try to regulate these trusts and combines on behalf of the public but have failed. I wish to give the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a certain amount of credit, in connection with this particular matter, for bringing down this bill for debate for he has long been a student of labour. Hon. members criticize the party system for not having done something to regulate the trusts and combines; I wish to criticize the United Farmers of Ontario and the group system for having fallen down in this matter. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has said that there is a shipping trust on the Great Lakes. So there is. And there is a sugar trust. Anyone who will take Houston's Financial Annual will see the large number of mergers that have been formed in recent years. The city of Toronto spent about $10,000 at the request of this Board of Commerce, of which the present Minister of Labour was one of the members, to secure data for them. There was a general complaint among the working classes and those receiving small salaries that they could not get a good lunch in a restaurant under anywhere from 60 or 75 cents to $1. A bit of a sandwich would cost 25 or 30 cents; corn, which could be bought at about 15 to 18 cents a dozen, would be sold at 35 or 40 cents each; tomatoes retailing at 35 cents a basket would sell at 35 cents a plate in some restaurants and hotels. The women's organizations sent a deputation to the Toronto City Council and Board of Control; they filled the council chamber—several hundred of them—and asked that we should do something regarding the prices of certain food products. It was pointed out to them what the law was, that section 498 of the Criminal Code had been suspended because of the Board of Commerce Act of 1919 and the Combines and Fair Prices Act. So the medical health officer, Dr. Hastings, was requested to make a survey of the situation in Toronto, at the request of the Board of Commerce which he did at great expense to the taxpayer. He made a survey and collected enough evidence to fill a trunk. It was sent down to the Board of Commerce at Ottawa, who filed and pigeon holed this elaborate report, but nothing further was done. They simply passed the buck to somebody else, as the military authorities say—all that could be done under that particular act.

I give the men who proposed that act credit for being sincere, but with all due respect that act failed, and for many reasons. The Board of Commerce legislation was founded very largely on the successful carrying on of the United States Federal Trade Commission, but the Board of Commerce never got going, and I believe the same will be true of this new board that is to be appointed—I do not believe it will ever get going. Before it gets going the skilled lawyers of the trusts will raise some technicalities and have the legislation before the Privy Council. Some clever lawyer will find

a flaw in the drafting, notwithstanding that it has been drafted by the Justice department, and we shall find it declared to be ultra vires of this parliament. The Board of Commerce was founded largely on popular clamour to regulate prices after the war. Popular clamour demanded action by parliament in 1918 and 1919, and in 1919 two acts were passed, but the main features of the Board of Commerce legislation, and the main functions of the board of 1919 never came into operation, owing to members of the board resigning, and owing to the fact that no action was taken on their reports. So the real working functions of the board of 1919 were never performed, and I predict that this new board will never perform its functions either, but will simply become a cypher. In other words the Board of Commerce Act was, and this act will be, "still-born" so far as practical results go.

I may say that profit control was one of the very last functions the Board of Commerce considered—but profit control, should be the main function in the regulation of prices and trusts and combines. The Board of Commerce no doubt did some good work. Mr. O'Connor did very good work in connection with profiteering, and the bacon extortion, and I venture to say that if some war profiteers had been prosecuted, better results would have been obtained. But the war profiteers were in a preferred class in this country. They got away not only with profits but with titles as well.

If I may be permitted a suggestion to the government I would advise them to repeal altogether the legislation of 1919 and adopt some practical legislation such as they have in the United States—the grand jury scheme of inquiry—under which some four hundred and eighty combines, trusts and mergers were prosecuted in one year by federal and state authorities. Take Judge Landis of the city of Chicago; he prosecuted the Standard Oil combine and imposed a fine on that corporation of $50,000,000 under federal legislation. That was practical legislation, not legislation under which you ran round in a circle and when you had got round it handed it over to the provincial Attorney General or passed the buck to another.

The provincial Attorney General in Ontario is in politics and does nothing but talk.

This matter was put up to him but he said: No, let the Dominion government look after it. We laid a bill of indictment before Mr. Justice Kelly and a jury, and we were told that the Crown prosecutor would not take the case, first, because the Attorney General would not approve, secondly, because he had no power inasmuch as the Criminal Code had been superseded by the Board of Commerce Act, and thirdly, because the applicant, the city of Toronto, would have to put up a bond as security for costs and bringing the witnesses there. But in the United States they did get results by the grand jury system of inquiry into trusts and combines and got results quickly.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that some of these mergers are good things. I could name several of them that have been good for the country; when they cut down the overhead and reduce the price of the article. Many of them have done good, but the majority of them have done wrong, and several of them are all wrong and should be regulated. The producer has the law on his side. It is always there in many ways to protect him. The law always favours the producer. But the five-and-ten-dollar consumer, the poor man, finds the legislation all against him. Take the Lord's Day Act, for instance, if a man is rich he can buy ice cream and a box of cigars for Sunday, but the poor man cannot have these luxuries on Sunday because he can only buy a cone or one cigar at a time. It is the same with trusts and combines. A poor man cannot get anywhere in his attack on them. If he wants to lay a charge he is told by the Crown: You will please put up security for costs, and so forth. I would suggest that the government adopt the grand jury system of inquiry as set out in the report of Judge Landis of Chicago. He did a great deal of good work, advised the federal authorities and got results a thousandfold.

I should like to propose this amendment if the government would be good enough to consider it. Of course, I know it cannot be moved to-day, but I should like to bring it to the attention of the government. It has been asked for by many grand juries. I know that a couple of grand juries made a recommendation something like the amendment I have drafted. I propose that the following be added to the bill as section 37, and I shall move this amendment in Committee of the Whole House:

(37) Any grand jury at any sittings of the General Sessions of the Peace, or any grand jury at any sitting of the High Court of Justice, or any grand jury duly and lawfully convened in any province of Canada, may exercise as respects any person or any property within such province any power which by this act may be exercised by the registrar or any commission appointed under this act, without obligation, however, to report to any minister of the Crown, and with power to make a presentment in accordance with the facts found by it.

What I would suggest is that the government repeal the Board of Commerce Act of 1919 and the Combines and Fair Prices Act

of 1919, and go back to the old law, section 498 of the Criminal Code. Let us broaden out that section by such an amendment as I have suggested, giving the grand juries power to go into these questions. After all is said and done, the government of the day can do very little in a matter of this kind. There are many problems which governments cannot handle in days of stress and strain like these. There are many problems that the government cannot solve legally or otherwise except with the aid of Providence—and while the government may try to do the best they can and are sometimes criticized unfairly, and sometimes insincerely, the best action to take in this matter is to decentralize the problem. There is nothing like the old law of supply and demand. The people of New York state have been teaching a lesson to the sugar combine and women organizations have been established in New York state to fight that combine by not buying sugar in order to force the price down. The same thing happened over here many years ago among the working classes as they refused to buy certain necessities of life because of the high prices. So while the government may endeavour to do its part, it cannot do all, and it is better for it to decentralize and leave this matter to those who have the necessary time, ability and knowledge—the judges, Crown officers, grand juries and municipal officers. Give them a chance of looking into these questions; and also give the grand juries the opportunity I have suggested, because there is nothing like a little publicity in these matters, and the grand jury will get results that this bill will never get.

I spoke of the city of Toronto's experience with the Board of Commerce and pointed out that we got no action at all. Bearing that in mind it was a funny thing to me to hear the speech of the Minister of Labour this afternoon. He was a member of that Board of Commerce. I do not wish to be unfair to him, but I understand that after all the members of the board had resigned he still remained a member for four months and drew his salary. If he did not believe the board was fulfilling its functions, he should have resigned and not drawn the salary which he did.

Mr. MURDOCK: Apparently the hon. gentleman is not aware that I was not the last member of the Board of Commerce to go. Mr. O'Connor left the Board of Commerce after I did.

Mr. CHURCH: I gladly accept the hon. minister's statement, but he was a judge on the board and acted although he now says his powers were curtailed. I do not know about this particular problem but I do know that when a trunk load of evidence was sent to the Board of Commerce in regard to the operations of certain combines, including American restaurants in the city of Toronto, it was without result. The health officer of that city at the request of the Board of Commerce spent thousands of dollars in collecting evidence with respect to combines of many kinds —restaurant services, boots and shoes, clothing and others. When that evidence was sent down to the Board of Commerce why did they not act? Instead of acting they moved in a circle and wound up by asking the attorney general of the province to institute proceedings. Well, the people of Toronto got disgusted, and what did they do? They laid a complaint before the Board of Police Commissioners stating that exorbitant prices in restaurants were being charged, and excessive prices for milk and the other commodities I have named, which are really necessities of life. That board took prompt action. In the city of Toronto restaurants, for example, cannot operate except under license from the police commissioners. So Colonel Denison and his colleagues, including Judge Winchester and myself, summoned the managers of these American restaurants before the police board and threatened to cancel their licenses unless the rates they were charging were cut in two within one week. Action in the desired direction promptly followed. Before the expiration of the allotted time the prices charged for coffee, toast, vegetables, eggs, and other articles had been reduced by 33 1-3 per cent. This shows that you can get action if you only go the right way about it. I really believe that if we could have periodic inquiries by the grand jury as in the United States into excessive prices we would really make more headway. Personally, I do not think it is fair for the government to introduce a bill of this character so late in the session. The principle involved here is exactly the same as in the legislation of 1919, but the difficulty seems to be for the lawyers to draft a statute in such a way that it will not be declared ultra vires of this parliament.

The tariff is blamed for the condition of affairs that is complained of. In my opinion the tariff is not responsible. The Mother Country is a free trade country and yet mergers, trusts and combines flourish over there. The United States has a protective tariff but over there they enforce the law against trusts and combines. As I have already said the United States federal attorney general, with the assist-

ance of the state attorney general, has prosecuted some 485 combines in one year over there resulting in the imposition upon them of penalties amounting to millions of dollars in the aggregate and the control of prices and mergers. Therefore, you cannot blame the tariff for the existence of these combines. The tariff is blamed for almost everything but in my opinion it is not responsible for this particular problem. The difference between the proposed legislation and that enacted in 1919 is that in the present bill you can by order in council amend the tariff. If a combine is taking advantage of it, or you can revoke a patent found to be operating injuriously to the public you can do that already now in another way. It is also provided that if the Attorney General of a province does not enforce the report of a registrar, the Solicitor General may act in certain cases.

The act of 1919 and the present bill will fail in effect for the same reason that the Board of Commerce failed. Undoubtedly there is a demand for action of some kind. A great many trusts and combines are flourishing in this country. The shipping combine, for example, seems to be most active both in the matter of freight and passenger rates. Formerly one could travel from Toronto to Niagara Falls for $1.25 return but that rate has been increased to $3 and over. Freight rates on fruit, vegetables and farm products carried to cities and towns on the shores of lake Erie and lake Ontario have also been enhanced. The small freight and passenger boats which in former days used to operate with great advantage and convenience to the public have been frozen out by this combine. The matter should be looked into by Mr. Raney the Attorney General of Ontario. This combine, which is a restraint on shipping, could be investigated and remedial action taken if the provincial Attorney General were so inclined under section 498 of the Criminal Code. The same is true of many other combines that are flourishing like a green bay tree.

There is a question involved here as to the power of parliament to enact such legislation in view of the decision given by the Privy Council in 1921 in the case of the Attorney General of Canada vs. the Attorney General of Alberta. It would appear from that judgment that it is very doubtful whether this parliament can enforce such legislation as this proposed bill inasumch as property and civil rights within a province is exclusively a matter for the provincial legislature, and that the federal authority cannot erect a board competent to make regulations affecting trade and commerce which will be of merely local application. This parliament can, however, regulate trade and commerce if its regulations are of general application and for the general advantage of Canada. If parliament goes to the extent proposed in this new legislation before us to-day into the matter of property and civil rights it is very doubtful if it can enforce the act by merely declaring that to violate it is a crime. I would suggest that the proper course to take would be to broaden out section 498 of the Criminal Code so as to enable a grand jury to investigate these and declare the maintenance of mergers, trusts and combines of a wrongful nature a crime. One of the ablest county court judges we had in Toronto was the late Judge Winchester, who was also a police commissioner. Some fifteen or sixteen years ago, he, together with Colonel Denison, police magistrate, took action under this section 498 against certain trusts. They sent down and seized the books of a particular trust complained of and within twenty-four hours those identified with that trust amended their regulations and reduced their prices. As it is now, section 498 of the Criminal Code is practically inoperative. Some time ago a prosecution was started against the milk combine in Toronto under section 498. A bill was preferred against a milk combine, but Mr. Justice Kelly and the crown prosecutor, Mr. White, refused to consider a bill of indictment, because, they said, the powers given under the Criminal Code, section 498, had been superseded by those conferred on the Board of Commerce. I would suggest to the government that they carefully confer with the Justice department and see whether, by broadening section 498 and bringing into operation the functions of grand juries, properly convened, action cannot be taken in the desired direction rather than pass legislation of this character. In that way no harm would be done to capital, to labour, or to any public interest and combines, trusts and restraints of trade would be subject to some practical, useful and effective public control.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): Before the second reading of this bill passes I would like to dispel an impression which may have been created in the minds of hon. gentlemen by certain references of an hon. member to the Canadian Press. The remarks in question were offered by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), and were very ably replied to by the Prime Minister whose statement I am glad to substantiate. Unfortunately those remarks have been accepted and commented on by subsequent speakers in this debate. In the first

place, I would like to correct the idea that the Canadian Press can prevent the publication of a newspaper in any city in this country, also that this organization is in any sense a "combine of opinion". It is not by any means in the power of the Canadian Press to prevent the publication of any paper in Canada. The only thing they can do, and which they have done in certain cases, is to deny to certain papers applying for it the privilege of the interchange of news which is enjoyed by those papers composing the Canadian Press. That matter I will deal with at some length later on. But the Canadian Press, contrary to the view expressed by some hon. members opposite, is in no sense a "combine of opinion" because the opinion expressed by any paper has no place whatever in the exchange of news among the different papers concerned. What the Canadian Press does is to furnish to its members news of the events transpiring in different localities in Canada. This is merely carrying out on a larger scale the arrangement which formerly existed between the newspapers of Montreal and the newspapers of Quebec for the exchange of local news. In accordance with this arrangement a newspaper in Quebec would wire to its Montreal confrère local happenings of interest, and the Montreal newspaper would reciprocate by sending to Quebec news of interest from its own neighbourhood. It was thought that the papers in different cities of Canada might agree to an exchange of news and that great advantage might accrue, not only to the papers but also to the reading public, because it would enable the different papers to carry the news at a cheaper rate. But again I say, never has the opinion of a paper been called in question. Take for instance the report of the Canadian House of Commons. These reports are published by Tory papers and by Liberal papers and by Progressive organs, because they are merely a compendium of what takes place in the House. If a paper wishes to comment on speeches made in the House, or measures that are being presented by the government, it is for them to engage a special Ottawa correspondent or to take it up in the editorial columns. There is no question of opinion in the alleged combine of the Canadian press. A Tory paper that is a party to that association may later be bought by the Liberal party or by an independent party, yet it would retain the privileges it enjoys in the Canadian Press. I repeat it is not in the power of the Canadian Press to prevent any paper from starting publication in a city where papers belonging to the Canadian Press Association already exist. The only situation that is created is that a paper starting in without the services of the Canadian Press would naturally be placed under a certain handicap, and possibly in that regard the Canadian Press may come more or less within the scope of the bill now before the House. There is not the slightest understanding between any of the papers concerned in the Canadian Press with regard to the rates of advertisement, or the price the paper will charge for copies. I would submit that this news service cannot be handled by a private company. It might be said that it would be better if a private company would undertake to organize a service of that kind and to place it on the market at a certain price so that every paper in the country could buy it. But a private company, not having the machinery and not having the benefit of the organization of the newspapers in different parts of the country could not hope to undertake a service of that kind at a price moderate enough to allow any of the papers to use it. It will also be understood that a service of that kind cannot be unlimited in number of members forming the association. The principle of it is an interchange of news. If you have in that association a paper whose service is limited, and it enjoys the news service of a larger paper for which it does not give a corresponding news service, there certainly would be a lack in the organization that would not be for the good of the newspapers concerned generally or for the good of the public that it is intended to serve.

On the other hand, we cannot forget that this association gets a subsidy from the government, and it looks very much as if it came to a point where the government was subsidizing a certain number of papers and leaving it in the hands of those papers to refuse admission of other papers in their association. I may say, quoting from memory, that article 7 of the charter of the Canadian Press of 1914 grants to the association the privilege of establishing regulations for the admission and expulsion of members. Possibly there is there too great a liberty given to the association. I would think that if the charter were amended in such a way that the Canadian Press could not refuse admission of papers applying for admission under certain conditions, we might remedy that part of it. But as I am connected with a paper which is now in the association of the Canadian Press, I thought it would be well, before the bill is read the second time, to give this explana-

tion to the House. Personally I do not think, outside of that point, that these papers are enjoying a subsidy of public money, I do not think there is anything wrong with the arrangement at all. I would say that if this bill is given effect to it might form the subject of an investigation, but I am quite sure the Canadian Press could withstand an investigation, and could show that its alleged combine is merely an arrangement whereby the Canadian public are getting news from all over the Dominion, not of a political or contentious character, but merely facts, and they are getting it at a cheaper price than they could if that association did not exist.

I fully agree with the principle of this bill. Some hon. member asked last night, what is the principle of the bill? I think the principle is clear. It is giving the taxpayer an efficient weapon against combines. It has been argued against the bill that it is useless because section 498 of the Criminal Code deals with combines. It has also been argued against the bill that the proceedings provided are too long and of a circuitous character. It has also been argued that the registrar should have wider powers and also a penalizing power. Other arguments have been presented to the effect that this bill could be abused, and that we must protect trade against any demand for inquiry that would not be warranted, and also that we must have secrecy in the proceedings in order to prevent blackmailing or anything of that character. I think all these arguments presented against the bill answer themselves. The reason why the proceedings are of the character the bill provides for, and the reason why the registrar is not given too extended power, is precisely to prevent what other members are afraid the bill might do; that is that it might serve, in the hands of an unscrupulous man or group of unscrupulous men, a wrong purpose. I think it is perfectly right that the registrar should not have absolute power, and that his power should be merely, as the bill provides, to establish an inquiry. It is also perfectly right that whatever company is inquired into should have the right to present its defence. I believe that the argument presented by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that it was a wrong principle to give a chance to the accused party to know of an accusation and give that party time to answer the accusation, is a very wrong argument and altogether un-British. I think the bill is along the right lines. This bill gives the public an opportunity to apply to a registrar for an inquiry, something which it could not do under the criminal code on account of the expenses that would be involved. It gives to the registrar power to restrict that inquiry, but it gives to the accused parties an opportunity to present their defence. I have sympathy for the proposal that has been made by some hon. members, including the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler), that a certain secrecy should be kept over these proceedings as long as the accused party has not been found guilty, because this would be the best means to prevent any group of men from using this bill, not to fine a combine but merely to serve some other purpose.

In conclusion, I hope this bill will attain its end, not only by providing means to suppress existing combines, but, if it proves an efficient weapon in the hands of the people, by preventing the formation of combines in future. I believe that this should be the aim of all legislation, not only to remedy what evil already exists, but to prevent that evil from spreading in the future.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): After the number of speeches that we have heard upon this subject, which is an important one, I do not know whether I am acting wisely in continuing to occupy the time of the House, as very much of the discussion will properly proceed upon the details of the measure when we are considering it in committee section by section. Yet there are some general observations which have occurred to me and which I feel are fundamental with respect to the measure, and that is my excuse for troubling the House after the debate has already proceeded so extensively.

In the first place, even at the risk of uttering some generalities, I think I may say that the speakers have been generally, if not entirely, in accord in recognizing as perhaps fundamental that combines, trusts and mergers are not necessarily injurious to the public interest. On the other hand, it is common experience that under certain circumstances, and carried on in a certain way, combines, trusts and mergers may produce a very great injury to the public. I think we can all see that, in the very formation of great aggregations of capital or industry, the world is slowly working out the problem of co-operation which, in some form or other, perhaps one or perhaps many generations after the present time, will find a different method of adjusting

human relationships from that which we now possess. It is not unnatural perhaps from this side of the House for me to take the traditionally Conservative view of desiring to be assured of what the next step is going to be before I take it. It is not to be wondered at that a certain portion of the community, which I might describe as radical, desires to take some extraordinary step regardless of consequences and rather for the sake of experimentation. Between the two seems to lie the traditionally Liberal view—I do not know whether I interpret it aright—of not saying whether they are going to take any step or not, but of waiting for things to turn up.

I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to legislation of the character which has been introduced in the House. Some remarks have fallen from the lips of hon. members rather intimating that there was no sincerity on the part of the previous government in dealing with this question. Some have said that the previous methods have not been effective. Really, Mr. Speaker, I would rather attribute that feature of the discussion, which we have heard in this Chamber, more to a desire to exploit the subject for political capital than to any real wish to bring something to bear upon the present measure and to discuss it on its merits, offering, if they can be made, helpful suggestions for the working out of the act. The past must always be the past, and I trust we are living in the present and looking toward the future; and it is for us, if we do not think that a suggested remedial measure reaches what is really perhaps a danger point in our civilization, to contribute something to the perfecting of that measure. I intend that what I say to-night shall be directed to that end, because before I conclude I trust I shall be able to make some suggestions which I believe would enable the present government and this parliament more effectively to deal with a question of this character than we are able to do under present circumstances.

Among the criticisms that we have heard of the past legislation was the remark of one hon. member that we had now got legislation with a kick in it, as he expressed it. I think I may fairly claim for past administrations, whether they have been Liberal or Conservative, that they have each and all recognized the difficulties which may be presented by some form of commercial combination and have each put forward some means of remedying this state of affairs, which means was thought to be adequate at the time it was promoted. I think the House could fairly agree to that; and it will be conceded, I have no doubt, that the measure introduced in the time of Sir John A. Macdonald was quite sufficient to meet the evils that appeared in his time; that later legislation which was introduced by my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was believed by him and his party to be adequate for such evils as existed at that time; and that when we come down to the Board of Commerce and the combines legislation my right hon. friend who leads this side of the House (Mr. Meighen) was presenting what was believed to be the most adequate and the latest development in legislation for dealing with difficulties of the character that was being experienced in that day. Surely we must give some credit for a little honour and sincerity of purpose in public life; and I think that the House would do much better to trace the legislation step by step to see where improvements have been made and to find out what gaps, if any, have been left unfilled, and view the present proposition in the light of that history and present experience, with the object of getting some measure, if the present one is not the best, that will be adequate to meet the situation. It is entirely in that spirit, as I say, that I wish to approach the question.

Now, we have to start practically from the Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act. There was legislation that I do not think can fairly be described as a wooden gun; it did not in any way lack a kick. The power was there for investigation, for prosecution, for punishment. If the old code provisions, about which I hope to say something before I get through, were not sufficient, at all events the government in 1919 took steps, by two reciprocal measures, to rid the country so far as possible of all unfair dealing in the necessaries of life and in articles of trade and commerce. I do not understand, I cannot find from the records, that a single criticism was offered at that time as to the possible ineffectiveness of the legislation. There was some criticism that the legislation was going too far, but we never heard, I think, on the floor of this House the suggestion that the legislation was in any way outside the competence of this parliament. Now, what happened? The legislation was called into question. We must expect that; every interest that is struck by legislation will naturally turn to the courts and look for relief. Certain interested parties did that; the case was ultimately submitted to the Privy Council, and whether we like it or not, whether or not we think it ought to be the law, we are bound to accept their decision as the law in this respect, and there is

no appeal for us except to the supreme law-making assembly, the parliament of Great Britain.

What did the Privy Council decide? I will not trouble the House by reading lengthy extracts from the judgment, but I think I can put it on this ground: The Privy Council recognized, as it must recognize, the division of powers as between the Dominion and the provinces as laid down by the British North America Act; that in the enumeration of powers vested solely in the province we have property and civil rights within the provinces, and that there is no power in this parliament to trench upon property and civil rights except in some mode ancillary to carrying out some one or more of the powers which are expressly and exclusively confided to this parliament by the British North America Act. I think that any layman, and a great many lawyers, in looking at the British North America Act and studying the allocation of subjects which are within the exclusive jurisdiction of parliament, would have said that the words "trade and commerce" were ample to confer all possible and requisite jurisdiction upon this parliament. But a decision of the Privy Council has laid it down that the vast business of insurance, which has grown so mightily in the last few decades, is not a subject falling within trade and commerce. The Privy Council went much further when the Combines and Fair Prices Act was submitted to it. The Privy Council said that unless the subjects dealt with fell within trade and commerce, this parliament had no power over them at all. It went even a step farther and declared that you could not decide that a thing that fell within the class of "property and civil rights" within a province was noxious and, having decided that, take it out of the class of property and civil rights by calling it an infraction of the criminal law. Whether we like this as a decision or whether we do not, it is the law that binds us today and it is the principle by which the act submitted by the right hon. Prime Minister must be judged. So that one of the objects of my address this evening is to clear away, if I can, what I humbly think are some misconceptions that prevail in this Chamber with regard to the power and the ability of the measure which has been presented.

I have heard hon. members discussing a subject into the details of which I do not propose to enter, namely, the regulation by an association of newspapers of a certain franchise. I know that some hon. members honestly feel that all that it is necessary to do is to get this bill enacted into law and that they will then be able to use the investigator and resort to the courts in order to obtain a franchise for a newspaper which is now being denied a franchise. Well, all I can say is that in the light of the decisions to which I have referred, that is a complete misconception of the law. I am not afraid of being treated as a prophet; in fact, there is no prophecy involved in it. You can adopt every syllable of this bill and there will be no relief for that newspaper situation. Let us pass to something else entirely different. This law professes to strike at, possibly, combinations in insurance, but it will be futile in any attempt to deal with that question because insurance has been declared not to be a part of trade and commerce by the highest legal authority in the Empire, and merely putting insurance in this bill will not make it a part of trade and commerce. Unless you legislate with respect to trade and commerce in its widest and amplest sense, you are not legislating at all; there is no power here to deal with the matter. Where then, is the power? The Privy Council has said that it resides in the local legislatures. Unfortunately for the objects of this bill, it does; and before I get through I shall possibly suggest a remedy with regard to that.

Let us now come to something that gets much nearer home so far as a good many members of this House and a good many of their constituents are concerned. Mention was made in the course of the debate of the question of milk supply. I have not the slightest doubt that hon. members within the sound of my voice think that if this bill goes through it will be possible to stop any unfair or oppressive combination with regard to the distribution of milk or the fixing of prices for milk. But you cannot do it. If this parliament had the power, the bill would be effective, but the bill fails because parliament constitutionally has not the power. The sale of milk, the sale of butter, of eggs, of ordinary dairy products, of most of the things that we eat or drink or wear, form incidents in the law of property and civil rights which has by the wisdom of our forefathers been allocated to the provinces. Hon. members will recall last year the difficulty that was experienced with regard to a wheat board. That was another attempt of Union government to do a thing that was strongly desired by a part of this country; it failed in precisely the same way. Hon. members know the difficulties that have been experienced since in trying to get corresponding legislation from the provinces in order that a wheat board might be galvanized into partial life. The very same thing that creates that difficulty

creates this one: you are simply up against the powers of the provincial legislatures and the want of power of this parliament.

Banks and banking. You have there a subject that belongs to the Dominion. You may pass legislation of this character dealing with banks and banking because you have control of the subject and you can pass any law that you want to with regard to the subject. With respect to insurance, as I have said, you cannot. Retail business within a province this parliament cannot touch because it does not fall under any of the heads of the powers that belong to this parliament. Wholesale business if limited to a single province would be equally out of the scope of the legislation, and I have already made a remark about the newspaper situation.

Now what is the remedy for this? In my judgment, and I am giving it for what it is worth, the proper way to reach this subject is to get the power in this parliament to deal with what is a very important phase of national life. I do not regard the compact of confederation as a thing that came into force on the 1st day of July, 1867, and that has never to be altered. I realize the immense difficulties there would be in getting the consent of the provinces to approach the Imperial parliament and have a resettling of those distributions of power, but I think we have got to come to it some day. I am not going to discuss by itself in any way the question of the wheat board that we had last winter, but I say that if wheat control is a necessary thing for Canada, if that be demonstrated then the obvious, the logical, the necessary thing to do is to go where the power can be given and get the power given to this parliament to deal with a question of that kind by Canada, instead of having it split up among the several provinces and become utterly ineffective. Just in the same way, if I am right in my interpretation of the judgment of the Privy Council, and I think I am, the remedy that ought to be applied today is not the enacting of legislation which is going to fall far, far short of the expectations of this House, is going to fall far, far short of the provisions that are contained in it, so far as effectiveness is concerned; the remedy is to get the provinces to co-operate and to ask the Imperial parliament to change the distribution of powers between the federal and the local legislatures and give the power to this body so that efficient legislation may be enacted. We are going to have, and have in increasing measure as time goes on, trusts and combines, mergers and monopolies, and it seems to me almost farcical to suggest that they ever can or will be adequately dealt with by provincial legislation. Then if the power is not here, and the Privy Council has said that it is not here except in rare instances, again I repeat the obvious thing is to take the proper steps to get the power so that this parliament may function in accord with the will of the people.

But entirely apart from that I would like to take perhaps a few minutes to discuss what might be done at the present time, without seeking any delay, that would afford some relief, would give some power and would in my opinion be more effective than the measure that is proposed; in other words would do very much the same thing but in a different sort of way. Reference has been made to section 498 of the Criminal Code. Reference has also been made to a judgment recently in an Ontario court, and to the observations of the Deputy Minister of Justice upon that decision. In my judgment—it may not be worth much but it is the best I have got—the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice is absolutely right and the obiter of the Chief Justice of Ontario—perhaps it was more than that—that the code provision was ultra vires is, I humbly submit, not a correct view of the law. I prefer and believe to be correct the judgment of the majority of the court and the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice. But this code provision which has been in force now for a great many years has never been a wooden gun. It has never been an ineffective weapon. It has been simply, readily applied, easily operated, and it may surprise hon. members of the House to realize that it has been invoked at least with fair frequency and on the whole with a very great deal of success. If my hon. friends will take the trouble to take any modern book on Canadian criminal jurisprudence, turn to section 498 and look at the list of cases that are cited as having been decided under it, they will find that in the great majority of these cases the prosecutions were successful. I have not pretended—I did not think it worth while—to make an exhaustive digest of the cases because I realize that while parliament is a court in one sense, yet about the last thing that parliament desires is to hear a lawyer talking shop, and therefore I do not want to make a long bead-roll of cases. But I might point out that there was a wheat case in Manitoba. It is known as the Gage case. There the prosecution failed. But why did it fail? Because the court held, or the single judge before whom it was tried held, and the appellate court felt they could not interfere with him, that an agreement to exact a profit of one cent

and to limit the profit to one cent per bushel was under the circumstances not an unfair agreement, not an undue combination, not in any sense an oppressive thing, but that it really worked out to the benefit of the business. Well, I do not suppose, assuming that the judge came to a correct conclusion on the facts, that anyone would want any different kind of a decision under the measure now proposed, under the criminal code, or under any other legislation.

But then we have other cases. An agreement in an Ontario case to sell cheaper to the Master Plumbers' and Steam Fitters' Association than the manufacturers were selling to other dealers who were outside of that association by a difference of twenty-five per cent was held to be a violation of the code provision, and a penalty was imposed. Hon. members who want to investigate that will find that it was decided in the case of the Central Supply Association. Now the code was not without a kick there. There was no wooden gun in evidence, and what machinery had to be gone through in order to obtain that provision? Nothing but for one man, not six, but one man to go into the office of a police court and tell the clerk of that court what his complaint was, wait till the clerk wrote it out, and then swear to it. After that the whole machinery of justice moved on without the necessity of that individual spending his own money or in fact doing anything else than giving the names of witnesses and a statement of the facts they could prove. No preliminary inquiry by a registrar, or a commissioner, or any other functionary—nothing but the plain, everyday, ordinary administration of British criminal justice as we have always known it. That does not require very much addition or simplification, does it? We had in another case a declaration by a court that it did not matter whether a price was to be raised or lowered by the combination; so long as it was an improper interference with trade it was a reprehensible thing and it was punishable. A lumber association was formed. That lumber association fixed prices and assumed to prevent persons from engaging in the lumber trade in certain localities without the consent and approval of the association, through its officers, and subject to its control both as to the minimum prices to be charged the public and as to the places in which lumber yards should be started. Now, in the Clarke case in Alberta, the association had arranged the prices at which tenders should be put in and who should put them in, and I think a fine of several thousands of dollars was imposed. Once again the ordinary administration of the criminal law of the country was found to be quite sufficient. There are many other cases. I have not extracted any more but I think hon. members will take my word that they exist, and that this act has been found to have a very great deal of kick in it, a great deal of vigour, and absolute effectiveness.

One of my suggestions to my right hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) is this: There is no question as to the power of this parliament to establish a criminal law to alter that criminal law from time to time, and to make new criminal laws, provided it deals with subjects that can be said to be properly subjects for criminal law. In the Board of Commerce case the Privy Council said that you could not take hold of a transaction which under the law of the province was only referable to the province for decision or transaction which, whether you liked it or not, was perfectly lawful under the law of the province, and attach criminal consequences to the doing of an act permitted by that law. In other words you could not have recourse to the criminal law for the purpose of interfering with the powers of the provinces. On the other hand under British law, from practically the earliest times, things that have been perfectly innocent when performed by one man have been held to be guilty because they were performed as the result of a combination by two or more men. That is the law of conspiracy. It is fundamental, and if you add to the code a provision imposing a penalty upon any persons who combine to do certain classes of acts you will have effective criminal legislation because you are not professing to do anything else than deal with crimes. You are not allowing a man to form a combination of something and then attaching to that the penalty of a crime, which was simply what had been done in the Board of Commerce and Combines and Fair Prices Acts. That was what was done there and what is sought to be repeated in the present legislation. Now I may be told that in a certain sense I may be wrong. I expect to hear this advanced in reply because it was intimated that the Deputy Minister of Justice, for whose opinion I have a very profound respect, or rather the Justice department, had gone over this bill and had expressed the view that it was within the constitutional limits of the power of this parliament. Well, I would be better satisfied if I could hear the opinion read not of someone in the Justice department but the Deputy Minister of Justice himself. And yet if I heard his opinion I doubt if I would feel justified in abandoning my own opinion be-

cause he had formulated a different one. I would be driven to this position: I would have to say that it must be a matter of considerable doubt, and that the question could not be resolved until the opinion of the highest appellate tribunal in the Empire had been taken on the subject. Because, after all, there is no very great difference in the reasoning power among the members of my profession. It is just as possible for one man to read the judgment of the Privy Council and draw his deductions as it is for another; and I would not lightly let go of my opinion which I may say I have not formed except after a very great deal of study of the question. I believe that I am absolutely right, though I would be sorry to assert that in such a broad way if I were confronted with an opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice just as stoutly asserting the opposite.

Now, in the course of the Board of Commerce case the Privy Council pointed out pretty well what this parliament might do. In summing up the legislation of the Combines and Fair Prices Act they pointed out that it authorized the board, under that act, to restrict in cases of food, clothing and fuel, accumulations of these necessaries of life beyond the amount reasonably required in the case of a private person for his household not less than in the case of a trader for his business. They pointed out further that this was an interference in normal times with property and civil rights; that the authority of parliament to legislate for the regulation of trade and commerce does not, by itself, enable interference with particular trades in which Canadians would, apart from any right of interference conferred by these words, be free to engage in the provinces. They further said that legislation implies a claim of title in the cases of non-traders as well as of traders to make orders prohibiting the accumulation of certain articles required for everyday life, and the withholding of such articles from sale at prices to be defined by the board, whenever they exceed the amount of material which appears to the board to be required for domestic purposes or ordinary purposes of business. The board was authorized, they say, to deal with individual cases, and not merely as the result of applying principles to be laid down as of general application.

Now, what is the present legislation? It is simply authorizing not a board but a registrar to deal with individual cases and is not merely the result of applying the principles to be laid down as of general application. The Prime Minister has, I think, considerably improved the structure of his bill by striking words out of the combination section leaving so much to the opinion of the registrar. But still the expression "combine," as defined by the bill, is to be what? It is:

> —to have reference to such combines immediately hereinafter defined as have operated or are likely to operate to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, whether consumers, producers or otherwise.

Limited as aforesaid the expression that is used in the bill is to be deemed to include certain things which are enumerated. I want to point out that while I, in common with every other member of this House, would be glad to see effective legislation which would prevent combinesters from attaining an object which they intended to reach in the future, yet when I read this language "have operated or are likely to operate," I realize that it is beyond the power of parliament to make a criminal act out of something that has not been committed. If this bill goes through in this form to the Privy Council, the moment they see that language they will say, "You cannot invoke the criminal law to punish a man for what he has not yet done. You cannot with one foot step into the domain of provincial right, and place the other foot upon the bed rock of the Criminal Code, and try to straddle the question in that way. You tried it once with the Combines and Fair Prices Act, and we upset that; you cannot come back and try it under this slightly changed form of words, for the change is very slight."

What I am appealing to the House to consider is not at all the interests of any one who seeks to oppress the people, or the interests of any one who seeks to interfere with the trade and commerce or business of the country, and not the interests of any one who strives to make a purely partisan question out of this measure. I believe that the measure will go through, but I am trying to drive home to hon. members the fact—and they might as well know it before they vote for the bill—that when they have set the seal of legislation upon this measure they will have accomplished practically nothing, so far as effectiveness is concerned. They will have done one thing. They will have voted an indirect subsidy that will not be paid wholly out of the exchequer of this country, but that will be paid by scores of contributors throughout Canada to gentleman of my cloth, who will have an opportunity of discussing the defects of this measure before court after court, until it reaches the Privy Council, and in the meantime, once you get a case launched towards the Privy Council, you will have absolutely no attempt to enforce the law until

that case is decided. You will have a veritable fit of paralysis.

My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) was not able in his speech to accurately define the measure. He got a little bit off the track and was trying to put the blame on my right hon. leader. He has not described to us yet any nefarious device that my right hon. friend invented or made use of to prevent the Board of Commerce Act, or the Combines and Fair Prices Act, from working, but he says it did not work. The reason it did not work was that when the question was raised, and when the question was on its way to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, it would have been blind folly to have started prosecutions all over the country which might, and, as the result shows, would have been upset in their conclusions by that decision. I would ask if there is anything more specific in what the minister charged than what he has already said. I think the reason I have given is a complete answer to the remarks that he made, as I thought rather unfairly, trying to throw upon an individual blame for something which, if there is blame at all in connection with it, is due to the Fathers of Confederation, who, perhaps somewhat unwisely, divided the legislative power between the Dominion and the provinces. My right hon. friend can scarcely be accused of that, and I do not know that any one political party can be accused of it. We are learning and we are developing, and I am suggesting that there is a way out of the difficulty by a reallocation of those powers. Going back to section 2, I would suggest to the Prime Minister that the word "such" in the third line be struck out so that the section would read:

> The expression "combine" in this act shall be deemed to have reference to combines hereinafter defined, or to combines immediately affecting trade and commerce and defined as having operated or likely to operate.

I have even great doubt of the wisdom of employing the words "likely to operate." It seems to me the only way this measure can be made effective is to couple it up with something that directly affects trade or commerce. Unless we have the power of getting rid of the Privy Council, we cannot legislate for anything outside of trade and commerce. As the section is drafted, it appears in a mere incidental form in the last clause—

> —or otherwise restraining or injuring trade or commerce.

But it can hardly be necessary to set up a board for the purpose of doing the one thing, or to appoint a registrar for the purpose of doing one thing, that the Privy Council has said we may validly do. I read from the judgment that the Dominion can call for statistical and other information which may be valuable for guidance in affecting Canada as a whole. Such information may be required before any power to regulate trade and commerce can be properly exercised. They cannot confer capacity to regulate particular trades and businesses.

Now against that vital portion of the judgment this legislation is bound to come, and when the two come in conflict, the legislation is going to fall, and not the decision of the Privy Council. I know that if I were dealing with this matter from a purely political and partisan standpoint, if we were indulging in repartee on both sides of the House, and if we were having a good election field night the discussion would be intensely more interesting, but I cannot help it. Law is a dry subject, and I cannot handle it in any other than a dry manner. Still I want the House to have the patience to follow me a little bit through the provisions of the code. Section 498 of the code says

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $4,000 and not less than $200.

And those can be increased by simple amendments.

> Or to two years' imprisonment, or if a corporation, is liable to a penalty not exceeding $10,000 and not less than $1,000, who—

Does what?

> —conspires—

Now we have all power to legislate criminally against conspiracy. We are on solid ground. The section continues—

> —agrees or arranges with any other person or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company to unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing, or dealing in any article or commodity which may be a subject of trade or commerce—

Whoever drafted that section scouted and rather condemned absolute safeguards, and yet whoever drafted that section had pre-vision of the decision of the Privy Council, was so good a constitutional lawyer that the Privy Council, nearly two decades afterwards, has fallen into line with him, because he confined this thing to trade and commerce, the effective subjects upon which we can legislate. The section continues:

> —or to restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any such article or commodity, or
> —to unduly prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any such article or commodity or to unreasonably enhance the price thereof, or,
> —to unduly prevent or lessen competition in the pro-

duction, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply of any such article or commodity, or in the price of insurance upon persons or property.

It is impossible, by talking about the matter, to make comparisons that will be visible. If hon. members could lay those provisions with the words separated, in the rough analysis that I have given, side by side with the proposed measure, they would find that really there is in the proposed measure not very much that is not in the code. There are, however, some things that are covered by the code, and I do not think will be reached by the measure. I am not going to take them all in detail. There is the subject of transportation, which is now under inquiry, not under the proposed legislation, but under a special commission appointed for the purpose. We know in a general way the complaint about the taking, practically the absorption, by the transportation companies, of the profits gained from the soil. Yet if those transportation companies operate wholly within the limits of a single province, the new legislation will not be effective as regards them. If the transportation is between two provinces, or between Canada and a foreign country, there will then be ground upon which this legislation can be based.

I do not think it will be worth while to continue a technical discussion of this character at greater length. I simply say that the way for this House to deal with this subject at present is by adding to the Criminal Code such provisions as are deemed to be vitally necessary. Then you have a straight, clear, direct way of enforcing punishment upon the people who violate those provisions. The other thing that can be done is with the concurrence of the provinces, to apply to the Imperial parliament, to change the British North America Act so that we may do what we ought to be able to do here, validly to legislate on a subject of this character as comprehensively as possible. That I believe can be accomplished; but in the meantime there is no use; in fact, it is unfair—I withdraw the remark "it is unfair"—it is of no use to represent to the people of this country that a wonderful panacea for social ills has been discovered and is now being presented to the country. I withdraw the remark that it is unfair, because I believe in the sincerity of the right hon. gentleman who introduced it and a number of hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support. No, I must withdraw that, because I have not heard, outside of two members, any who have spoken absolutely in its support. Most hon. members on the government side have found fault with it, and I have not heard very great faith expressed, except by one hon. gentleman in the other portion of this side of the House; but I think those who are putting it forward are sincere. I also think, and I have the right to think, they are absolutely mistaken, and that when this measure becomes law, when the official is appointed for whom the place is being made ready, when he has his cohorts around him, when he begins trying to persuade the Attorney General of a province to take action—and that has not been easily accomplished in the past—when he falls back on the Attorney General of Canada or the Solicitor General of Canada and gets some prosecution going, I am not absolutely sure that the people of Canada are not in for another great disillusion. For a few days it will go through the country that a wonderful remedy that nobody ever thought of before has been provided; but after the lapse of a year or so, it will go into the discard along with other legislation that has been passed and that has been found to be ineffective.

I will not make any remarks of a partisan character. I simply appeal to the right hon. gentleman in charge of the bill to give it some more consideration, and if he will, to adopt the suggestion of strengthening the criminal code and letting the Attorney General of Canada or the Solicitor General of Canada, armed with a real gun that will shoot, go into the courts and bring down some of those "combinesters" that we heard so much about during the last election, and that up to this hour no hon. gentleman opposite has either named or even indicated by a vibrant finger pointing in many directions at almost the same time. The province of Ontario was flooded with speeches from an hon. gentleman who, I see, is taking hypocrisy out of public life by retiring himself. I refer to Attorney General Raney, who went throughout the length and breadth of Ontario preaching against the combine in connection with the Ford Motor Company and telling the farmers of Ontario how they were being robbed by the iniquitous government which was putting thousands and millions of dollars into the Ford Company. Last night I was in earnest, I was not joking, when I asked the Minister of Labour to name some of those combines that the government wants to get after. I thought he would name the Ford Company, but he did not. He was invited from this side of the House to name a number; but, oh, with that smile that this House enjoys so much, and with that oratorical utterance that is so pleasant to us all, he just waved aside all interruptions, looking as if he was perfectly

9 p.m.

happy about what he was saying, managed to side-step everything and, in the end, took his seat without having expressed his faith in the existence of anything but some vague, nebulous combine that he did not propose to name and that he would not even assure us that he could name if he would.

While last session this question which I must ask, would not, perhaps, have been quite pertinent, this session it is surely reasonably fair. We were accused of being the party standing in with combines, mergers and monopolies. We were the oppressors of the poor. Every rise in the cost of living was charged to us and our wicked associates. But our hon. friends have now had a fairly reasonable time to put into effect the somewhat vigorous existing provisions of the criminal code; they have had a fairly decent time in which to prepare special legislation, naming the villains if they want to get at them directly. Have they done so? Under those circumstances, is this bill after all marked with all the sincerity that I have been giving its authors credit for, or is it just one more scene in the vast camouflage of politics?

Mr. HAROLD PUTNAM (Colchester): Mr. Speaker, I had not the privilege of hearing the whole of this discussion, and I may set the House at rest by saying that my observations shall be very few. I want to tell the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) that I have very much enjoyed his speech, and I have no mental reservations in telling him that I particularly enjoyed that major portion of it which was devoted to a legal discussion of this question. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, would receive a respectful hearing on a legal question wherever he chose to present himself. There was one observation of his with which I might have the temerity to take issue, or at least to discuss with himself and the House. He seemed to imply that if the person laying the information in the early stages could arrive at no further point than to show that there was a state of facts, or that there were doings or circumstances which produced nothing more than the imminence of an objectionable combine there would be no offence under the act. I cannot follow the hon. gentleman there. The bill does presume a state of affairs wherein a combine is imminent; it does presuppose a state of affairs wherein a combine may or might result from certain indicated circumstances; and it says in effect that you may nip the mischief in the bud and go on with the investigation. The very clauses read by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) from the Criminal Code went no further than that; and yet that was by his own admission a distinct crime, because those clauses read by him from the Criminal Code, I take it, relate merely to a conspiracy to do certain things. I think therefore that a state of affairs which reveals the imminence of an objectionable combine is an offence just as truly as are the cases which were cited by my hon. friend when he read from the Criminal Code itself. In the other and more elaborate phase of the hon. gentleman's very interesting and lucid legal argument, I do not presume to follow him to-night further than to say that to me it was very interesting and I thought substantially fair. I am in hopes that this is entirely intra vires legislation. However, if it is not it will but prove another of those little knocks by which from experience we have come to understand the Act of Confederation better and better as the years roll on.

The bill has been considerably criticized on the ground that it is too easy and informal a proceeding to allow, as it does, six persons to put their heads together and submit a complaint seeking thereby an investigation. Looking at the surrounding circumstances, we must presume that the registrar will be a man of intelligence, of reasonable shrewdness and of judicial temperament. We must presume that, as a juror, he will know or can ascertain, to some substantial extent, the character of the six persons who make the complaint. It is suggested that a man might have a spite against an employer who may have dismissed him from his factory, and that for that reason he would start a merely vexatious prosecution. Well, the remedy for that lies in the common sense of the registrar. I know that in my home town we have a stipendiary magistrate, who, if someone comes and lays a charge against an alleged rum-seller, and if he detects any element of spite in the conduct of the complainant, generally gives such a man pretty short shrift in his court. So that I would take it that one who held so important an office as registrar for the Dominion under this legislation would have an opportunity of becoming fairly well acquainted with the bona fides of a complaint that was submitted to him. Further, six men are a fairly substantial number to lodge a complaint, and it is not at all probable that they would be just so many ne'er-do-wells trying to start trouble. But if they were, as I say, the registrar by a little local inquiry could easily ascertain their character and the bona fides or the mala fides of the complaint, which would largely influence him in coming to a conclusion in the matter and would make for thoroughness and care before the undertaking of an investigation. But the registrar need not be content with a mere verbal or

written statement; he can at once invoke section 17 and require the complainants to go upon oath; and every layman knows that if he is reckless in a solemn affirmation or affidavit he is immediately open to the charge of perjury. Section 17a provides:

> The registrar and every commissioner may accept or require evidence upon affidavit or written affirmation, in every case in which it seems to him proper to do so.

That means that, at any stage, he may declare himself dissatisfied with the statement submitted to him and require an affidavit upon which to base the investigation. So that the mode of instituting the investigation is not quite so plain and easy and informal as many a critic in this House may imagine. The origin of an investigation is something more substantial than that; it is not nearly so intangible as many hon. members evidently suppose.

There is some misconception abroad already with regard to this bill. I find that the Ottawa Journal in an editorial has the ridiculous supposition that if the registrar produces a certificate that in his view the matter should go to the criminal court, that is all the evidence that the Attorney General will require to obtain conviction. Let me read one paragraph from the editorial. It is interesting merely as showing how wide of the mark the writer has been:

> The registrar may, if he sees fit, conduct his proceedings in camera. If he signs a certificate that a combine is in existence which is detrimental to the public interest, such certificate by him is all that the prosecuting attorney need present to the court in asking for a conviction and the accused, although before the court, may be denied the right to establish or attempt to establish his innocence; the courts under this bill may become merely sentencing bodies.

This is interesting only by reason of the fact that interested parties are deluging members of parliament with propaganda; and I would suggest that if they undertake to give it the dignity of print they should be much more careful with reference to their facts. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) himself expressed an opinion entirely contrary to this only last night. His fear was that you would reveal the evidence upon which the prosecution would be based and that you would not get a conviction. He was decidedly of the view that up to the time the matter reached the criminal court nothing would have been done in the way of having a legal pronouncement made as to the guilt or innocence of the man against whom an objectionable combine was charged. He properly explained that a complete trial would have to take place in the criminal court. I am sorry the right hon. gentleman is not at this moment in his place,

but he appeared to think that it would be a calamity if the accused were not convicted I do not look upon the matter in that light at all. It might well be that while the accused did not go over the edge of the precipice and did not actually form an objectionable combine he might have come very near the mark and that his conduct was properly a matter for investigation. We are not after blood; if it is shown that he did not go that full length, no possible harm is done. But I should say that if a responsible registrar sent the case that far it is highly probable that a man whose conduct in connection with the class of trade in which he was engaged was the subject of such suspicion, he would be pretty well warned at that stage, and the publicity would do no harm but good. Moreover, the bill safeguards him by providing that the inquiry shall be conducted in camera if there is nothing to send up to the criminal court.

Almost every hon. member concedes that we should have laws and regulations against the miserable device of combines, trusts and mergers that are really inimical to the public interest. But hon. gentlemen opposite say: We have a criminal code that is an almost perfect remedy in itself; with a little amendment it would be a perfect remedy. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been used to a federal statute dealing with alleged combines and mergers, apart from the criminal code, and we should continue to have such a law specially dealing with cases of that kind. Even if this is not a perfect act the deterrent effect will be of value. I say that another warning hand should be held out, in addition to what is involved in section 498, which is practically hidden away in the criminal code. Let the public know that we have made this effort; it will not interfere with legitimate or honest business. Imperfect though the bill may be, it can be improved with practice and experience at subsequent sessions of parliament. Let us make a start, because at present we practically have to fall back entirely on the criminal code.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition said, I think it was last night, that we could get so far with the procedure under this bill but no farther. I confess I could not follow him in that. He said: "You say what a combine is; you bring your evidence, but you do not tell the man complained against what he shall not do or what he shall do henceforth." Well, it seems to me that you might as well say that if at a given level crossing there were no accidents in the course of a year, you might reasonably take down the conspicuously painted sign which directed the

attention of the public to the fact that that was a railway crossing and warned them to be careful. Or you might as well say that if in a given community nobody was prosecuted for theft during the period of a year, the provision against theft might well be struck out of the criminal code. It is only a quibble to say that the publicity of the evidence and the pronouncement of the judge for conviction or acquittal will not indicate to a reasonable merchant whose conduct has been called in question that he should adopt a certain course. It is only a quibble to say that that experience will not give him the cue as to what he shall do or what he shall not do, or as to how he shall or shall not henceforth carry on his business.

Mr. A. J. LEWIS (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up very much time to-night; a great deal of what I had intended to say has already been said. I have listened to the various arguments for and against the proposed legislation, and I was particularly interested in the new line of argument presented by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) namely, the constitutional aspect of the question. I do not know very much about the constitutional law of Canada, but it does seem to me that colour is lent to his argument when comparison is made with the neighbouring republic to the south. There we find that there is a federal law in regard to trusts and combines, and the great majority of the states as well have legislation dealing with the same subject. Whether or not this applies to Canada I am not in a position to say, but it does seem to me that some such legislation is needed in Canada at the present time. I do not think anyone can read the evidence that has been given before the various committees in this House without feeling that there is need for legislation such as is now proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I wish to speak not so much in regard to the spirit of the bill as to the need of it. I was particularly struck with a certain sentence uttered by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler). He said that somehow or other the common people of Canada had got the idea that the high prices, the high cost of living, were due to trusts and combines.

Mr. MARLER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Is he reading from Hansard?

Mr. LEWIS: I quote:

> I think I am right in saying that the public mind has for many years associated the high cost of living with the existence of combines, trusts and mergers so-called.

Mr. MARLER: The hon. member used the words "common people;" I never used that expression. I do not believe the people are common people.

Mr. LEWIS: The public mind, then.

Mr. MARLER: Quite so.

Mr. LEWIS: I think the public mind judges pretty fairly the conditions as they exist. Now, I read the bill carefully and I was heartily in support of it, but I was just a little bit disappointed when the right hon. Prime Minister, in his remarks yesterday, explained its application. It seems to me that by his explanation the bill was largely robbed of its virtue. His words were—I think I can quote them also exactly—that in the industrial world as we find it at the present time, combines and mergers are essential, and that there are such things as just combines and agreements. What I want to ask the House is this: What is the general reason why we have a trust? There must be some reason why business men get together to form trusts, combines and mergers. In the United States some years ago, when mergers and combines had become prevalent, an investigation was made during the course of which organizers of combines, trusts, and so on were interviewed. In almost every case it was stated by those people that the purpose of the combination was to suppress competition and to gain control. One particular sentence is significant in that connection, and I will read it. It says:

> It throws off the restraint of competition by absorbing overawing or crushing out competition.

That was the reason, the investigators said, why they had combines and mergers in the United States. Now in looking over this bill and over the history of Canada it seems to me that this sentence is particularly applicable to the banking history of this country, when you consider the number of banks that have passed out of existence and the financial control that has been centered in the hands of a few men simply by absorbing and crushing out and beating out competition. In this bill I am sorry to say I see nothing in regard to financial combinations. It seems to me that the financial end should also be included in the bill. I can readily understand that from the standpoint of the business man competition is an evil. The chief thing that a manufacturer desires is high prices for his products. I think it is a well known economic fact and law that where combination is possible competition becomes impossible. I was speaking to one of the wholesalers in Saskatchewan only a few weeks ago, and he said that he comes down

east to Montreal or Toronto to buy his goods for the whole year about the 1st of May, but he said that he cannot buy them on that date. He must wait a certain time, possibly till the 15th, and then on the 15th of May he is told the price of his goods. He said that it would not make any difference to him whether he went to one man or another. There may be six firms manufacturing the same thing, but they would all have the same price. The price had already been set by the combination of these firms. So it does seem to me that where this exists, and we seem to know instinctively that such mergers and combinations do exist and set prices in Canada, such legislation as this is really needed.

The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) mentioned a fact last night in regard to the tariff. I notice in the bill that one of the remedies that is proposed in section 23 is the lowering of the tariff if the price charged the consumer is too great. Now in the United States some years ago a certain man named Havemeyer uttered this sentence, "The protective tariff is the mother of trusts." I do not think that statement can be swept away without some consideration. It has been said repeatedly in this House that the tariff has nothing to do with combines, mergers and such like. I believe that the tariff has something to do with them. I believe that another factor enters into it also. One is the industrial situation as we have it at the present time. We have a competitive system, and the logical outcome of any competitive system is this, that the manufacturers will endeavour to save themselves from any competition that would destroy them, and so for that reason the logical sequence of a competitive system is naturally combines and mergers for the salvation of those in the business, and until we can change our system and have some other form of co-operation it will be necessary to have combines and mergers as we have them at the present time. In the United States, with all the drastic legislation they have enacted, means have been found of outwitting the legislation and beating the anti-trust laws as they have them there.

In regard to the sentence I quoted a moment ago as to the tariff you can readily understand, Mr. Speaker, that high tariff duties charged on many articles permitted a large measure of profit to the manufacturers with the result that there was a duplication of plants, and as a result of that duplication ruinous competition and production, and in order to escape the latter trusts were organized. Now if the tariff had not granted immunity from foreign competition, people would not have ventured to place their capital in those industries. So in the first place it is a result of the high tariff. This artificial barrier has led to goods being manufactured in this country that never should have been produced here, and that has made it necessary for us to have combines. Where it can be materially proved that combines exist as a result of the tariff I think that section 23, if applied drastically, will have the effect of remedying the situation.

There is another thing that I feel is a great evil in regard to combines. Certain hon. members of this House have said that combines are not necessary evils. As I look over the history of combines in this country, what do I find? I find that possibly some ten, fifteen or twenty companies have been merged into one great company, and when you compare the total capitalization of all the companies that entered into the merger with the capitalization of the merger you will find that in the new merger the capitalization is overwhelmingly above that of the sum total of the smaller companies. The result is that in a merger we get an over-capitalization. What effect has that on the consuming public? The man who is put in charge of this new merger demands that his company shall pay dividends on the over-capitalization, with the result that these mergers instead of producing a commodity at a lower price through the smaller economies that can be effected by means of a large organization, are swallowing up such benefits by paying large dividends on over-capitalized stock, with the result that the combination is of no benefit to the consumer.

Professor Jenks on behalf of the Industrial Commission in the United States refutes the thought that combines through the small economies effected bring about cheaper prices. He cites two instances, the instance of the Standard Oil Company and also the Sugar Trust. It is true that as a result of the Standard Oil Company coming into being, although that one great organization passed out of existence some years ago as far as legislation was concerned, they did lower the price, but when an investigation was made it was found that the crude oil had also been lowered in price and that the difference to the consumer was even smaller than the difference in the price which the Standard Oil had to pay for its crude oil. The same relation was also proven in regard to the sugar industry.

I view with a great deal of alarm the centralization of capital in large-scale industries

It is said that it is necessary for us to have large industries in order that we may compete successfully with other countries in other parts of the world, and yet when we look at the prices that our products sell for in foreign countries we find them very much lower than the prices in our own country. So the argument does not work out very well. It is a well known fact that in Great Britain, the United States and Canada the home consumer usually has to pay for the export trade. Large scale industries may not be an evil in themselves. They may save a great many small economies, but so far as I am concerned I believe in legislation that will be drastic enough to have complete power to investigate any merger or combine, and if it is found that it is working against the interests of the public it should be amenable to law and that the law of Canada.

I should have liked to speak in regard to the history of some of these combines and mergers in the United States. During what we might term the year of combines there we find that 149 combinations were formed in which the subscribed capital amounted to over three billions of dollars, a menace practically to the public. It was the fear of destructive elements of competition that forced these people to combine. I ask the government, could this have taken place in the United States or in Canada if free trade had prevailed? As a result of combination in the United States the Standard Oil Company paid 12 per cent in dividends in 1891 and in 1902 no less than 45 per cent. Yet to all appearances, they give some semblance of competition to the people of the United States. As far as possible the authorities have endeavoured in the United States to overcome these combinations. I understand that in 1892 the Supreme Court of New York state declared that the organization of the Standard Trust Company was illegal. What did the company do? Immediately following the declaration they adopted a new plan. They divided up the shares, but continued to hold the great majority of them just as completely as in the case of the old Trust Company. That is the danger in regard to any legislation that we put upon the statute books.

The spirit of the measure that we are now called upon to pass is all right. It is a step, and a good step, in the right direction; but I would like to see the responsibility for taking action placed not upon any six individuals, but upon the government. The rights of the people are in question here. They are bearing a heavy burden at the present time, as we find out from the evidence given before investigating parliamentary committees; and it seems to me that the government should not only enact this legislation but follow it up by such action as will free the people from the operations of these unjust mergers and combines. Combinations may be necessary in the industrial life of the country but when they operate unjustly the people should be given a chance to escape from the extortionate charges which these combines often exact instead of remaining satisfied with legitimate profits.

Mr. A. E. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): I do not intend to offer any very extended remarks at this late hour, but believing this to be the most important legislation that has come before the House this session I wish to put myself on record as being strongly in its favour. During the past few years the subject with which this bill deals has been a very live one throughout the Dominion, and has been discussed pro and con from every platform. Now we believe the time has arrived when some relief should be given the public along the line indicated.

The criticisms which have been directed against the measure to-night are not very well founded in my opinion. We must make a start somewhere. Legal questions will always be raised in connection with any proposed legislation; gentlemen of the legal profession will always discover points for discussion no matter what the provisions of a bill may be. I believe this is a start in the right direction. We do not want any better evidence of that than the sensation which it has created throughout the country. Hon. members have been receiving letters and circulars from combines and trusts showing they have awakened to the situation which confronts them and realize there is going to be something doing in the future. I cannot altogether follow the argument of some hon. members who maintain that in a free trade country there will be no combines. Personally, I am strongly in favour of a policy of free trade and I would like the time to come when we, in the lower provinces at least, might enjoy that great boon. But the existence of free trade is no deterrent against the formation of combines and trusts. We read in the public journals that in the case of articles upon which there is a low rate of duty combinations have been formed on both sides of the international boundary for the purpose of getting together and holding up prices. So that I am not able to follow the reasoning of hon. gentlemen who argue that combines will not exist where free trade obtains.

I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) this afternoon. He sounded a splendid note in his address and I believe his remarks will have their due effect on some of the combines to which he referred, notably the sugar trust. We know, also, that the manufacturers on a large scale of hats, caps, boots and shoes are seemingly making exorbitant profits. If this bill is brought into operation and one or two of the offenders taught a severe lesson I believe it will tend to put an end to this unjust system and that in future those who conduct industrial enterprises will be satisfied with a more reasonable margin of profit. I do not think anyone in this House wishes to crowd any manufacturer out of business. What we do desire is that he shall be satisfied with a fair profit and not exact exorbitant rates from the consuming public.

I am strongly in favour of this legislation and am proud to belong to the party responsible for introducing it. I am only too glad to follow a Prime Minister who has brought such a bill as this before parliament; it is one that should receive the support of every hon. member. Let us adopt this measure and show the country that we are behind the Prime Minister and intend to see that it is put into force. I do not take much stock in the argument that this bill is not workable. As I say, this legislation is a start in the right direction and if experience discloses any imperfections the law can be amended from time to time. Let us all unite in passing this bill and show the country that we mean business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If any hon. member desires to speak he should take advantage of the present opportunity before the mover of the resolution closes the debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The discussion which has continued now for the greater part of two days has disclosed, as has already been alluded to by one hon. member opposite, that the House is practically unanimously agreed that in this age of competition it is unavoidable that there should be large combinations of capital and business interests. It was pretty generally admitted, with the exception of possibly one speaker, that industrial combinations in one form or another were inevitable having regard to world competition as it exists to-day. This legislation starts out from the point of view that such is the case. The hon. member to whom I have referred, also mentioned that new times bring new developments and new methods of dealing with new situations. I think it is worthy of note in that connection that from the point of view of legislation on matters of this kind a real advance has been made. The Canadian parliament in 1909 was virtually the first parliament to take the attitude that it was not proper to legislate against combinations as such, but rather that it was from the point of view of guarding against the ill effects of large combination that legislation of this kind should proceed. It has now become pretty generally accepted that that is the correct point of view to adopt.

Let me refer by way of example to the Sherman Anti-Trust legislation of the United States, regarded at the time as the best possible method of proceeding. It started from the point of view that combinations as such were wrong, and that combinations of large business interests were an evil. It was found, as endeavours were made to enforce that law, that its enforcement was an impossibility; that it was really proceeding from a wrong point of view. To-day we find that members on both sides of the House are in general agreement as to the right of combination where it is legitimately carried on. This would have been impossible fifteen years ago. We may feel in the circumstance that the world has moved a step forward in an understanding of the problems of modern business.

Another point on which the House has been in agreement is that combinations which operate against the public interest or are detrimental to the public interest should not be supported or permitted. Well if we are in agreement on both these points, I fail to see wherein any reasonable objection can be urged to the legislation which is being presented to parliament to-night. It is based on the supposition that combinations will continue to exist; and if properly conducted have a right to exist. The only kind of combination which it pretends in any way adversely to affect is a combination carried to the point where the public interest suffers in order that private interests may make gains to which they are rightly entitled. If the country will appreciate, and the House will appreciate that such is the sole purpose of the legislation, the bringing to time, so to speak, combinations that in their secret business methods go beyond what is reasonable and fair, to prevent what amounts to extortion as regards the public, and that this is all that is being aimed at in this legislation, there should, I think, be unanimity of expression in favour of some legislation of the kind.

Let me say a word about the relations of the public to big business. I have heard a great deal in this debate about the business interests and the rights of business, and the

non-interference with private rights and the like. I think it is sometimes forgotten that perhaps, after all, the public is one of the parties to industry just as much as any of the other parties. It was assumed at one time that all the problems of industry were problems that related solely to labour and capital. Then there came forward another class that claimed the right to be considered in the discussion of these problems. That was the class that describes itself as management, those possessing managerial ability. It was pointed out that while capital could do a great deal, and labour could do a great deal, unless the two were in some way brought together and directed intelligently under the skill, the business ability of a guiding genius very little could be accomplished in the way of large business. It is now admitted that these three groups are entitled to consideration in matters pertaining to industry but a fourth group of late has come more and more to the fore, and is beginning to receive more and more its due consideration,. I mean the public; the public which, for a long time, was ignored altogether. Labour, capital and managerial ability each claimed its share of consideration in the distribution of the fruits of industry, but the public was left to shift for itself. So far as this legislation is concerned, it is brought forward in the name of that fourth party, in the name of the public without whom neither labour nor capital nor managerial ability could accomplish or achieve anything.

It may be asked, Mr. Speaker, how it is that large businesses are able to expand and to carry on to the extent they do? It is in virtue of what the public does, or permits to be done, through its organization in one form or another. Were it not for law and order as preserved by the public through governments what could large businesses achieve? Were it not for what the public permits in the way of organization of transportation, organized banking and credit facilities, agencies of communication and the like, what could large business achieve one way or the other? Were it not for what the public does in furthering education, encouraging invention, stimulating trade through its consular representatives, through its trade agencies and the like, were it not for what is achieved by diplomatic representatives, where would large business be in its successful ventures throughout the world? I might go on and mention the very direct aids that are given to big business in such matters as have been referred to frequently in this debate, as for example the tariff, bounties and other forms of special protection given to large business. By whom? By the public, through the agency of its representatives in parliament. Well, if it is true that the public is rendering this service to industry, surely the public has a right to demand of industry and business that, so far as it is concerned, it will be protected from any extreme and extortionate act on the part of large business through the facilities it affords. That is all the government is asking for in this bill.

We come in the name of the fourth party to industry, we come in the name of the public, the people at large, and say to large business interests, whether it be manufacturing, wholesale or retail businesses, agencies of communication, commercial enterprises or the like, but for what the people do, not merely in creating demands for commodities of these industries and arranging for their distribution, but in the other ways to which I have referred, large business would not have any place in the community at all. We say, in consequence of that, the public is entitled to know where it stands in reference to its part and relation to industry as a whole.

A great discussion over this measure has had special reference to the criminal offence which is created in this enactment. Hon. members opposite, and particularly my hon. friend for St. John (Mr. Baxter) have spoken more especially in reference to the criminal section of this bill. I would like for the moment to have hon. members forget that there is a criminal section in the bill, or a criminal offence intended to be created by the legislation. As I explained briefly, both at the time of introducing the measure and on moving the second reading, the law falls broadly into two phases. The first has to do with investigations, and the second has to do with criminal prosecutions. Let us for the moment leave to one side altogether the possible intra vires of the legislation, so far as the criminal prosecution is concerned, and consider the other aspect of the legislation, that namely which has to do with investigation. So far as I am concerned, in my own view of it, I would say that the powers of investigation given under the act are likely to be more effective in achieving the end aimed at than the new criminal offence which the bill creates. I think powers of investigation, rightly, legitimately and carefully exercised will go far towards curing ills, with respect to which penalties would be found wholly ineffective. In other words, as I expressed it the other day, there are certain classes of offences, those particularly which relate to social and economic conditions,

which publicity is infinitely more effective to prevent and to redress than penalty. Once the public has the facts before it, once it has the necessary information, has got at the truth, once the situation is known from within, and that it affects the public adversely, the public may be expected to find some means, through its parliament and in other ways, to provide the necessary remedy or cure for any particular situation. That is the point of view from which this legislation proceeds. It seeks to frame machinery through the agency of which the light of day can be let into transactions with a view of disclosing whether these transactions are in the public interest or against it. In other words, it seeks to do for the social system in the matter of its moral health what the light of day or the sun does for the physical body in the matter of its health. Exclude the sun and its power from the physical universe, and very soon you find disease setting in where there should be health and vigour. Prevent the light of day from penetrating the secret recesses of various business devices, and very soon industry, instead of being the great servant of humanity which it should be, comes to be an instrument to be used against the well-being of the people themselves.

This legislation, in providing for investigation, does so, as I have said, for the purpose of bringing out the facts, bringing out information. My right hon. friend said that the measure was of no value, because it meant simply one investigation after another. At this point, may I draw attention to the character of the criticism which has proceeded from hon. gentlemen opposite? The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) was the first to speak at great length on this legislation, his whole attack was that it went too far; that it was vexatious; that it was altogether harassing and extreme, and that it would be an injury to private business. The leader of the Opposition went to the other extreme—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said the same thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, the right hon. member said the same thing, and he also said something directly the opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. He generally takes both sides at the same time. He said that the legislation had no teeth in it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think he remembers that. On the one hand it was extreme in one direction, and on the other it was extreme in the other direction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Legislation can be very vexatious without having teeth in it. That can be done by the effect of its claws.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If we have succeeded in bringing into this House legislation which to one section of our opponents opposite appears to be altogether short of the mark, and to another section appears to go much too far in the other direction, that is pretty good evidence that we have struck the happy medium by avoiding extremes. That is exactly what we have sought to do. As to the investigation having no advantages, might I ask my right hon. friend, when he says investigation is powerless to be of any service, how is it that we have royal commissions appointed to inquire into problems with respect to which light is needed? Why is it, might I ask, that we have committees of parliament at the present time trying to get at the truth in regard to many important matters? Is it not a fact that both royal commissions and committees of parliament sitting at this very time are recognized by all hon. members as rendering the kind of service that is essential for legislation along right and proper lines, and for adequately informing public opinion? Is that not the best answer to anything that can be said against investigations into combines, monopolies, trusts or mergers which may tend to operate against the public interest? If the facts can be ascertained, a remedy will very soon be found.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right hon. member puts that as a question to me. I do not say that investigation is useless; but I say that a permanent body for purely investigational purposes without power to enforce its finding, is a surplusage. The power of investigation, in any individual instance or contingency the government has without this legislation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not a permanent body that this particular legislation undertakes to create.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The registrar?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The registrar is one individual; he is not a permanent body in the sense in which that term is generally used. The effective investigations will be by the different commissioners who will be appointed to deal with cases which the registrar thinks are deserving of more careful investigation. My right hon. friend says that because there is no power to enforce the finding of the particular commissioner, the investigation is, therefore, of no value. To argue

in that way is to deny any value to public opinion, to deny all value to the power of parliament, and those are the two greatest powers which the people have in the matter of self-protection. The power of a well-informed public opinion and the power of parliament to deal with any situation of which it may have accurate and concrete knowledge—that is the power which this legislation brings into being. It provides the machinery whereby, in regard to matters which directly affect the people, which affect them vitally as regards their food, clothing, housing and all the things which go to make up the necessities of their existence, they may get accurate information; this it does in order that the framers of public opinion throughout the country, whether they be in parliament, on the platform, of the press or in whatever form public opinion cares to express itself, may have an opportunity to help to redress a public wrong. I ask hon. members if that is not the greatest power which it is possible to give. What is the power 10 p.m. of the criminal code to prosecute some particular person or group of persons in comparison with the power of spreading broadcast throughout the land accurate and true information with regard to a situation which is inimical to the public interest, and which the people themselves are certain to be concerned in remedying. Take it as respects legislation. How is parliament to know what is the best course to take in the matter of legislation unless it gets true and accurate information? If you wait until the criminal code is put into operation against some particular concern, you may never hear of the evil. An important inquiry has been going on respecting freight rates on the Great Lakes. I imagine the country has become pretty well aware at the present moment of how necessary that inquiry has been. I wonder if that inquiry would ever have taken place under the criminal code if there had been no investigation. Investigation where properly conducted is the one thing which will bring to the attention of parliament what is necessary in the way of legislation to protect the public interest. Therefore, if this legislation went no further than simply to provide what it does in the way of machinery for investigation, it would be rendering a great and much needed public service.

But there are other immediate methods of action which follow upon investigation, apart altogether from the criminal procedure. Under this legislation the Governor in Council with respect to an article of commerce which is shewn to be unduly enhanced in price as a consequence of the tariff, has power immediately to reduce the duty or to wipe out the duty altogether. That is apart from any criminal offence created in the measure. That is a power given to the government itself to be exercised at any and at all times.

May I draw this further fact to the attention of the House? The value of a measure of this kind is not to be estimated by the number of prosecutions that take place, nor by the number of investigations. Rather is it to be estimated by the power of prevention which lies in the fact that it is known that a certain course of procedure will inevitably lead to an investigation and disclosure of conduct that is contrary to the public interest. Is it not desirable to have upon the statute books of this country a power of that kind which stands at all times as a safeguard of the interest of the public?

As regards big business itself, I think it is rendering big business the greatest possible service that such a power should at any and at all times be found on our statutes. There are members of this House who view with alarm at times the advance of what they refer to as socialism, the tendency for the state itself to take over control in a variety of directions. What is it that more than anything else has been responsible for the advance which socialism has made? It has been the feeling in the minds of the masses of the people that, in some way or another, their interests are not being protected or looked after; that in some way a power other than themselves is greater than the power of the state itself. You help to remove a feeling of that kind when you put it into the hands of any six persons, who have reason to think there is some social injustice under which they are suffering, to have that matter investigated and to have their minds set right as to whether or not the facts which they believe, are true.

A reference has been made to the old Combines Investigation Act of 1910, under which it has been stated, there were only one or two prosecutions. I had a little to do with the administration of that act, and I know that as respects a number of industries in connection with which people believed or were asserting that some injustice was being worked, once these people had it within their power to bring about an investigation, they refrained altogether from taking action because they were unable to submit even a prima facie case sufficient to establish ground for an investigation of the charges they had so freely made. I believe it will be so in the case of this legislation. I believe that men who get up and, without any justification for their words, begin to attack large business

simply because it is large, once they are given an opportunity to make good the charges which they are ready to bring against such business will be more careful about the use of their words and directing accusations against big concerns. From that point of view I think the legislation is calculated to be of service to large business as well as to the public itself.

Now I may touch upon one or two other points that have been referred to. But first of all let me say that if at the time of introducing the legislation, I had had any doubts about the wisdom of it, those doubts have been completely removed through the endeavours that have been made, in the name of so-called private business interests to prevent any investigation whatever. What has legitimate business to fear from the light of day? Why should men be afraid that the power of investigation is going to lead to all kinds of serious trouble, if there is nothing to conceal? I think that there must be plenty of work to be done under legislation of this kind if some of the fears which appear to be entertained by some gentlemen are real. So far as anything is reasonable or fair or just in business relations it will not be affected by this legislation; but if there are existent, in connection with business, practices which will not stand the light of day, then probably there is justification for some of the alarm and some of the fear that has been expressed as a possible consequence of investigation. That however is only a reason why this parliament, which is here to protect the interests of the people as a whole, should see to it that legislation such as that being considered, is placed upon the statutes.

Now, it has been asserted that many of the methods which large industry adopts in price fixing and in other forms of combination and agreement are wholly in the public interest. I admit that; I have so stated; and I am willing to agree with anyone who points out that by large combination and price fixing you may help to bring about in industry a stability which otherwise it might not possess, as well as economies and increased efficiency. That is all perfectly true. But it is also true that by these very same methods men who are not actuated by a public spirit, but who think primarily of all that it is possible for them to exact from the public, may carry their price fixing and their agreements to the point of monopoly in a manner which will be detrimental to the public interest; and as soon as private rights reach the point where they become public wrongs, at that moment it seems to me there has been a departure from what is just and fair and the commission of a wrong that to all intents and purposes is a crime. When you get a public wrong that affects the people as a whole then surely the government of the country is entitled to make a criminal offence out of that which is against the interests of the public. That is all that this legislation seeks to do. It makes no criminal offence until it has been established by the most careful and conservative processes conceivable that there is reason to believe that the public in some way has suffered an injustice from certain conditions complained of. Take the steps leading up to the creation of a criminal offence. I think it was the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) who said that this legislation tended to erect a crime out of what was common sense. That was his way of stating the criminal aspect of the bill. Well, at what point does the legislation erect a crime out of common sense, as the hon. gentleman says? In the first place, at least six persons who are British subjects must present to the registrar, who will be appointed by the government, which will be responsible to parliament for the kind of appointment it makes, sufficient ground for him to believe that there exists a combination which is operating to the detriment of the public and against its interest. The registrar is given power to call before him the parties concerned, to go to their place of business if he so desires and thinks it necessary, and to gather information from various sources, with a view to ascertaining whether there is really sufficient ground to believe that the business is not being conducted in accordance with legitimate and accepted methods but is going beyond that to the injury of the people at large. Unless the registrar is satisfied that such is the case, there is no further investigation of the particular combination of which complaint has been made. If the registrar, after having examined the case carefully, comes to the conclusion that the men who have presented their complaint are not cranks nor disgruntled, dismissed employees, nor any of like classes to which reference has been made, but that they are sober, sensible citizens who have a regard for the well-being of the public at large,—if in short he comes to the conclusion that there are just reasons for believing that a combination is operating to the detriment of the people, then he reports to the minister, who thereupon asks the Governor-in-Council to appoint a commissioner to make a larger and more careful inquiry. Now, the government is responsible for the commissioner that will

be appointed; no government is likely to appoint at random any kind of an individual to that position. The government will be responsible to parliament for the class of men it appoints to discharge this responsible duty. The worth of any finding that will be made by a commissioner will depend on the class of man chosen for the particular position; and unless the commissioner, after having made a full inquiry, after having given all the parties concerned the fullest opportunity of making out their case, is convinced that the action of the combine is against the public interest, nothing further comes of the matter; nothing at all by way of prosecution. But that is not all. Even after the commissioner has presented his report, which parliament will be in a position to call for at any time, it then remains for the attorney general of a province or the Solicitor General of the Dominion to enter prosecution against the combine concerned. The question is, will an attorney general of a province or the Solicitor General of the Dominion enter a prosecution against some concern with respect to which the evidence is not strong enough in his opinion to effect a conviction? Up to that point there is possible nothing in the nature of a criminal prosecution against any concern which is alleged to be injuring the public interest. Yet my hon. friend says that the legislation seeks to erect a crime out of what is common sense. I think that if we have regard to the different stages that have to be passed before we reach the criminal stage we shall agree that by the time we get to that point it is high time that some legislation should "erect" a crime out of a course of behaviour that would lead that number of different persons, looking at all sides of the case, to the belief that the public is suffering a wrong by reason of a certain course of conduct. So much, then, for the criminal offence which the act creates.

But my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition and those associated with him have said to us over and over again, "Why not rely on the Criminal Code? You have everything in the Criminal Code which you want. Why add any other legislation?" Well, may I ask my hon. friend, why did he not, when in office, rely upon the Criminal Code, if it was sufficient? Why did he introduce the Combines and Fair Prices Act or the Board of Commerce Act if the Criminal Code was sufficient for all purposes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I told my hon. friend that when I spoke.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What was the answer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated that in those days there was very great business activity and that very large profits were being made. It is all right to erect a Board of Commerce; there is some result in it if you give that board power to give effect to its findings. I stated to the Prime Minister that if he thought similar conditions existed now he might go ahead, but that he should give his board power to give effect to its findings, and that until he did that his legislation was a sham.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This afternoon, my right hon. friend's associate, the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), said, I think, that he believed that to-day very large profits were being made, that to-day business was being conducted very much as it had been when my right hon. friend was in office. If that is the case, there was just as much need for the Criminal Code when he was in office as there is to-day, and the Criminal Code ought to have been just as effective then as it is now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But my right hon. friend did not rely on the Criminal Code; he introduced the Combines and Fair Prices Act and he introduced the Board of Commerce Act. I am not complaining of his action; I think he did what was right, except in restricting actions under the code. I think he was right in believing that the Criminal Code of itself was really of very little use.

It is a fact, and no one knows it better than my right hon. friend, that in regard to the class of subjects which we have been discussing to-day, the criminal law is in a very different position from that which obtains when we are dealing with the class of criminal cases to which we are most accustomed. In cases of theft, murder, perjury, any of these crimes, there is little or no difficulty in ascertaining that a certain wrong has been done; the difficulty is to apprehend the wrong-doer and bring him to justice. As regards the average subject with which the criminal law deals the offence itself is apparent on the surface, but it is not so in respect to most of the evils that arise out of the methods resorted to by combinations in restraint of trade. As a rule these are framed with the assistance of the best legal advice that can be obtained; they are worked out in the most careful manner. The men who have to do with the administering of questionable methods of proceeding in business usually take all possible precautions to see that there is as little publicity as possible with respect to what is being

done. In such cases the difficulty is to discover and bring to light the evil of which complaint is made, but when it is discovered, when the facts are brought to light, then the Criminal Code may well become effective. That is the basis on which this legislation proceeds. It seeks by the agency of investigation to bring to light methods which will not stand the light of day, if there be any such. And when they are brought to light, then, with the evidence assembled, the bill provides a means whereby that evidence may, at the instance of the Attorney General or of the Solicitor General, be used for the purpose of bringing the combine into court and obtaining such redress as may be possible by means of a criminal prosecution.

Mention has been made of an alleged inquisitorial phase of the legislation. I think the member from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) said that because this investigation was to be carried on in private before the registrar or before the commissioners, it was in the nature of a star chamber proceeding. Well, so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to have that investigation as open as the day, both before the registrar and before the commissioners, and if my hon. friend will move an amendment to that effect, I shall be willing to abide by what the House says in regard to it. The reason that the investigation has been made private is because the so-called interests, those that have made their representations, have expressed it as their opinion that it should be in private.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Perhaps the public think otherwise.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The public may think otherwise, but I think the interests are right in the point of view which they present, for this reason; the investigation may be made at the instance of any six persons, and I do not think it is desirable, if it can be avoided, to have the affairs of any business brought out before the public to any greater extent than may be necessary, until it is shown that the course of procedure complained of is really contrary to the public interest. That is the nature of the protection which this legislation gives to legitimate business. It seeks to prevent any undue publicity; but if and when it is shown before the registrar or before the commissioners that the method of procedure of the combine in question is contrary to the public interest, then the veil of privacy which for the time being has been thrown about what has been assumed to be a legitimate business is withdrawn; the evidence may then be made public. The particular combine, if it has been operating against the public interest, no longer gets any protection in the way of privacy; on the contrary, the public at large are given all the information that has been secured. I think that is perhaps the best way of proceeding.

My right hon. friend says that what we have in this legislation exists in large part in other legislation. He referred to the provisions of the Customs Act which give to the Governor in Council power to reduce the tariff after an inquiry by a judge, and he referred also to certain powers given under the Patent Act for the revocation of patent rights. Well, that legislation was in existence when the Combines Act of 1909 came into effect. It was thought advisable to make it clear in that act just what the different classes of remedies were to which the public might look when there was evidence adduced that the public interest was suffering through combines in restraint of trade. That legislation existed exactly in the form in which it exists to-day, when my right hon. friend introduced his Combines and Fair Prices Act and his Board of Commerce Act; and he embodied both the clauses—the very clauses that we have here—in that legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly—if the right hon. gentleman will permit me. I do not find fault with putting them in. But we have these clauses in other statutes and there is no need of a new bill merely to enact them twice. What I say is that my right hon. friend, while he is having his legislation, may just as well have all the remedies in one bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Now my right hon. friend is coming to my point of view. That is precisely what the government seeks to do; it is seeking to assemble in one piece of legislation all that is relevant to the particular subject under consideration. By bringing together the different parts of existing legislation that have a direct relation to the investigation and prosecution of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers, in whatever form these pieces of legislation may appear, we have perhaps taken the most effective means of preventing combines of one kind or another from proceeding contrary to the public interest.

As to the constitutional aspect of the question, to which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) has referred, I think the House may well accept, for the time being at all events, the opinion of the Department of Justice that what we are doing in this legislation is entirely intra vires of this parliament. However, if it is not, I would still think it was

advisable to introduce this legislation at the present session rather than to wait a little longer. The sooner we find out how far we can legislate in this matter the better, and I would say to my right hon. friend that if at any time it should appear that this legislation in any particular is not intra vires of this parliament, and that by expanding the Criminal Code or adding to it in any way we can still deal effectively with the evil we are seeking to remedy, if the present government should remain in office and be there in office, very little time would be lost in making the Criminal Code all that he or any other member of the House may desire in that regard.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) which was agreed to on the following division.

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Brethen,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Clifford,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Déchène,
Delisle,
Denis (Jolicette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desrochers,
Drummond,
Elliott (Dundas),
Euler,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gardiner,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Good,
Gordon,
Gould,
Graham,
Hammell,
Hatfield,
Healy,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hopkins,
Hudson,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jacobs,
Jelliff,
Johnston,
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Knox,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Leader,
Leger,
Lewis,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Low,
Lucas,
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McBride,
McConica,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McMaster,
McMurray,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Millar,
Milne,
Mitchell,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Prevost,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Reed,
Rinfret,
Roberge,
Robichaud,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Simcoe),
St. Père,
Sales,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Stork,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Vien,
Walsh,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—138.

NAYS

Messrs.

Arthurs,
Baxter,
Black (Yukon),
Boys,
Charters,
Clark,
Dickie,
Grimmer,
Hubbs,
Jones,
MacKelvie,
Manion,
Meighen,
Preston,
Ryckman,
Senn,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Tolmie—21.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips)

Messrs.

Logan,
Murphy,
Power,
Rheaume,
Kyte,
McKinnon,
McCrea,
Malcolm,
German,
Kay,
Mitchell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Chew,
Pelletier,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Lavigueur,
Gendron,
Robb,
Bristol,
Porter,
Mewburn,
LeSueur,
Drayton,
McQuarrie,
Stevens,
Duncan,
Chaplin,
Wilson,
Manion,
Guthrie,
MacLaren,
Hanson,
McKillop,
Sheard,
Garland (Carleton),
Porter.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea). Had I voted I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I was paired with the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). Had I voted I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. KAY: I was paired with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson). Had I voted I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Chew). Had I voted I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. MALCOLM: I was paired with the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Duncan). Had I voted I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. GENDRON: I was paired with the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Garland). Had I voted I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. McKILLOP: I was paired with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sinclair). Had I voted I should have voted against the motion.

Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definitions "combine":

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think this clause will cause some discussion. I there fore move the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

MARINE AND FISHERIES

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

Ocean and river service—examination of masters and mates, $20 000.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister give us an explanation of that item?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): This item is to provide for the examination and certification of masters and mates of ships. The law requires them to have certificates. There are three districts in which examinations are held, the eastern divison, the Great Lakes division and the western division. The expenditure last year was $19,958.29. It will be about the same this year.

Mr. TOLMIE: Who conducts the examination?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The department has a certain number of officers in every district. In my hon. friend's district we have Captain Charles Eddy, who is the supervising examiner at Vancouver, Captain Davis at Victoria, and Captain Lindsay at Nelson.

Mr. TOLMIE: Are these examinations held once a year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, only when candidates offer themselves for examination. In Vancouver there were twenty-three masters examined last year and given certificates, thirteen mates and five second mates; and in the same proportion in other places in the western division.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are the masters and mates for? The mercantile marine or the Canadian navy?

Mr. LAPOINTE: For all Canadian ships.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Including the navy?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, the Canadian merchant marine or any ship operating in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any ship operating in Canada?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Only on Canadian waters?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: The examiner of masters and mates can examine for deep-sea certificates?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend said just for Canadian waters.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I meant also deep-sea certificates.

Mr. STEVENS: Does this appropriation include payment for lecturers? I remember the question arose last year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, that is for navigation schools. There is a special item for that.

Mr. BANCROFT: Where is the examiner for Manitoba located?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Manitoba is in the Great Lakes division, because it is nearer to the Great Lakes than it is to the Pacific ocean. There are only three divisions: the eastern division, the Great Lakes division and the western division. The Great Lakes division comprises Toronto, Collingwood, Port Arthur in Ontario, and Selkirk in Manitoba Selkirk being at the moment vacant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does this provide for certificates for masters and mates on our trawlers?

Mr. BUREAU: They are not trawlers; they are chasers.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have nothing to do with the chasers to which my right hon. friend refers. They are outside of my jurisdiction altogether.

Item agreed to.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I just wanted to get into the estimates, so that I could go on with them any day.

Progress reported.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

JOINT COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER MATTERS OF COMMON INTEREST

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a message from the Senate requesting the House of Commons to unite with the Senate in the appointment of a joint committee to be composed of an equal number of members, not exceeding five, of each House to consider the following matters:

1. The forms of bills and the best means of affording information and assistance in the consideration thereof at all stages of legislation in both Houses of parliament.
2. The better distribution of the work of legislation between the two Houses.
3. The practical operation of the provisions of the Senate and House of Commons Act, R.S.C., 1906, chapter 10, respecting the attendance of Senators and members of the House of Commons and the expediency of making any alterations in these provisions;

And that the hon. Messieurs Béique, Belcourt, Calder, Green and Pardee have been appointed to act on behalf of the Senate as members of said joint committee.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, May 9, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS

Agreement between the Imperial government and the government of Canada with respect to the prepaid passage scheme.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Report on the discovery of placer gold in Labrador.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 155 (from the Senate), to incorporate National Surety Company of Canada.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 156 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Austin Trow.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 157 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Jean Buchan.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 158 (from the Senate), for the relief of Louisa Wemp.—Mr. Simpson.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN CUSTOMS OFFICER AT NEW YORK

Mr. LADNER:

1. Has the government any information, and if so, what, with regard to the extent of business in lumber, canned salmon, pulp and paper, iron and steel and other products, as between Eastern Canada and the Pacific Coast, that is lost in favour of the United States owing to the fact that there is not a Canadian Customs Officer at New York and duty is imposed by the United States on goods passing through the Panama Canal from Eastern Canada to British Columbia?
2. Has the government any information, and if so, what, in regard to grinding balls to an Owen Sound firm from the Premier mine of British Columbia which was cancelled and placed in the United States because of the absence of a Canadian Customs Officer at New York?
3. Has the government any information, and if so, what, with regard to the advantages of a Canadian Customs Officer at New York, in facilitating trade between Eastern Canada and the province of British Columbia?
4. Has the government any information, and if so, what, with regard to the iron and steel used in British Columbia which might be purchased from Nova Scotia if a Canadian Customs Officer were established at New York?
5. Has the government any information, and if so, what with regard to the effect of the absence of a Canadian Customs Officer at New York on the amount of freight which might otherwise be sent over Canadian railways by the Canadian manufacturers and traders but which actually goes to the United States?
6. What would be the annual cost of maintaining a Canadian Customs Officer at the port of New York?
7. Does the government refuse to place a Canadian Customs Officer at the port of New York?
8. If so, what are the grounds of such refusal?
9. What are the advantages, if any, which accrue to the government of Canada or the people of Canada by refusing to put the said Customs Officer at New York?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The government has no information.

6. This information is being ascertained.

7. No, the government does not refuse.

8 and 9. Answered by previous questions.

GREAT LAKES AND ST. LAWRENCE SHIPPING TOLLS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Will legislation be introduced this session to place shipping and marine rates and tolls on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence under some public control such as the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada?
2. If not, what will be done to afford the public some relief from excessive rates, both for freight and passenger rates?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The matter of marine rates and tolls is the subject of investigation by Royal Commission at the present time and it would not be possible to answer this question in any positive way until the report of that commission has been received.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. When will the report of the Royal Commission re Great Lake rates be received, and will an opportunity be granted parliament of considering their report?

2. When will the Banking, Agriculture, and Redistribution Select Committees reports be received by the House?

3. Owing to the lateness of the Session, will these reports be received in proper time to have them dealt with at this session of parliament, or will they be left over for next session?

4. What legislation, if any, is yet to be brought down this session by the government, not referred to in the Address at the opening of parliament?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This question, I think, the hon. member is in about as good a position to answer as the government.

1. The government is unable to say when the report will be received, and it is impossible to say what opportunity will be given for consideration until it is received.

2. I suppose they will be received when they are ready, I cannot think of any other answer.

3. Obviously it is impossible to say what will be done with the reports until they are received, or what time may be available.

4. I answered this question yesterday in reply to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen).

DAYLIGHT SAVING IN OTTAWA

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Has the government been officially advised by the Mayor of Ottawa that daylight saving becomes effective in the city on Sunday, May 13th?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to recommend to parliament to conform to daylight saving time, and to make the same applicable to the public departments?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Yes.

2. The government has assumed that parliament would wish to do this year as in previous years, adapt its proceedings to the local time. So far as the public departments are concerned, where daylight saving is being observed the public departments will be expected to conform to the usage of the locality.

PORT ARTHUR ELEVATOR

Mr. SHEARD:

Does the Canadian government elevator buy or purchase screening shutouts, or, in other words, the dockage of 3 per cent or over on grain that is unloaded, in their Port Arthur plant, or does the Canadian government elevator only handle for its own account the dockage on grain that is allowed the terminal elevator, according to its tariff?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE (For the Minister of Trade and Commerce): The procedure followed is that when cars of grain are unloaded into the Canadian Government elevator at Port Arthur, warehouse receipts, both for grain and screenings, outturns showing charges, and official weight certificates are sent to the Winnipeg office of the Canadian Government elevator system, where they are delivered to the party surrendering the bills of lading, usually the commission merchant acting as agent for the shipper. If these parties desire to dispose of the warehouse receipts for screenings to the Canadian Government elevator, the manager of the Winnipeg office is always prepared to purchase same at the current market price, and is provided with a fund, designated "Special Account," from which to make payment for such purchases. The holder of warehouse receipts for screenings is under absolutely no obligation to dispose of same to the Canadian Government elevator, but is always at liberty to take delivery of the documents and dispose of same to the best possible advantage or in any manner he may see fit.

TORONTO AND SUBURBAN RAILWAY

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the portion within the city of Toronto of the Toronto and Suburban Railway been offered for sale to the city, and on what terms, either by the government or National Railways?

2. Have the bondholders objected to the sale of a part instead of the whole road, and can the sale of a part be legally consummated?

3. Have the bondholders notified the government to this effect, and how does the sale now stand?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The Toronto Suburban Company's lines within the city of Toronto are governed by a franchise granted by the former town of Toronto Junction (now Ward 7 of the city of Toronto), which expired in 1921. Under their franchise, the former town of Toronto Junction, or its successors, had the right, upon notice, to take over the whole of the lines within the limits of the town at a valuation to be agreed upon, and fixed by arbitration. The city of Toronto duly gave notice in 1921 of its intention to take over the franchise lines, and a tentative valuation was made between the two parties, which has not yet been acted upon.

2. An objection was made on behalf of the bondholders that the whole of the lines of the Suburban Company, both inside and outside of the franchise limits, had to be taken by the city on the expiry of the franchise, but this objection was not concurred in by the Toronto Suburban Railway Company, and is not maintainable. The bondholders are subject to the franchise terms to the same extent as

the railway company, and while objection may be made, at discretion, by the bondholders to the sale of lines, or parts of lines outside the franchise limits, within the franchise limits the consummation of the sale or taking over by the city depends only upon the fixing of the consideration to be paid.

3. The representatives of the bondholders claim that they must be consulted and must agree to any value fixed or to any disposal of lines outside the franchise limits. In the correctness of this position the railway company concurs. The terms and the extent of the taking over are now under active consideration by the parties concerned, subject to the rights of the bondholders as stated.

MR. EDWARD E. BOUDROT

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has Edward E. Boudrot been dismissed from the position of light keeper at Green Island near Arichat, Cape Breton?

2. If so, when was he dismissed and what were the reasons for his dismissal?

3. Were any charges made against Mr. Boudrot and if so were said charges investigated, and by whom?

4. What report was made as a result of such investigation, if any were held?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Order in Council of the 15th January, 1923, has issued dispensing with his services and he will be relieved when arrangements are made by the Civil Service Commission for his successor.

2. See answer to No. 1. He assaulted a fisherman and his son when they landed on the island for shelter.

3. Yes. The charges were investigated by Daniel D. Boyd, a Commissioner under Part II of the Inquiries Act.

4. The lightkeeper's conduct on the occasion in question cannot be justified.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are now being sold, what are the terms and conditions of sale, and will tenders be called?

2. Why are they being sold at all, and are these ships suitable in draught for service on the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes?

3. While in operation were the Merchant Marine (Limited) a part of an Atlantic combine in any way for an increase in freight rates?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. As proposed by the late board and recommended by the present management authority has been taken to sell twenty-seven of the smaller vessels by public tender, if satisfactory offers can be obtained, but otherwise by private sale.

2. These vessels are too deep in draught and of wrong type for service through the St. Lawrence canals, but would be serviceable for, and some are already being made use of on the upper lakes.

3. The management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, maintain that they were never parties to any combine though their representative has sat in at the weekly sessions of what is known as the "North Atlantic Conference" for the stabilizing of freight rates and the ensuring of equality to all shippers.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

SHIPPING RATES—GRAIN

Mr. COOTE:

For copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other communications passing during the summer or fall of 1922 between the Dominion government or any of its ministers or representatives and the Dominion Marine Association or any of its agents or representatives, or of any other person or persons whatsoever, in any way relating to the abrogation or suspension of the Dominion Coastal Shipping Regulations, or in any way relating to the grain congestion at lake ports or Montreal, or to the alleged combine, or the imposition of exorbitant rates by shipping interests engaged in the grain trade.

SANITARY CONDITIONS ON CATTLE BOATS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he noticed the statement in to-day's newspaper press that the unsanitary conditions on boats carrying Canadian cattle to Great Britain had been the subject of discussion in the British parliament. The despatch in question said that an inspection had been made necessary by the Canadian Department of Agriculture owing to these conditions. Has the minister any knowledge of the matter? It is very necessary that this service should be carried out under the very best auspices and, if unsanitary conditions prevail on these boats, that steps should be taken to remedy them

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): I saw the despatch in this morning's paper to which my hon. friend refers. I do not know that we should attach too much importance to all these despatches because of the confusion that exists between the authorities over there and ourselves with respect to the proper conception of the arrangement that was made last fall as to the class of animals that were eligible to be shipped. As I understand the situation, nothing but stockers, that is non-breeding cattle and fat cattle, are eligible to go over; breeders are

not eligible. With respect to the sanitary conditions on the boats engaged in carrying cattle, I understand that when the embargo first came off some vessels were put into commission rather hastily and were not up to the requirements. I expect, however, that will be remedied when these vessels take on board their second load. I did not hear exactly all that my hon. friend said. If there is any part of the question I have not answered I should like my hon. friend to repeat it.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING—INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Labour to the fact that so long ago as April 18, a return was ordered showing the names of newspaper companies and printing companies who have received federal moneys for printing, since January 1, 1922. This return is not yet forthcoming although its preparation would not take very long. On the occasion of a former inquiry I was told that some other members had asked for some other information, but that should not in any way affect this return for which I have asked. The return is a long time overdue and it should be brought down without further delay.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): I am very sorry for this delay. The information was prepared and was all ready to present to the House last week when it was found to be somewhat inaccurate in that it did not give exactly what the hon. gentleman and others had requested. It was therefore necessary to have the return re-checked in order that the information might be accurate. I had hoped the return would be here to-day, but I feel sure that it will be forthcoming at the next sitting of the House.

ICE IN CABOT STRAIT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): I should like to ask if the government is aware of the serious ice conditions which prevail in Cabot strait at the present time, greatly impeding shipping bound for the port of Montreal. I am informed on reliable authority that yesterday there were forty ships held up in that vicinity owing to ice conditions. I would like to ask the government what action, if any, it intends to take in the direction of sending the new government ice breaker to that vicinity to help shipping.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The ice breaker Montcalm has been doing ice patrol duty in Cabot strait and the lower part of the gulf of St. Lawrence for the last two weeks, and the reports are that the conditions there are much more serious this year than ever before. It is true that yesterday there were approximately forty ships trying to get through the ice into the gulf of St. Lawrence, their progress being attended with great difficulty. In addition to the Montcalm the ice breaker Stanley is also in service there. The Mikula is undergoing temporary repairs in the Champlain drydock but is expected to leave for Cabot strait next Saturday. The department has been communicating with all the principal shipping companies and they agree that everything possible is being done and that the delay is due to the unusually difficult conditions of the ice this season.

CATTLE EMBARGO—MR. DUNCAN MARSHALL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a cable despatch which appeared in the daily press yesterday to the effect that Mr. Duncan Marshall our Commissioner of Agriculture, in a public speech at Dundee, Scotland, said that it is the intention of the British government to put an end to the bargain made with the Dominion of Canada with respect to the entry of cattle into Great Britain.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): That was not my understanding of the despatch which my hon. friend refers to. May I read it Mr. Speaker?

Duncan Marshall, in a speech at Dundee, is credited with the statement that the British government is preparing to break its bargain with Canada regarding the admission of cattle. Marshall is reported as saying: "The embargo is only partly removed. The Royal Commission reports recognized cows and heifers as stores, but the government differs. The Canadian representatives came to a definite arrangement allowing and speeding the entry of cattle. My information is that the British government does not purpose to carry out the bargain. The matter will be threshed out on May 15."

I may say that I have a cable from Mr. Marshall quite to the contrary. His position is this: He is taking the ground that the arrangement entered into by my colleagues the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the one which should be carried out. That is all that Mr. Marshall is contending for.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister say whether Mr. Marshall has been appointed to the position of Commissioner of Agriculture?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He continues to hold the appointment which he has had from the beginning.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister ever considered the wisdom of suggesting to Mr. Marshall that he might ease up a little on his speeches in other countries affecting questions between us and those countries?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Whatever may be said with regard to Mr. Marshall's speeches, at all events they are absolutely accurate.

CANNED SALMON VIA PANAMA CANAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Perhaps we can now get an answer from the Minister of Customs in regard to a question I put last Monday dealing with a telegram sent by him on 16th April to the Gosse-Millerd Canning Company, of Vancouver, informing them that on shipments of canned salmon consigned via the Panama canal and New York to Halifax and other Canadian ports, a tariff would be imposed on the goods entering Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: No that is not right.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Calling at New York.

Mr. BUREAU: That makes all the difference in the world.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I asked for an explanation of the telegram. I wish to know by whom and on what authority that regulation was brought down.

Mr. BUREAU: The regulation has existed for years. I could not say who passed it, or under what authority it was passed. I took it as it stood and enforced it.

ICE BREAKER ON THE BAY OF FUNDY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): I wish to call the attention of the government and particularly the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, (Mr. Lapointe), to the question of having an ice breaker to clear the ice from the Bay of Fundy, especially for the vessels endeavouring to come through Minas channel and basin and proceeding to the port of Windsor. For some time there have been vessels loaded with nitrate of silver at New York and other places, consigned to Windsor, Nova Scotia. This nitrate of silver is sometimes called by the railway company a dangerous explosive; consequently it takes a higher rate of freight, and therefore, we have to ship it by water. The vessels so loaded are not accustomed to enter fields of ice.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MARTELL: I brought the matter to the attention of the department and asked to have the question dealt with—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friends may call "order," but they cannot put me off in that way.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I would be pleased to get the information for my hon. friend and give him an answer to-morrow.

Mr. MARTELL: Will you have an ice breaker sent there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Possibly. We are short of ice breakers just now.

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

The House again in committee on Bill No. 54, to provide for an investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Definition "combine:"

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I mentioned my intention to strike out the words "in the opinion of the registrar or any commissioner" after the word "as" in line 9. I offer that amendment before we discuss the clause.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MARLER: Before the amendment is carried—

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is carried.

Mr. MARLER: The amendment is all right, but I suggest to the Prime Minister to alter the words "or are likely to operate," and insert in place thereof the words "or are about to operate." A combine likely to operate is something intangible, whereas a combine about to operate means one that has been formed, in which case there might be something tangible for the registrar to get at as being improper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The words "or are likely to operate" are taken from section 2, subsection 1, of the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919, and I imagine that they were chosen with care at the time. I

fail to see very much distinction between the words "likely to" and "about to." I think the words "likely to" indicate the probability, and that is what should be aimed at for the purpose of investigation.

Mr. MARLER: Suppose that two concerns were about to get together and make their financial arrangements, and six persons, under the following section of the act, came along and said, "Oh, this concern is likely to operate as a combine, we will put a stop to it and put an end to the financial arrangement," whereas, if those two concerns had got together in such a way that there was a tangible evidence that a combine would occur, it would mean that the registrar would have some facts to go on, so that he could actually prosecute under the act. I am quite aware that these words are taken from the Combines and Fair Prices Act, but under that act I think the complaint had to be made in such a case to a judge. I am speaking from memory in that regard. I suggest to the minister that the words "are about to operate" indicate something tangible, something fixed, and the words "likely to operate" indicate something intangible or something not fixed, but something which might likely take place in the future.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not see very much force in what my hon. friend has said. I cannot see that the use of the word "about" will alter materially what is aimed at. If it will help to reconcile my hon. friend to the section as a whole, I have no objection, if he likes to move the amendment, to have it adopted.

Mr. MURDOCK: I think it would be a misfortune to change the word "likely" to the word "about." An ounce of prevention is surely worth a pound of cure, and if, as the hon. member indicates, two concerns are likely to be brought into a combination or a merger to the extent that they might, as a result, by being brought into combination, be likely to operate to the detriment of the public, the ounce of prevention is what should be used if anything is to be used, and prevention of that particular combine, if that were brought about, could be made effective. We should not wait until they have been brought together and consolidated and had a free field to see if they could evade the intention of the law. Personally, I do not think my hon. friend has anything whatever to fear. It would certainly suggest discredit on the entire intent of the act to make any such change as that, for the reason which has been given.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MARLER: I can hardly follow the reasoning of the Minister of Labour. I quite realize the intent of the act. I said that I realized the intent of the act, and I voted for it. But I certainly think, as the bill now stands, to have something tangible is a great deal better than to have something intangible, and I cannot see how the amendment which I suggested to the Prime Minister does any harm to the bill itself. I do not think the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) caught the drift of my remarks.

Mr. McBRIDE: I should like to say a word in connection with a statement made in this House by two hon. members on this side regarding an alleged fruit combine in British Columbia. I want to state definitely that no such thing as a fruit combine exists in British Columbia. There is in British Columbia an organization that is trying to get what it produces to the consumer with the least possible expense. In days gone by, certain profiteers were making as high as a dollar or a dollar and a quarter a box on fruit, whereas the people producing this fruit in British Columbia were getting only from 7 cents to $1.25 per box for raising, packing and shipping, and they did not think that was right. They have formed an organization so that they will be able to give the consumer on the prairies and in other places the best possible prices on fruit.

In connection with the bill before the committee, I should like to make one or two suggestions, and the first one is in regard to the six persons who will lay a complaint against any combine. The registrar should see that those six persons are not from any one company or concern. It would be very easy for a concern that was running in opposition to another to have six of its members lay a complaint; in fact, this would be a sort of blackmail. The law should be such that those six persons should be from six separate concerns, and when they lay a complaint, the first thing the registrar should do would be to call upon them to prove the allegation laid before him, and if need be, he should put them under oath and make them prove it. This is only reasonable. In the next place, those who do the investigating should be sworn to secrecy. They should not be at liberty to make public in any way what they may find until such time as the matter comes before the court.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Under this clause, would there be a possibility of prejudicing or embarrassing the operation of a wheat board?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If any parliament or legislature undertakes to enact a piece of legislation, I should imagine that would be a sufficient answer to any inquiry that might be made respecting its propriety.

Sestion 2 as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Registrar:

Mr. CASGRAIN: As regards subclause (1), which relates to the appointment of a registrar, when speaking on the merits of the bill, I said that I thought a lawyer of a certain number of years' experience at the bar should be the registrar. I would, therefore, ask the Prime Minister if he would have any objection to considering my proposition now, that such registrar shall be a lawyer of at least ten years' standing at the bar.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the government will have to take the responsibility for the appointment it makes, and I imagine that it will be wise to leave with the government the discretion that may be necessary in the matter of the appointment itself.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Application for investigation of alleged combine.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I intimated also another amendment that I would ask to have inserted with respect to this clause. The amendment is to the effect of requiring the application for an investigation to be made by six persons, British subjects, resident in Canada. I beg to move:

That clause 5 be amended by striking out lines 8 and 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"Any six persons, British subjects, resident in Canada of the full age of twenty-one years who are of the opinion that a combine exists, or is being"

and also by striking out lines 14, 15 and 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"showing: (a) the names and addresses of the applicants, and at their election the name and address of any of their number or any attorney, solicitor or counsel whom he may, for the purpose of"

Then in line 18, by striking out the word "him", and substituting for the word "him", the word "them".

Mr. McMASTER: I should be glad to have an explanation why the benefits of this law should be restricted to British subjects. I think it is the sentiment and tradition amongst our people that any person domiciled in Canada should be protected in the exercise of his legal rights and should have free recourse to the courts. There are some jurisdictions, for instance, where aliens are not allowed to hold real estate. I think that is the case in the state of New York; but that has not been the case, so far as I am aware, in any province of Canada, and I do not see that the bill is in any way improved by restricting the class of persons who may make a complaint. Take, for instance, the case of a citizen of the United States, whose business has brought him to Canada, who has lived here for many years, whose interests are here, but who, through sentimental or other reasons, has hopes in his old age to return to the United States and who has never ceased to be a citizen of that country. Why should such a man as that be precluded from laying a complaint under this law? I see no reason for the change, though, perhaps, the Prime Minister, who is in charge of the bill, may have some weighty reasons which may show me that I am wrong in my view. The principle I would lay down is this, that this is in the nature of a judicial inquiry, and the courts are and should be open to all dwellers in this land who are behaving themselves in a seemly fashion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The clause as originally drafted stated that any person resident in Canada might make an application for an investigation. That was thought to be too broad, and for that reason the words "six persons" were substituted. The addition of the words "British subjects" was simply to ensure a little more care as to putting this legislation into operation. As my hon. friend knows, there are large numbers of foreigners who are domiciled in Canada, who are not wholly familiar with our laws, institutions, and methods of proceeding, and it is conceivable that, for reasons more of agitation than otherwise, some of them might be persuaded to endeavour to set this particular law in motion simply because it is so easy for the individual to do so. I should think, if any six persons in the country who are not British subjects, really had ground for believing that a combine existed which was operating in restraint of trade or to the detriment of the public, they would find very little difficulty in securing six other citizens who were British subjects to make the application on their behalf. I do not believe it will really affect the freedom, the liberty or the right of anyone in any material significance, and if it tends to give a sense of greater security to some of those who fear that there is too much latitude in the law as it stands, I think it is advisable to retain the words "British subject."

Mr. MARLER: If the Prime Minister has no objection, I would suggest that in line 11

the word "shall" be substituted for the word "may" and that in line 13 there be inserted before the word "statement" the word "sworn."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no objection to the first suggested amendment, of substituting the word "shall" in line 11 of section 5 for the word "may."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MARLER: I suggest further that the section be amended to read:

The application shall be accompanied by a sworn statement showing, etc.

As the section stands, a mere statement, without any qualification, is required.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am prepared to be governed by the wishes of the committee in this particular, but I do not think we should make it difficult for an application to be submitted. The purpose of the legislation is to give to the citizens of the country a feeling of assurance that there is an avenue of approach against any possible injustice, and to make that approach as easy as possible. The registrar would have to be satisfied himself that the application put before him was one deserving of that careful consideration which the law would expect, and one that merited an investigation, before anything further could be done. The fact that the application must be sworn to might make it more difficult for some persons to apply. If however the committee thinks that the suggested change is advisable I shall be prepared to consider it, but I rather hesitate to compel people who are not accustomed to taking oaths to submit to such an obligation in a matter of this kind. I should be glad to have an expression of opinion from the committee.

Mr. FORKE: A statement over the signature of six persons is definite enough without being sworn to.

Mr. PUTNAM: The amendment my hon. friend proposes might, I think, be out of joint with subsection (a) of section 17 which gives the registrar or any commissioner power to exact an affidavit or a written affirmation at any stage of the proceedings.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 6—Registrar shall cause inquiry to be made:

Mr. CASGRAIN: It might be well, if the Prime Minister sees no objection to the proposal, to have this section amended in accordance with a provision in the Immigration Act which I shall read to the committee.

[Mr. Marler.]

The hearing of all cases brought before such board of inquiry shall be separate and apart from the public, but in the presence of the immigrant, passenger or other person concerned whenever practicable, and such immigrant, passenger or other person shall have the right to be represented by counsel whenever any evidence or testimony touching the case is received by the board.

I think that the accused should have the right to be represented by counsel whenever any evidence or testimony touching the case is received by the registrar, and that he should have the right to adduce evidence on his own behalf. A similar privilege is accorded immigrants who come into the country and in regard to whom the question of deportation is under consideration. If we do this much for persons who are not citizens, surely we can give a citizen accused under this legislation the right to be present and to be represented by counsel. If the accused were represented by counsel and gave certain explanations to the registrar, or if certain officials of his company were given an opportunity to explain matters fully, it might well be that the registrar would consider such explanation satisfactory and that further investigation might be avoided. This happens frequently in connection with inquiries under the Immigration Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The point of view which my hon. friend presents suggests that the persons complained against as belonging to a combine that is operating to the dertiment of the public are in the position of defendants or accused. I think that is a wholly erroneous assumption. The fact that a representation is made by six persons that some particular concern is a combine operating to the detriment of the public does not place the persons involved in that alleged combine in the position of defendants or accused until, after an investigation by the registrar and after an investigation by the commissioner, and at the instance of the attorney general of the province or the Solicitor General of the Dominion, they are brought into court as having violated a section of the act which we shall discuss later. At that stage it would be quite proper that the persons about to be placed on trial should have the right to be represented by counsel and have all the protection that the law can give them. But for the purpose of a preliminary inquiry to ascertain whether there are prima facie reasons for believing that a combine exists and is operating to the detriment of the public, I think that the more freedom that is left to the registrar to make that preliminary investigation, the better. It goes without saying that the first act of the registrar would be to bring

before him the persons against whom the particular complaint is directed. It is conceivable that some of the applications might on the face of them be of such a character that he would dismiss them without going thus far, that is to say, if they were frivolous or vexatious. On the other hand, I cannot conceive of an investigation proceeding a single stage without the registrar getting immediately into touch with the persons against whom the complaint is made. I do not think it would be wise to introduce the lawyers at that early stage of the proceedings.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I was not speaking on behalf of the lawyers.

Mr. MARLER: Is the Prime Minister of opinion that the registrar has to be satisfied with the prima facie proof adduced, or does he think that it is imperative that he make an inquiry whether or not he is satisfied with that preliminary proof? It does seem to me, from a reading of the action, that the registrar is bound to make an inquiry into the matter, or have the commissioner make the inquiry, whether he is satisfied or not with the preliminary proof adduced. That is the point I raised a day or so ago. I said that if the registrar had any shadow of proof before him—I did not care what the proof of the six persons was—then there was no objection to his proceeding to investigate any business. But I did think it was a mistake to make it incumbent on the registrar to examine into a business before he was satisfied in the initial stages that there was something wrong. If the Prime Minister would consider that point I should be glad to have his opinion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the registrar must proceed up to the point where he is satisfied that either the complaint is frivolous or vexatious and without sufficient foundation or that there is substantial ground for believing that the representations are accurate. It should be left to the discretion of the registrar to proceed in the matter so far as satisfying himself one way or the other. That is all that the section requires. It does not propose that the registrar shall start a full-fledged investigation involving wide and extensive examinations if on the face of things there appears no ground for anything of the kind. On the other hand, if the application does contain representations which make it advisable for the registrar to go pretty carefully into the case before reporting to the minister, he will doubtless proceed as far as the circumstances seem to warrant.

Mr. MARLER: Is it not the case in the opinion of the right hon. gentleman that the registrar under this section would have to investigate the books of the concern or make such reasonable inquiry to establish whether or not the complaint was vexatious or not? How could he determine otherwise? The point I am drawing to the attention of the right hon. gentleman is this, that after the word "registrar" in the second line a few words should be inserted to show that after sufficient proof had been adduced to the satisfaction of the registrar he would proceed to make an investigation. As the section now stands I think the registrar has no option but to make an investigation to determine whether the complaint is frivolous or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will look at the words in line 31:

—as he shall consider necessary to inquire into with the view of determining whether a combine exists—

Those words ought to meet what my hon. friend has in mind. If the registrar thinks it necessary to carry the investigation to a certain point to satisfy his own mind, he is at liberty to do so. If by a brief examination he feels quite satisfied that the combine does not exist, then he need not pursue the inquiry any further. But the responsibility is his to say that he has looked into the matter and found that there are not reasonable grounds for believing that the combine is operating to the detriment of the public. Having that responsibility, he ought to be permitted to judge how far he should carry his investigation.

Mr. MARLER: In that case the registrar would be bound to make an investigation, which might be of considerable extent, to determine whether the allegations made were frivolous or not. I do not think there is any doubt about that. In other words, the registrar would have to go into the company's books and make an examination of its affairs no matter whether the allegations were wholly frivolous or not. Under this section

4 p.m.

the registrar would be bound to take that course in order first of all to satisfy himself whether the complaint was well grounded. That is the objection I urged a couple of days ago, and I think it is still in the bill as it stands now. I am not asking that the discretion of the registrar shall be circumscribed by any rules, but that he should have produced what in his opinion is reasonable proof before he makes any investigation and puts a business to all the disturbance that this would involve.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Of course, my hon. friend must assume that the person who is appointed as registrar will be a man of character and judgment and will act accord-

ingly. By way of illustration, I might be allowed to assume for a moment that my hon. friend was appointed a registrar under this section, and a complaint was brought before him. The responsibility would be his to decide whether there were grounds for believing that a certain combination was acting to the detriment of the public. In that regard he would use his judgment as to the class of people who appeared before him and as to the representations they made in deciding how far it was necessary to go in verifying their representations. He would not necessarily at once institute an inquiry into all the ramifications of the business before satisfying his mind that such inquiry was essential. I think a great deal is unnecessarily made of the effects of inquiries of this kind. It does not follow that concerns are going to be prosecuted because they are given an opportunity of explaining a certain situation, and that is practically what all the preliminary investigations of this character amount to. I should think a combination that is conducting its business in a fair and honest way would welcome a chance of coming before the registrar.

Mr. MARLER: Providing the registrar is myself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Providing the registrar is my hon. friend. Perhaps while the government may not be able to secure any one for the position so much to its liking as my hon. friend, it will endeavour to get a registrar who will commend himself to the hon. member.

Mr. MARLER: The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) might be made registrar.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): You might do worse—probably will.

Mr. MARLER: The Prime Minister suggested if I was appointed registrar under this act what I would do. There is only one thing I could do—I would have to make an investigation of the company's books to determine in my opinion whether the complaint was frivolous or not. Under the section as it now reads I would have no alternative.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman I certainly never understood the section in the sense stated by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler). The words in line 26, "shall have reason to believe" seem to me simply to place in the hands of the registrar the responsibility of determining what he shall do.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MARLER: May I interrupt the hon. minister? Will he please read a few lines further down?

Mr. MURDOCK: (Reading):

—that a combine exists or is being formed, or whenever so directed by the minister,—

Mr. MARLER: Will the minister please read the next few words?

Mr. MURDOCK: (Reading):

—the registrar shall cause an inquiry to be made—

Mr. MARLER: Precisely.

Mr. MURDOCK: Precisely. He

shall cause an inquiry to be made—

if in accordance with line 26, he—

—shall have reason to believe that a combine exists—

And do not let us dodge the real facts now or try to misquote something that is not in the section.

Mr. MARLER: I am not misquoting.

Mr. MURDOCK: He

shall cause an inquiry to be made—

if he—

shall have reason to believe that a combine exists

detrimental to the public.

Mr. MARLER: The hon. minister is reading the section backwards. If he reads it forward he can come to no other conclusion than that which I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think, Mr. Chairman, this is an important clause and should be cleared up, because I have been entirely in error so far if this section contains anything such as is suggested by the hon. member. My understanding all along has been that it was contemplated that an honest-to-goodness-business-square-dealing man would be appointed as registrar with some authority under this bill to utilize ordinary business common sense in deciding that there was real substantial ground to institute an inquiry, and that in no other case would he start in to make an investigation that might be inconvenient or embarrassing to some business concern. If the registrar is going to do even one tithe of what the hon. gentleman suggests, he certainly will be a busy man.

Mr. MARLER: He will be.

Mr. MURDOCK: He would be if he attempted to investigate all business concerns in Canada. I do not think anything such as is suggested can be injected into the bill.

Mr. HEALY: I read this section in exactly the same way as the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George:

Whenever such application shall be made to the registrar—

then you can skip the next three lines and continue

the registrar shall cause an inquiry to be made.

It seems to me that it is compulsory there for the registrar to make an inquiry.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think, Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friends will look at the next section they will see pretty clearly by the very first words what is intended:

If after such inquiry as he deems the circumstances warrant, the registrar is of the opinion that the application is frivolous or vexatious,—

That is the extent to which the registrar is expected to go. He must satisfy his own mind having regard to the circumstances, and the inquiry that he is to make is clearly such inquiry as he deems the circumstances warrant. That is the whole purpose of the section.

Mr. MARLER: I think the Prime Minister is thinking of the second inquiry. I am speaking of the preliminary inquiry. That is the only one I have ever taken exception to. I have not taken exception to the second inquiry at all. If the registrar is satisfied by the preliminary inquiry that there is a combine, an injury being done, I have never said that he should not go on. I think he should. I am entirely in accord with the Prime Minister's viewpoint there. But the one point I have made, as has been stressed a few moments ago is, notwithstanding what my hon. friend the Minister of Labour says, that section 6 makes it absolutely imperative for the registrar to make an inquiry. The Prime Minister, a few moments ago asked, if you were a registrar what would you do? I would have absolutely no alternative but to go into the combines themselves and make an investigation of these facts to find out whether the allegations and the complaints made were frivolous or not. However, I have spoken long enough on this subject.

Mr. BOYS: I agree entirely with my hon friend (Mr. Marler). I think reference to section 6 will show that there are three things contemplated by that section. The first is the inquiry to be made by the registrar upon receipt of application. Secondly, the registrar himself if he has reason to believe a combine exists can start an inquiry of his own accord, and thirdly, the minister if he sees fit, can set the machinery in motion. I do not think the lines referred to by the Minister of Labour "or whenever the registrar shall have reason to believe" are coupled at all with the first line. He seems to think that when the application is received the registrar pauses to consider, and after doing some considering, if he thinks there is reason to believe a combine exists, he proceeds. I think the minister is reading it entirely wrong. It is perfectly obvious that there are three distinct provisions. If I am wrong in that I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he should consider an amendment to the section, for certainly it is open to that construction without any doubt. Let us read it again:

Whenever such application shall be made to the registrar—

That is one thing. Then he must proceed to make the inquiry referred to, and furthermore he may require returns to be made under oath and so on. That is one thing. Next comes this:

—whenever the registrar shall have reason to believe that a combine exists or is being formed—

He may set the law in motion. Or third, the minister may set the law in motion. If that is not the intention I would respectfully suggest that the Prime Minister had better reframe the section for I feel certain that the language is not capable of any other interpretation.

Mr. MARLER: It has been suggested to me—it is not my own suggestion—that after the word "registrar" instead of the word "or" the word "and" be used. The section would then read:

Whenever such application shall be made to the registrar, and whenever the registrar shall have reason to believe that a combine exists or is being formed, etc.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does not that go further than the hon. member intends? That would shut off any initiative on the part of the registrar, and I do not think that he means to go as far as that. Of course, the real trouble about this bill is that those who are chiefly in favour of it have not taken the time to find out what it does mean. The hon. Minister of Labour is just as right in his contentions on this clause as he has been in the whole of his main argument. He is keeping up his batting average. He is one hundred per cent wrong exactly, no more and no less. I do not know that it makes very much difference. After all, this is only a start. The government are satisfied with the bill; let them have it. They think it is all right; let them have it. We have tried to point out how absurd these things are, but they do not want

any assistance, none at all, so why should we delay the proceedings one way or the other. Of course, if English means what English is supposed to mean, if these written words are to be taken not as a joke from the Department of Labour but as meaning just exactly what they are supposed to mean, the hon. gentleman who has raised this point is absolutely right.

I want to ask a further question. Can my right hon. friend give us any light as to what the words "or others" mean in this same section? I admit we have had one explanation from the Minister of Labour, and I must congratulate him upon that. In that explanation he again kept up his batting average. I think his explanation was again one hundred per cent error, because he tells us that the reason that the words "or others" are put in there is this, that these combinesters sometimes are so clever that they can take the position that they are neither producers nor consumers, and they therefore are "others," so that the word "others" according to the minister means them.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. gentleman is misquoting me, as he will find if he refers to the record.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We will see just what he says. Here it is:

> It came to my attention some two or three years ago that these words "or others" were very necessary on account of the business in which such "combinesters" were engaged, that if these words "or others" were not there, they would be able, with legal advice, to prove conclusively that they were neither a producer of the thing they were combined to deal in, nor a consumer of that particular thing, and that therefore, the words "or others" were necessary there to include them and every citizen of this Dominion.

Now my hon. friend will say that the word "others," is put in because these people that are combinesters can say: We are neither producers nor consumers. Perhaps I had better pause here to ask the minister if I did not read his statement right.

Mr. MURDOCK: That part of it which you read I think was read right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the only thing I am referring to, that and nothing else. My hon. friend will say that the word "others" there is put in for the purpose of protecting these wicked people from themselves. They may say they are not producers, or they may say that they are not consumers. They are in a combine and that combine may be hurting themselves, and that is the reason the word "others" is in there. That is the explanation given. I am quite sure that my right hon. friend will say that that is not his reason, but that is the only reason we have been given up to date. I think we should be given some sane, logical reason as to why the word "others" is there.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can give my hon. friend a reason that he will accept. He himself is partly responsible for the insertion of those words, and I think that reason was given and given by the Minister of Labour yesterday. My hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) has only to ask his own leader and to consider what he did when he was a member of the government to discover where those words came from. I have in front of me the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919, which was passed when my hon. friend was a member of the government, and the language of that act is as follows:

> The expression "combine" is used in this act with intended relation to articles of commerce, and it shall be deemed to have reference only to such combines, immediately hereinafter defined, as, with relation as aforesaid, have, in the opinion of the Board of Commerce of Canada (or of a single member thereof acting under authority of and for the purposes of section eight of this act) operated, or are likely to operate, to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, consumers, producers or others—

That is the language that my hon. friend was responsible for putting in the statute which was passed relating to combines. The present administration is seeking to take from previous legislation what was best and most effective in it and omit what seemed to be superfluous and unnecessary, and therefore retains those words. I confess I did not see that they had any great significance until I heard the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) yesterday draw the attention of the House to the fact—or rather ask the question—was an insurance company a consumer or producer, was a transportation company a consumer or producer. He said he could not tell. Well, the purpose of this bill is to protect any section of the public, whether transportation companies, insurance companies, or anyone else. That is the reason why the words "or others" are inserted there and should be kept there. I hope my hon. friend will feel that, inasmuch as he has been partly responsible for the insertion of these words in a similar enactment perhaps there is great wisdom in their being included there.

As to the other point which has just been mentioned, let me say to my hon. friend that when he intimates the government is not anxious to receive any assistance that can be given he is quite in error, the government will welcome any assistance. What the government hopes will be avoided is unnecessary criticism, obstruction simply for the purpose

of obstruction. Nothing of the kind has been shown. But I would certainly like my hon friend and every member of the House to feel, that the government will welcome any suggestion, any assistance in making this bill as perfect as it can be made. It is a very difficult question and will require all the expert advice it is possible to offer.

Just before I leave the section we are referring to let me read the provisions one by one. First of all there is this provision:

Whenever such application shall be made to the registrar—

That is the first condition if one wishes to put it so. Then:

—or whenever the registrar shall have reason to believe that a combine exists or is being formed—

That is the second.

—or whenever so directed by the minister—

That is the third. Now continuing—

—the registrar shall cause an inquiry to be made—

I think that is, perhaps, where the fear of hon. members arises. They have a fear of the word "inquiry," they attach to it a significance which the rest of the language of the section does not justify. "Cause an inquiry to be made" does not mean that the registrar shall institute a large and extensive inquiry, going into all the business transactions of a company in a formal manner. If one reads the rest of the section one will see what is meant. Let me continue:

—cause an inquiry to be made into all such matters whether of fact or of law with respect to the said alleged combine as he shall consider necessary—

The whole of it is limited by what the registrar himself shall consider necessary to inquire into with a view of determining whether a combine exists. He is not expected to go and find out how far the combine could operate; and by the word "combine" there, reference, of course, is to a combine as defined by the act which is a combine operating to the detriment of the public. He proceeds to inquire with a view to determining whether a combine operating to the detriment of the public exists or not. Now the very next section, which still refers to the registrar says:

If, after such inquiry as he deems the circumstances warrant, the registrar is of the opinion that the application is frivolous or vexatious, or does not justify further inquiry he shall make a report in writing to the minister setting out the application, the statement or statements, the inquiry made and the information obtained, and his conclusions.

It is perfectly clear that the whole purpose of the section is simply to appoint some person who will receive applications and whose duty it will be to act in much the same manner as a grand jury acts in regard to matters that are drawn to its attention to discover whether there are grounds sufficient to merit an inquiry of a more elaborate character being gone into. I think if my hon. friend will read the two sections just as they are in plain English he will find it difficult to come to any other conclusion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is quite true that the words in question can be found somewhere else, but I apprehend the draftsman had some reason for what he was doing, There is a good deal of difference between two acts. Words and definitions, and the like, change as acts or as objects change. That I think the right hon. gentleman must know. It is perfectly idle to say to me that I should know all about it, for frankly I do not. I thought this was really the hobby of my right hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King). I thought he would know the use of every single word in this bill. I am very much surprised to learn that instead of knowing anything about it he simply says "We have gone through your legislation and we have taken all the good we can find in it, dropping the unnecessary clauses." That is discarding the most ingenious although highly fallacious explanation given by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). The Prime Minister is driven to this point, that knowing nothing about it and having no other reason to offer, he is forced to accept a suggestion made by this side of the House. Well, I think, perhaps, we shall have to let it go at that.

Mr. MURDOCK: I would draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the Minister of Labour on 27th January, 1920, knew entirely too much to suit my hon. friend about these things.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have had so many funny things—and they generally come from the same funny source—they are coming along from time to time. I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to. He is a creator of jokes as well as a great investigator.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not of jokes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Sometimes the investigation was a joke. There was one supreme joker investigated.

Mr. MURDOCK: You are a splendid judge of jokers, you are the king of them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I might tell my hon. friend what splendid investigations are sometimes made. He has given us a certain

date. That date reminds me of one of his startling discoveries made during the last election when he found that a whole carload of 45,000 pounds of campaign literature had ben sent from Ottawa to help me in the West York campaign.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is getting out of order; he is wandering from the immediate consideration of clause 6.

Mr. MURDOCK: Who started that, a Tory?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, no; the hon. gentleman knows where it started.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows very well. I thought this came up as the result of a question that the hon. gentleman put to me.

The CHAIRMAN: The fact that the hon. member is asked a question does not justify wandering from the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the investigation to be secret or public?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Secret, or rather I should say private.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So the sun does not commence to shine just yet?

Mr. GOOD: Will the Prime Minister allow a suggestion as to wording which I think will make the meaning of the section a little clearer? I would suggest putting in the word "such" before the word "and" in line 29, and delete the words "to inquire into" in line 31, so that the section will then read:

> The registrar shall cause such an inquiry to be made into all such matters whether of fact or of law with respect to the said alleged combine as he shall consider necessary with the view of determining—

and so on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think that would alter the meaning. However, I have no objection to using it if the committee think that is better phrasing.

Mr. BOYS: I gather from the remarks of the Prime Minister that he does not agree with the construction placed upon the first two lines of this section by the Minister of Labour, but it would be well to make sure of that. If I understood the Minister of Labour rightly, he really read the section as if the word "or" were "and"; but if I interpret the remarks of the Prime Minister correctly he does not intend that the word "or" should have the effect of the word "and" at all, and there are three distinct propositions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is right.

Mr. BOYS: If the Minister of Labour is right in his view, there is no question that when you receive the application you then must go a step further and the registrar must have reason to believe a combine exists. I do not think that was the intention, and I see that the Prime Minister does not think that is the intention of it either.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Labour said he never could agree to that meaning. Is he going to resign?

Mr. MURDOCK: Not at the present moment. That would be too entirely satisfying to my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might be a good thing for the country.

Mr. MURDOCK: I respectfully decline to resign. It seems as though it is really necessary for me to explain my position a little further. I do not take any exception whatever to the statement made by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys); but I hold that, under any reasonable and consistent application of the first words of that section, where six gentlemen had made an application to the registrar, if he had, as it is presumed he might have, absolute knowledge of the conditions in effect with regard to the particular matters as to which representations were made, and if he, therefore, had reason substantially to know that there was nothing in it, he would certainly indicate that fact to those who were making the appeal. So that surely, if the registrar is to be a responsible officer acting under the direction of a responsible minister, the general question would be to determine what would be "reasonable knowledge" before proceeding, or to determine that there was no necessity to proceed. That is the reason why I said that it should be surely determined by the words "shall have reasonable knowledge," because in the final analysis, in any case, so far as the registrar is concerned, that would be the determining factor for the registrar in judging how far he might proceed.

Mr. BOYS: The point was that if the application is once made the registrar is obliged to act whether he wants to or not, and in making that observation I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to what he next proposes under section 8. The registrar requires a return under oath, with the production of all agreements, contracts, and so on, and he does this on his own initiative.

I would not object if that were done on the direction of the minister, but it seems to me it is an extensive power to give a registrar who is in one sense responsible to no one. All he has to do when he gets the application is to call for a return upon oath from the party against whom the allegation is made, and then they have to supply the vast amount of information provided for by this section, and return all contracts and agreements, and so on. My own idea would be that this is too much power to give any registrar. If the minister thought it necessary to call for that, I would not object.

Mr. MURDOCK: Does section 7 not provide that the minister shall determine this question?

Mr. BOYS: No. It provides only one thing, and that is that, if the registrar comes to the conclusion that there is not sufficient ground, he then reports the matter to the minister; who then considers it, and if he agrees with the registrar, he in turn gives his reasons for his conclusions to the applicant. On the other hand, as part of that inquiry—I may be reading the act wrongly, but I do not think I am—whether it is the minister or the registrar, or the six individuals, the registrar calls for an extensive return on oath. I say that is a tremendous power to give a registrar.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We can discuss section 8 when we come to it.

Mr. BOYS: It has to be discussed in connection with this section, because so long as you leave the words "or whenever the registrar shall have reason to believe a combine exists," you give him that power, and having that power, he proceeds as outlined in the following section. I am quite prepared to discuss that section when we reach it, but it is quite proper at this stage to refer to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think if the act is to have any virtue, you must give to the registrar all the powers he might find necessary to satisfy his mind as to the applications made. The charge that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has made against this measure is that it has no teeth in it of any character. I think he added that it had no claws. My hon. friend wants to take away apparently all the little power that is given to the registrar. I think unless you give the registrar some opportunity of getting any information you render his position one of absolute futility.

Mr. BOYS: I think you should sink your teeth in the result, and not in the preliminary investigation. In the preliminary steps teeth are not so essential.

Mr. BIRD: Did I understand the Prime Minister to say this section gives the registrar the power to begin an inquiry on his own initiative?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BIRD: That is apart from any previous proceeding?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, if he believes there is a combine in restraint of trade.

Mr. BIRD: From information he has acquired himself?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BIRD: Would he be expected to exercise surveillance over the conduct of business in general on behalf of the public?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think he would probably find his time would be very well taken up simply discharging the duties the act places upon him without attempting any general supervision of business.

Mr. BIRD: I asked that question because it seemed to me almost vital that he should be expected to exercise some degree of surveillance over the business that he is concerned with. I understand from the tenor of the right hon. member's speech on this matter, that the registrar would be appointed as a guardian of the rights of the public. The history of the guardians of the public is instructive. The guardian of the rights of the public unfortunately occupies a delicate position. That is, he takes up his position on lines that divide the public from their would-be exploiters, and I recall to mind the history of the guardians of the poor in the history of the British Poor law. Originally guardians were instituted with human motives in regard to the rights of the poor, but eventually they degenerated into guardians of the taxpayers, and were always on their guard against the encroachments of the poor. It seems to me to be vital, and in fact I do not see that any other part of this act is at all vital as compared with that part which delimits the functions of the would-be guardian. If this registrar is simply placed there to take the buffet and absorb the shock of public complaint ere it reaches the foot of the throne, I do not think there is very much in this legislation after all, and I would very much prefer that this registrar were given certain police powers, powers of surveillance, so that his

spare time might be employed on behalf of the people as against their would-be exploiters. My prophecy is that unless that is done his position will degenerate into that of a guardian of the exploiters of the people, and will not maintain its original intention of being a guardian of the people themselves.

I offer that as a criticism of this bill. It is all right to be precise and exact about the incidentals, but when you come to define the functions of the man or the person who is to carry out the law you are touching its nerve. Therein lies the whole work. The registrar, whoever he may be, will be exposed to much influence from the public. Any motion that comes from the public will be now and then and here and there, scattered and pretty much ineffective. It will not be concerted. The powers that will move upon him from above will not be of that kind. They will be concerted, concentrated; and woe to the man if his duties are not defined and if those duties are not so defined as to make it beyond any peradventure that he is placed there on behalf of the public. I wish the committee to note that that was the sole motive for introducing this legislation—that the public should be safeguarded from this menace that exists from growing combines. The whole intention of the legislation is defeated to begin with if you do not so state—put it in the bond—that this registrar is placed there purely for public reasons, for the public benefit, and not in any way to absorb the effect of public complaint before it reaches the point where it can be effectively heard.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the fact that any liberty is given to any six individuals to bring to the attention of an officer of the government a matter which, they believe, affects the public in a detrimental manner, is not sufficient in the way of supervision in the public interest, I doubt very much if more effective supervision could be found in giving to one government officer the general business of going around and hunting for grievances and difficulties. What my hon. friend suggests would lead only to an expectation on the part of the people, of interference with business in a manner which would hardly be in the public interest itself.

Mr. PUTNAM: To revert to a minor matter, I must support the suggestion of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) that the word "such" be inserted in line 29 before the word "and." This will not alter the meaning in any degree, and it will make good language. The word "such" is rather obviously omitted.

[Mr. Bird.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have the word "such" appearing six or seven times in the one sentence. That does not affect the meaning.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Registrar to report to minister on inquiry; minister to decide whether further inquiry shall be made.

Mr. CARROLL: Has the Prime Minister taken into consideration the suggestion I made the other evening regarding the finality of the minister's decision in matters of this kind, whether or not, after he has read the evidence sent up by the registrar, he will place the matter before the attorney general of the province? I would think, unless the minister who will have charge of this matter is the Minister of Justice, there might possibly be an appeal to the Minister of Justice or to the members of the government. The reasons I gave for that were that if the minister who would function under this measure were a layman, he might, perhaps, not be just in a position to understand the nature and weight of evidence as well as the Minister of Justice or members of the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Any action of the minister would be action on the part of the members of the government. I think that will cover the matter.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Power of registrar to investigate and to enter and examine premises, books, etc.:

Mr. LEWIS: Is this power of investigation limited to the registrar himself, or can he appoint anyone to conduct the investigation? The clause does not say anything about anyone whom the registrar may appoint for the purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I presume the registrar would have in that regard just the same powers that a judge would have in making an investigation. Some things which it might be impossible for him to investigate personally, he might detail an officer to work out for him; but the responsibility for the investigation must be with the registrar himself.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Governor in Council may appoint commissioners to hold investigations:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume, under clause 7, if the minister orders another investigation, the registrar has to go on and make another

investigation. The bill does not say so, but that is clearly presumable.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Clause 7 reads:

Whether further inquiry shall or shall not be made.

I think the further inquiry there rather refers to an inquiry by the commissioner than by the registrar.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister orders a further inquiry, he further inquires. Will this further inquiry be private or public?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it will still remain private unless hon. gentlemen wish to change the drafting of the law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am waiting to see when the sun comes out, that the minister referred to yesterday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just as soon as the bill passes.

Mr. CASGRAIN: This clause refers to the commissioner. I think this would be the proper moment to suggest the amendment which I tried to introduce before, that the man appointed should be a lawyer of ten years' standing at the bar, or a judge of the Superior Court in the province in which the inquiry is to be held. I understand there might be some objection in the case of a registrar, because a registrar would more likey be an officer such as we call a prothonotary, or an officer of the court. When the question is one of appointing a commissioner who is going to go outside, in a larger territory and wider field, to investigate matters, he ought to be a lawyer of a certain number of years' standing at the bar, say, with the number of years' standing necessary to be a judge, or a judge of the Superior Court. Under the old act of 1910, it was always a judge who was president of the board. A board comprising Mr. Justice Laurendeau, of Montreal, Mr. Walsh and, a lawyer, I think, a Mr. White, conducted the only investigation that took place at that time. In this case, the amendment that I suggest might have its raison d'être, and it ought to be adopted by the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend stops to consider the class of persons who have been appointed on royal commissions, he will see the wisdom, possibly, of not limiting the individuals just to members of the legal profession. No doubt members of the legal profession have some special qualifications; but there might be cases pertaining to industry in its various branches in which an individual who was more or less familiar with the particular industry or allied business, might be a more suitable man to conduct the investigation than a member of the legal profession. The government will have to take the responsibility for its appointments in that regard. Appointments will be made by the Governor in Council, and I think my hon. friend may feel that care will be exercised in the selections made.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Another knock at the lawyers.

Mr. GOULD: I suggest to the hon. gentleman who so frequently offers amendments in favour of the lawyers that it is quite unfair that he should advance arguments so often in support of class legislation.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It is not class legislation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are my right hon. friend's ideas as to the remuneration that will be paid the commissioners to be appointed, and also the registrar? The bill may be useful although we think it is too much emasculated to be of use. However, we hope it will be useful to some extent at least. It may also be turned into a beautiful mess of patronage and prove a waste of money, and I think the House has a right to know now what the views of the cabinet are in regard to the remuneration of these gentlemen, whether you call them commissioners or anything else. The usual practice in the past has been to select the prosecuting attorney of the district, who is accustomed to elucidate facts and is familiar with search warrants, the seizure of papers and so forth, for such duties as are here contemplated. If that plan were adopted, although the government might rob itself of the opportunity to reward a few more Liberal politicians who are not yet satisfied, the country would be very greatly benefited by a very much reduced scale of costs in the appointment of persons who have been accustomed to look after this sort of thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend may have noticed that the bill gives power to the government to name some individual who already holds a position in the public service to act as registrar or, if the circumstances seem to necessitate it, to make a separate appointment; and I should think that for the class of work expected of the registrar, and having regard to the character of the man who would fill the position he would correspond very nearly to a deputy minister and the salary would be proportionate. As to the amount to be allowed the commis-

sioners, I should think that what has been the average in the case of royal commissions would possibly be the amount that the government would think proper for these officers. I have no final judgment on that point, but I am sure that in fixing the amount the government will bear in mind its responsibility to parliament for such expenditures as it may find necessary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the average allowed royal commissioners? I confess I do not know.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: About $30 a day—it varies between $20 and $40—with necessary expenses. Some commissions have gone much higher than that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What my hon. friend has in mind is an amount between $20 and $40?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. FORKE: What the hon. member for West York wants to know, I suppose, is how much it will take to satisfy disgruntled politicians.

Mr. JACOBS: It depends on how disgruntled they are.

Mr. BOYS: Would the appointment of the registrar be for life or for ten years as in the case of the Railway Commission? On what basis will he be appointed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On a basis similar to other members of the Civil Service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the Prime Minister really think that the registrar in this position, with the powers he has under the act, if it does not become a dead letter, should be a creature of the government, subject to dismissal at any time by the government? Should he not be in the position of members of the Civil Service Commission, or of the Railway Commission, or of the late Board of Commerce?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is very desirable that whoever is appointed should feel that there is some certainty of permanency about the position so long as his duties are being performed in a satisfactory manner, and I should hope that if the government ever changed, the government succeeding would retain in office whomsoever might be appointed provided he filled the office satisfactorily. I do not know that the expression "creature of the government" is wholly a proper one to use in reference to an appointment of this kind. I think the government would be fully aware of its responsibility to the public and to parliament in the matter of such an appointment and would seek to appoint someone whose standing in the community commended itself to the people. The government would be the first to recognize that the effect of a measure of this kind would depend on the character of the men who had to do with its administration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That does not answer my point. If what the Prime Minister says is right and applies generally, then judges should be appointed on the same basis. If the government can always be relied on never to dismiss anyone for selfish reasons, if the government is always of the nature depicted by some hon. gentlemen yesterday—virtuous and right no matter what issues from it—then, of course, the Prime Minister's position is defensible. But, judging from some appointments that this government has made if one may not judge from anything else, I must say that my faith in that regard has been rudely shattered.

Mr. CAHILL: Did you ever have faith in this government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can say that I have had more than I have now.

Mr. MURDOCK: Your government made mistakes, too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We appointed strong Liberals, and I do not know that we ever made a greater mistake than that relating to the hon. gentleman who interrupted me. If I am ever forgiven for that I shall be safe for all time. Now, I do not myself anticipate—I give my opinion for what it is worth, of course—that this registrar will have very much to do. He will have one job a month; about the end of each month he will have a small task. He may possibly have a little work in between if the act is put into operation and does not become a dead letter; but practically speaking he will have one job a month. If these great inquiries that are supposed to take place are to be of the nature of the sun that dispels thieves and robbers and unworthy things, according to King Richard II in Shakespeare, if these inquiries are to act as a sun to clear away the germs that the Prime Minister mentioned yesterday, there will have, of course, to be an operation of the act. But the registrar sitting in his office will not be any such sun. Anyone who suggests, for example, that the Combines Investigation Act operated as a preventive must have a great imagination.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There was a registrar under the Combines Investigation Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He had a fine sinecure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He was a deputy minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He did no work at all. The power of investigation was in the old act, but so far as that act proved a preventive of combines, it might as well have never been passed, and the whole country knows it. There were never as many combines formed in the history of Canada in the same period as during the existence of that act. My anticipation is that this will be just the same and that the registrar will have the duty of drawing his salary once a month. To the extent that it operates the act may prove vexatious, but it will get nowhere. But in the exercise of his duties, in order that at least the minimum of harm may be done and that effective action may be possible, the registrar should not be subject to dismissal at the will of the government. If such is the case he is disrobed of all judicial clothing whatsoever; there is nothing judicial about his office; he is simply there to carry out the will of the minister and of the government, subject to dismissal if he does not. The moment you place a man in a judicial position you must place him beyond the power of dismissal at the hands of the government. Is there anything of the nature of a judicial office in the post of registrar? If there is, then he should not be subject to dismissal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with my right hon. friend, I think whoever holds this position should feel that he is to all intents and purposes precisely in the same position in relation to the government as is a judge. But the duties are somewhat new and it may be that it would be difficult to find a man of experience to fill the position. Therefore I think it would not be wise to provide in the statute that the registrar shall not be removable from office until it is seen just how far it may be possible to secure a person who will fill this position in the most satisfactory manner. Personally I would not have any objection whatever to having the statute include a clause to the effect that the registrar shall be in the same position as a judge and be appointed for life; but when we are introducing legislation of a new character I think it is wise not to finally close the door to a possible change in the event of an appointment being made which would not be all that the government hoped it would be. I certainly agree that if the office were made in any sense political it would be a great abuse of the whole purpose of the statute.

Mr. FORKE: I do not know whether what I am about to offer is a practical suggestion, but would it not be possible to make the appointee responsible to parliament?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All members of the service in one sense are responsible to parliament.

Mr. FORKE: I know.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Every minister is responsible to parliament.

Mr. FORKE: But could not the appointee be removed by action of the whole House?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That practically comes to just what my right hon. friend is suggesting, that the position be similar to that of a judge. If the committee think it wise I would have no objection to this being done, but I submit that perhaps it would be better to have the registrar appointed on the understanding that his office would be a life appointment, unless after he had exercised the functions of the
5 p.m. office for some months it was found he was not the person adapted to such a position. I think it would be better to leave the door open in this way so that if the man appointed in the first instance did not measure up to what was expected of him he could be removed from office.

Mr. BOYS: I suppose the appointment of a registrar would involve also the appointment of a secretary and a stenographer and provision for special office accommodation, all of which would cost not less than ten or fifteen thousand dollars. Does not the Prime Minister think that before the country is saddled with any such permanent expenditure there should be some certainty of the registrar having something to do? As my right hon. leader said, I do not think the appointee will be very busy. If he has four or five investigations to make in a year I venture to say that is the utmost he will be called upon to undertake, in fact there may not be as many. Supposing we are right, if the office is once established we are committed to this expenditure. I would suggest that an officer of one of the courts in Ottawa should receive this appointment, at the outset at all events, until we see where this legislation is going to land us. Of course, he should get fair remuneration for any work he does. After a year, or at the outside two years, we will have an idea as to whether there is any real need for such an officer or not. There is power in the bill now to appoint some person

who already holds office. That is what I would suggest at the outset, say the registrar of one of our courts in Ottawa, or possibly the deputy minister could for the time being fill the office. There is certainly no good reason to make a life appointment and incur this heavy expenditure until we know just what the duties of registrar will involve. For my part if we find there is necessity for a registrar and important work for him to do, I certainly agree that he should not be subject to removal by any government, but should be in the same position as a judge and be removable from office only for proper cause.

Mr. RYCKMAN: In any event I would suggest to the Prime Minister that such a life appointment be not made until it is determined that this measure is within the competency of parliament to enact. One of the most learned counsel in Toronto has already expressed the opinion that such legislation is beyond the competence of this parliament, and I for one would think that it was not in the interests of the country to appoint a registrar and staff, involving superannuation allowance and other burdens, until it is beyond doubt that this legislation is not ultra vires.

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Chairman, I think the question asked by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) as to whether there is any need of a registrar being appointed is easily answered. In my opinion there is sufficient evidence before the committee now to warrant the speedy appointment of a registrar.

The other day the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) inquired as to whether the refusal by the Canadian Press Limited—as it then was—of a franchise to the proposed Ottawa paper would come within the provisions of this measure. In attempting to give some information the other evening I recited part of the history of a case that had come before the Canadian Press Limited. My remarks called forth from the Ottawa Journal two full columns of personal abuse and a double column editorial this morning. In the latter the Journal calls me almost everything that it is possible to call a man, but I suppose hon. members are not interested in such personal abuse heaped upon themselves. However, as I am termed a company promoter by the writer of the editorial, I may at once state that I never owned a share of promotion stock in my life or drew a fee for promoting a company. I am also charged with the crime of writing a letter to the Canadian Press, Limited, in stationery that happened to be owned by a company in the city of Detroit of which I am president. Of course, this may be a crime in the eyes of the Ottawa Journal.

But perhaps the real reason for these abusive articles is that the managing director of the Ottawa Journal is the president of the Canadian Press which I suggested might be a combine. Now, I think some provision might be made in this bill that where a registrar discovers that a combine exists, and that this combine is subsidized by the government in order that it may exist, the government should cancel the subsidy or any unpaid portion of it during the year in which the discovery was made. That is only a suggestion, but as to the fact whether this is a combine or not the Ottawa Journal goes along for two columns and gives the history of two cases. It connects me very thoroughly with one and ends up by saying that I should be the last person, or words to that effect, to complain because the Canadian Press did eventually grant a franchise to a paper that I promoted and own. The facts are I was a director of the Windsor Telegram, that the Windsor Telegram invested in buildings, plant, machinery and paper $167,000, put a paper on the street, and then asked the Canadian Press for a franchise. The only connection I ever had with that, except writing a few letters, was to appear for five minutes before the Canadian Press at the city of Toronto. They said: "It is all very fine. There is one paper in your border cities of sixty thousand. If you stand the gaff long enough we will probably give you a franchise next September." We carried along our paper without any telegraphic news whatever because the Canadian Press absolutely controls the telegraphic news of this country. It also has an agreement with the Associated Press, and it is impossible for any newspaper in this country to get any telegraphic news without the Canadian Press service. They say in this article, and have said before, that they do not prevent anyone from starting a daily newspaper. Quite right. Mr. Herman could come into the city of Ottawa and invest a million dollars in plant, land, buildings and machinery, and put a daily newspaper on the streets of Ottawa, but he would have no telegraphic news in it. He would have no news of the proceedings of the legislatures. It is true that he could put a special reporter here, but he would have no news from any other part of Canada unless he owned a franchise now controlled absolutely by the Canadian Press, which is controlled in this city by three men, not five, as is stated in this article, because the Citizen owns two franchises, the Journal owns two, and the French paper one.

Now that is the situation. If that is a combine, if the people of this country are willing to pay that combine $58,000 a year so that it will exist, we should know whether a newspaper owner or any number of men who wish to start another daily paper in any part of this country cannot have the telegraphic news. I suggest humbly that it is possible somewhere in this act to take care of a situation such as that. I believe personally that the combine does exist. I believe that it is not for the benefit of the public that it exists. I do not for one moment criticise the service rendered by the Canadian Press. The statement in this article is absolutely correct, that every report sent out by the Canadian Press is accurate. There has been no politics of any description in the reports sent out. I am not attempting to criticise the newspaper men, but I do criticise the men who control these franchises and I say it is to the detriment of the general public of this country that such a situation exists, and that we should cease subsidizing them and perhaps cease allowing them to gather their news over the telegraphic lines owned by the people of this country.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—Employment of experts:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the intention as to the employment of these other people? Are they to be just temporary employees for each particular case or what?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just temporary, certainly, to meet a special situation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They will not be regular employees; no additions to staff there at all? It is still private down to that point too, is it not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Unless my hon. friend would like to move to make it public.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am just asking. You have not got the sun yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not yet.

Section agreed to.

On section 16—Powers of registrar and commissioner as to witnessses, evidence on oath and production of papers:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As to non-attendance of any person who has been duly served with an order, does that cover any ordinary individual who may happen to make default under subpoena.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is referring to paragraph (d)? This is simply to require the attendance of witnesses that are essential for the investigation. It would be impossible for the registrar or a commissioner to make any headway with the inquiry if no attention was to be paid by witnesses they might subpoena.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What provision of previous legislation do you rely upon for this precedent?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Section 36 of the Combines Investigation Act, 1910.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has my hon friend—I ask merely for information—ever considered the application of penalties of this character, six months in prison and a fine of one thousand dollars in the case of non-attendance of a witness? Now if he was charging against the people that were interested in the combines that they had destroyed their books or withheld evidence or anything of that kind, well and good, but what does my hon. friend think of imposing a penalty of six months' imprisonment and a thousand dollar fine for a witness forgetting his subpoena papers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Unless the witness was a material witness and there was some evidence of deliberate intent on his part not to comply with the requirements of the law, I do not think that there would be any likelihood whatever of the penalty being imposed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid my hon. friend is relying very very much upon somebody else going through this and putting the proper amendments in for him. It is a most extraordinary situation.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—No person excused from attending or giving evidence on ground that evidence may incriminate him:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have an amendment to this section, Mr. Chairman, that I mentioned it was my intention to introduce. I move to amend the section by inserting the word "oral" before the word "evidence" in line 40 and by striking out the words "or documents" in line 42 and substituting therefor the words "so given." The section as it stands protects in the event of a criminal prosecution any person as respects the oral evidence which he may have given and also as respects documents he may have introduced. It is quite clear that unless the words "or documents" are stricken out, the clause would only serve to protect the combine in the matter of the evidence that was needed at the criminal prosecution.

Mr. MURDOCK: I would point out in that connection that it will be necessary to insert the word "oral" in line 4.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is what I have done.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 19—Proceedings in private:

Mr. MARLER: I suggested a few days ago that the proceedings up to the end of the preliminary investigation should be in private, and that secrecy should be maintained with respect to the documents produced. I do not think the bill carries that out.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The complaint made with respect to this bill, as I understand it, is rather that there is too much privacy about the legislation as drawn. I think the intention is perfectly clear that the proceedings shall be private. The documents certainly would be kept private.

Section agreed to.

On section 20—Counsel may be instructed to conduct investigation:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the Prime Minister of the view that when he is going to appoint investigators the investigators have to have counsel to tell them what to do?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There may be cases where it would be in the public interest to have a commissioner assisted by counsel. I think it should be left to the Minister of Justice to appoint counsel if, in the opinion of the government, that step would be wise in the public interest.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is evident that this bill is thorough in one respect—it is about the only thing I can congratulate my hon. friend on having done thoroughly—and that is getting opportunities to employ people. The bill is very thorough there. Now, my right hon. friend, in the first instance, has his registrars and his commissioners. Then he has a right to appoint experts for the purpose of assisting the commissioners when assistance is necessary. Now on top of that he wants to get the right to appoint counsel. If the commissioner is not an expert he might need an expert to advise him. If the commissioner is neither an expert on the one hand nor intelligent on the other, and requires counsel to tell him what ought to be done he should not be appointed. If my right hon. friend accepts my suggestion and appoints the local county crown attorneys as his commissioners he will have no such trouble, and if no additional expenditure is to be incurred the Minister of Finance will be correspondingly relieved.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would point out to my hon. friend that the government is not seeking, in connection with this bill, the right to make any more appointments than have been thought advisable, for example, in the case of royal commissions empowered to investigate different subjects. I think the act has to be broad enough to permit the meeting of any kind of case that may arise. The government will naturally wish to be economical in the administration of this measure and will feel its responsibility for expenditures that are incurred.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, very much, as in the case of the German claims.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—Distribution of report:

Mr. BOYS: Is it the intention that the report shall be available to anybody who wishes to get it? If so why should it be left to the minister to furnish copies? Under section 19 the proceedings of the registrar and commissioner are to be conducted in private, but the minister may order any portion of those proceedings to be conducted in public. When it comes to the report it is provided that a newspaper or any person can get it only if the minister so directs. I do not see any necessity at all for that precaution. Surely if the country has to pay for all these proceedings, anyone should be able to get a copy of the report, possibly, if thought proper, upon payment of the usual fee of ten cents a folio or a reasonable charge. It should not be for the minister to say that the report shall or shall not be made public.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There again, Mr. Chairman, I would feel that there is a responsibility with the minister which he may be expected to exercise in accordance with what was in the public interest. I can conceive of some cases where, perhaps, it would be the part of wisdom for a minister to withhold a report. But he would be responsible to parliament for his action in so doing; he would have to give the reason for having refused to make a report public. In fact I can conceive of cases where the commissioners might, after having gone into a matter very fully, give it as their opinion that it was inadvisable that the report should be made public. Therefore I think, discre-

tion should be left with the minister in that regard. Personally I am rather sympathetic with the point of view of my hon. friends opposite that everything should be made public; but let me point out again that the government, in this legislation, has sought to avoid what some hon. gentlemen have pointed out as a possible danger—too much interference with business and subjecting private businesses to an amount of publicity that might bring about a possible injury. The government is sincere it its desire to not prejudice a private interest if that can possibly be avoided in the carrying out of this legislation. I think, probably, it is wise to leave with the minister discretion as to the amount of publicity that is to be given to a report.

Mr. BOYS: I do not know that I can agree with my right hon. friend there. I quite appreciate that the earlier stages of the inquiry should be private; but when you have once found that there was something to inquire into, and when a commissioner goes into the matter and hears the evidence and a report is made, surely what I suggest is not going to hurt the firm or person investigated. If the report is unfavourable why should not the public have a right to know the result of the proceedings for which they are paying? As the bill stands at present the whole thing is absolutely private from beginning to end and even the report can be withheld unless the minister chooses to say it can be made public. Not one single step to be taken under the provisions of this bill can be made public except with the minister's authority. Even when the country has paid for the investigation and the report arising out of it is ready that report cannot be obtained except with the minister's permission. The newspapers of the country cannot get the report, the newspapers cannot even be represented at the investigation unless, forsooth a minister of the Crown says so. I am absolutely in accord with the views of the Prime Minister as to the earlier stages of the investigation; I do not think it would be fair to a company, when the matter is being first investigated, that the press and public should know all about it. But when the registrar is of the opinion that there is something to be investigated, and when a commissioner is appointed to take that investigation in hand, why in the world should not the proceedings of that court be open to the public and the press just as readily as the proceedings of any court of justice. Whether the Prime Minister will agree with me in that I do not know; but to maintain, that after a report has been made, the press and the public are not entitled to a copy of it unless some minister says they may have it, seems to me extraordinary. I have heard nothing from the Prime Minister which justifies that. Let me repeat: If the report whitewashes a suggested combine surely to goodness they would want it made public and they, or anybody else, ought to be able to get a copy of the report. On the other hand, if the report finds there has been a combine why put it in the hands of any minister to hush the whole thing up if he wants to? Surely it is in the public interest that the matter should then be made public? What is the good of this bill if the whole thing can be kept from the public? I am not saying the minister will do this, I hardly believe he wants to do it, but why give him this power? The proceedings having reached the stage where the alleged combine is being investigated, the parties concerned being represented by counsel if necessary, I cannot see why they should not then be just as public as in any court of justice. However, if the Prime Minister does not think that procedure is correct I do trust he will accede to the suggestion that at least those interested, including the public and the press, may get a copy of the report when that report is made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the word "may" is, to all intents and purposes, equivalent to the word "shall" with this one possible difference; that if you insert the word "shall" you leave no discretion whatever for the holding back of an individual report. You compel every report to be published, regardless altogether of what the circumstances may be. In the event of any report being withheld, the minister is responsible. I have not the slightest objection, if my hon. friend wishes, to move to insert the word "shall" in place of the word "may". The only reason the government has used the language which appears in this bill is the one I have given, an endeavour to have caution exercised in respect of any matters which are likely to be of concern to private business, so as to interfere as little as possible with private business. I feel certain that the minister administering the act would take advantage of the word "may" to give publicity to reports which had been received. If he is given that permission I think that is almost sufficient guarantee that he will exercise it, unless there is exceptional reason for not doing so.

Mr. BOYS: If the Prime Minister intended his remarks as an answer to my suggestion, he

misapprehended my meaning. I do not care whether the word "may" or the word "shall" is inserted. If you leave the word "may" in the section I admit you, perhaps, leave it open for a judicial decision. I know that in the county of Simcoe we had a case which lasted one solid week, and finally reached the Court of Appeal, which involved the meaning of the word "may." It was a very costly affair. But my point is as to the words "if the minister so directs". The section reads:

A copy of any report may, if the minister so directs, be sent free of charge to any person.

And so on. My suggestion is that it should be amended so as to read:

A copy of any report shall be available and free to any person and to any newspaper in Canada.

Mr. MURDOCK: As to a case in which the report is against the concern being investigated, as referred to a few moments ago, I would like to ask a question. Considering that the minister has no authority to assess the penalties, or to finally determine, in a real court of justice, the actual guilt for penalty assessing purposes, does the hon. member think it would be in accordance with British justice that the report should be heralded through the country at all times broadcast to the world that one single individual, acting as a commissioner, had expressed to the minister his best judgment that a serious situation existed, that should be sent on—

Mr. BOYS: This is a speech, not a question.

Mr. MURDOCK: No, it is a question.

Mr. BOYS: I will answer it, if the minister will give me a chance.

Mr. MURDOCK: Does the hon. member think it would be in accordance with British justice to send a man to trial with that cloud hanging over him? Would that not rather be a proper thing for the attorney general of the province or the Solicitor General to deal with in sending the case on for determination.

Mr. BOYS: I do not think the question is at all troublesome. Have you not exactly the same state of affairs in a preliminary investigation in any criminal court? Many people are prosecuted in the police court. An investigation takes place there. If the magistrate thinks there is sufficient evidence to place the party on trial, the proceedings in the police court are public, and the party is sent up for trial. At the same time these parties are sometimes found to be innocent. After you have had your preliminary investigation, and this registrar, who has the status of a deputy minister, a fairly responsible man, comes to the conclusion that there is something to investigate, you then go further and your commissioner, another high-priced and capable man, investigates the matter. Both sides are heard. He thinks there is a combine. Do you not think it is time the public knew something about it?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am entirely willing to accept the hon. member's view.

Mr. BOYS: I am delighted I have made some impression on the minister. I was trying to answer his question. I cannot see anything terrible about what the minister has suggested. I did not hear all the discussion yesterday. I was more pleasantly engaged.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where?

Mr. BOYS: Read the papers and you will find out. I understood the suggestion was there was to be so much light thrown upon this, and it was to be exposed to the sun. Now, I find the whole thing is to be in camera, unless the minister otherwise directs. Coming back to my suggestion—and I make it for the last time—I say that this clause should be amended so that when we reach the last stage of a double investigation no matter what the report is, any newspaper or any individual should be permitted to get a copy of the report if they want it.

Then the bill goes on and provides that the proceedings should be sent to the attorney general, and he should institute proceedings and if he does not do so in three months, the department at Ottawa takes it in hand, and we have a further investigation. It seems to me the provisions of the bill are useless if, when you go through the entire process, the public can not even get a copy of the report unless the minister says so.

Mr. CHURCH: I think it would be better if the House did not pass this bill at all. The committee has carried twenty one clauses, and we are never going to get anywhere in regulating the trusts and combines with this bill. The result of this bill, if it passes, will simply mean a lot of party politics. The registrar and the commissioner, when appointed, will be under the control of a minister of the Crown, While he may be a good minister, he is still a politician, and he will have to deal with the matter of regulation of trusts and combines. This bill provides for a private or star chamber inquiry, and we are not going to get anywhere against the powerful influence of the shipping combine and other trusts, the banking institutions, the great manufacturers' association, and all the rest of these trusts and combines. We have had on and off the

statute books for thirty years various legislation dealing with this problem, and we have never got anywhere in solving it. We have not been able to accomplish anything for the working classes in the way of bringing down the cost of living. I listened to the Minister of Labour yesterday and to-day, and I may say that the more I look into this bill the more I am convinced that it is simply fashioned after the style of the Board of Commerce Act of 1919. The registrar will be a politician, and the commissioner will be a politician; one reports to the other, and the other reports to the minister, and then you have got to the end of the first circle. They have to go to the minister and get permission to go further. The proceeding is not conducted as a court would be conducted at all. They had the same legislation in the United States twenty years ago, but they went further, and as I said yesterday the grand jury system was then adopted. Our Board of Commerce Act was based on the same principle as the United States Federal Trade Commission. They did not get anywhere. What has been the result in Chicago under the grand jury system? They had the great motor combines and the oil combines indicted. These gigantic combines are located at the foot of lake Michigan, in the city of Chicago. The grand jury sat and Judge Landis fined the Standard Oil fifty million dollars.

I urge that we take this question out of party politics, and leave it to the grand juries in the different centres of population throughout Canada. In that way we would relieve the government of a great burden. I do not think it is fair to ask the government of Canada, whether this government or their successors, to deal with this matter. The Ministers of the Crown are too busy to attend to it. It is not fair to ask them to take hold of a matter like this, and the country does not expect the government to do the impossible. I think it would be far better if the minister would consider whether he would not, at the end of this bill insert a provision vesting in the grand juries throughout the country the power to deal with this question. There are judicial and national questions and they deal with economic matters. We must be fair to capital on the one side, and to everybody concerned in trade and commerce. You cannot deal with the matter properly if you are going to handle it as a political question instead of as an economic one. You must be fair to the mergers and trusts in that respect, because some of them have been doing good work; some of them have been effecting economies in many spheres of activity.

The majority, however, have not, and they should be under some form of public control. Railway transportation interests are under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners; they are not under the control of a registrar or of a commission, and there is a suggestion to give that commission increased powers and to put transportation on the ocean and the Great Lakes under its control. If that board can deal with matters like that which are of a national character, surely grand juries can handle the trusts and combines better. They know local conditions and the judges and juries have the time, which a busy minister of the Crown has not, to study the problems. I do not think it is fair to a minister of the Crown on the opposite side, because ministers are loaded up with work, that he should have to assume this additional burden. I would not ask the Prime Minister to do so. The grand jury is a judicial body which can handle this question, it has the time and machinery to handle it, and it is the only body in the Dominion of Canada that can properly handle this question. Under the old Combines Act, 1910, there was only one inquiry, that into the United Shoe Machinery Company; the minister said that from 1908 to 1923 there was only this one inquiry.

Conditions are continually changing in Canada. I hope the government will succeed under this legislation, but I doubt very much if they are going to succeed. I do not doubt their sincerity; I do not doubt the sincerity of the Prime Minister in introducing this legislation; I give him credit for bringing this legislation before parliament. I will be glad to see him bring about some results; but on the one hand, in these days of stress and strain, we must not forget that the capitalists have some rights and, on the other hand, the consumers must come in somewhere. Therefore, I think the courts are better fitted for this work than ministers of the Crown, and registrars and commissioners appointed as they no doubt will be under party politics. We should take this whole question out of party politics to get results.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If it were possible to foresee all the circumstances and how they were likely to operate, I would, I think, agree with my hon. friend that it were well to change the wording and make the publication of the report compulsory as soon as it is handed in. On the other hand, I think a moment's reflection will show that circumstances might arise where an investigation has brought to light many facts which are included in the report. The minister may feel that the case is one which should go on

immediately to the courts as the combine is of a character that should be prosecuted. He might wish to reserve for the time being, to place in the hands of the attorney general of the province or the Solicitor General who might be prosecuting the combine, the evidence and the report made on the evidence. It might be to the public interest that all those facts should not be disclosed before the case comes to trial. That discretion should be left with the minister. At all events, I would say to my hon. friend that I think that is a clause which might be permitted to stand as it is, at least, until the legislation is given a trial, and if experience shows that it is wise to make it mandatory rather than permissive, we can have it amended at a subsequent session.

Mr. FORKE: I am rather in sympathy with the remarks of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys). I think it is clause 25 which says that unless the minister thinks there is sufficient evidence to go on with, the whole thing is put aside. That seems to throw a tremendous responsibility on the minister. The whole proceedings have been in secret; nobody knows anything about them. The evidence is taken; then the matter comes before the minister, and he can shelve it if he likes. If the public had some information as to what evidence had been gathered in the inquiry that had been made, they would be in a position to know whether the minister had acted fairly or otherwise in dismissing the case. A tremendous responsibility is thrown upon the minister; in fact, this is a temptation that, perhaps, he should not be subjected to without some public investigation of some kind. I admit the argument which the Prime Minister has advanced.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might point out to my hon. friend that his remarks would have great force and weight and I would agree with him wholly, were it the circumstance that the minister is not responsible to parliament for everything that he does. But when members of the committee recall that with respect to every action of a minister, either in giving out a report, or in withholding it, he is accountable to parliament, and that any hon. member may call for any report that has been made, may demand from the minister in the presence of his fellow members, an explanation of why that report was not made public at a particular time, with that thought in mind, having regard to the unforeseen nature of the circumstances of different cases and what the public interest at the moment may render most desirable, I think it is better not to take away the discretionary power of the minister. I think a minister will seek at all times to further what he believes to be the public interest. I cannot conceive of any minister, unless he is heading straight to destruction, both for himself and for his government, trying to take a course that will be other than in the public interest and one that he can defend on the floor of parliament. That is my reason for thinking that, on the whole, it is wiser to leave with the minister the discretion as to the time, at any rate, of giving out a report that may be made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just let us see how far we are really going in this legislation —towards enabling the whole of the matter to be turned into a matter of party political exigency, that and nothing else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend this question when he speaks about turning the whole matter into a matter of party political exigency? Is that the point of view from which he would administer the legislation? If not, why should he impute a different motive to anyone else?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I cannot see any other reason from the manner in which the bill is drawn. In the first instance, my hon. friend is perfectly right. He is going into this question of a combine, and he does not know whether there is anything in it or not. He puts a man, in whom he is supposed to have trust and confidence—or else he would not appoint him—in a position for the purpose of finding out whether the prima facie case is such that it is clear that a combine exists. It is quite right that that should be all private. Nobody is arguing that that should be made public. That is the first proceeding. The second proceeding is this, that my hon. friend turns around and this particular concern over here is turned inside out, and that particular concern over there is turned inside out for the purpose of finding out whether the commissioner or the registrar was correct or not in his views. Those people are, in effect, on trial and they ought to be. I am not quarrelling with that at all. They are undergoing a preliminary investigation, and they are undergoing a preliminary investigation at the hands of the person that my hon. friend again has to have confidence in or he ought not to appoint him, for the purpose of finding out whether or not they are guilty of an offence. On top of all that, money is being spent. The investigation here and the investigation there are costing the country money, for experts,

commissioners, time, evidence and the like. The result is a result from which further criminal proceedings are to start or not to start, just exactly the same as in the case of a preliminary investigation. The crime is certainly no graver than are crimes that are covered by preliminary investigations. These preliminary investigations are held under the laws passed by this House. They are public; they relate to far more serious offences, such as the improper publication of the opinion of a magistrate that the committal should be made, and they do far more harm than any mere trade offence can do. And there are further investigations that are not surrounded with as many safeguards as we have here. I ask my hon. friend why there should be the difference, unless there is to be political favouritism or favouritism of some other kind. A concern over here, let us say, is being investigated. The minister may not like the colour of the man's hair or the kind of business he carried on, and he makes the report public. Another concern is being investigated at the same time; the minister likes the man and thinks his business is all right; and there is no publicity in that case. The one is taken and the other is left. If my hon. friend wants to have something like unifrom treatment of companies and wishes to see justice in the administration of the act, there should be no room for such favouritism. The minister should take his stand openly in regard to either course. He may be right or wrong in both, but the public surely have a right to know what the facts are. We have criticized this bill on the ground that it is going to take us nowhere. Surely my hon. friend must see the force of these criticisms, if the whole thing is to be left to the possibility of being tied up in secrecy. My hon. friend suggests that the matter should be kept quiet until the attorney general knows about it. Why? Why should it be kept quiet before the attorney general knows about it any more than any other crime under the statute? What possible harm can come of publicity? I think my hon. friend on further consideration should have that clause so amended as to provide that the public shall have the second report when it is made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member starts on the assumption that the minister who is to administer the act will not make the reports public; I think I am equally entitled to assume that he will make all reports public. It is from that point of view that the government is proceeding, namely, that the reports will all be made public unless there is some very special reason why publicity should not be given to a particular report at a particular time. I think that any minister who would refuse to make a report would incur a great responsibility. The minister in charge would be very careful in exercising that right in view of that responsibility. I have in mind a matter that is the subject of inquiry at the present moment,—the question of freight rates on the Great Lakes. The government had a preliminary investigation made of that matter and a report was presented by the investigator. I believe the whole report has been substantiated under a royal commission which had power to put parties under oath. An effort was made on the part of interests concerned to secure a copy of the report before they were brought to the position where they would have to appear before the commission for investigation. The government refused to make the report public, believing that it was in the public interest that the information gathered in that way should be handed over to the commission that was to make inquiry into the matter and be used by the commission in such a manner as would best serve the public interest. The government, I think, was wise in withholding the report from publication at the time; and I can conceive of cases under this act where, a group of interests having associated themselves, are acting in a manner detrimental to the interest of the public, information is obtained and a report submitted which is so strong that the government intends then to proceed to prosecution of the combine concerned. It might in such cases be very much in the interest of the public to withhold the report of the evidence on which the decision to prosecute is based, until such time as the combine itself has been investigated in a court of law in the regular way. This is a matter that can be determined only in the light of each case as it arises. I am entirely with my hon. friends opposite in this regard,—I think that wherever it is possible, and there is reasonable ground for believing that no just interest will suffer, the fullest publicity should be given to all proceedings under the act.

Mr. BOYS: My right hon. friend is with us, but he will not accede to our request.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let the hon. member move an amendment.

Mr. BOYS: I was more or less impressed by what the Prime Minister said with regard to the finding on the part of the commissioner. In special cases it might not be desirable to publish the report. Personally I should be satis-

fied if the Prime Minister would go this length, that if the commissioner himself, who should be the best judge because he has to hear all the evidence, recommends against the publication of the report, then by all means the minister should withhold it and let the matter go on to trial. If the report is a favourable one I can see no reason why it should not be published; any question of withholding the report could arise only in the case of its being unfavourable. If the commissioner after hearing the evidence is of opinion that the report should not be published, and he so recommends, the minister should be in a position to exercise his discretion and withhold its publication. But if the commissioner does not so recommend, I do not believe any minister should have the power that is here provided. I think you are putting more on the shoulders of the minister than you should; and if perchance there ever were a minister who wanted to use legislation to personal advantage or profit, you are certainly giving him a wonderful opportunity. You might have a report recommending a prosecution or stating that a combine existed, and if the minister were a man susceptible to influence, and if he were so influenced, the work of the whole investigation could be frustrated merely by a word from him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall be pleased to hold the section and confer with my hon. friend to see if we can draft a clause to meet what he has in mind. I share the views of hon. gentlemen who want to give as much publicity as possible to inquiries, and shall be only too happy to go as far as I can if I can get the committee to go with me.

Section stands.

On section 27—Contempt of registrar or commissioner:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the precedent for this?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is similar to section 31 of the Combines Investigation Act of 1910.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems a rather absurd section; it goes further than anything I have yet run across.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is very similar to a clause in the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act which has been on the statutes for twelve or fourteen years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The section refers to any person who "wilfully insults" the registrar or any commissioner. Who is to determine when such an insult takes place?

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: You never know how anyone will behave.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But what does the Prime Minister think?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is a section of the bill which cites the manner in which persons offending under its provisions are to be tried, and I presume it will be in accordance with that section that action will be taken.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can understand the reference to "interruption" much more readily than I can the reference to the "insult." I do not know what exactly is sought to be got at. Suppose anyone said the registrar was stupid. Would that be an insult?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, possibly my hon. friend is correct. But what does he think would be an insult under that clause?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The following section provides:

> For the purpose of the trial of any indictment for any offence against this act, section five hundred and eighty-one of the Criminal Code authorizing speedy trials without juries, shall apply.

And the next section:

> Any person who contravenes or fails to observe the provisions—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is missing the point. His reference to section 27 has nothing to do with my question. I was asking him what is a "wilful insult." He says it would not be a wilful insult to say that the commissioner is stupid? What is the intent?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suppose if he hit him over the head it would be an insult.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would call that an assault.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Possibly—an insult too.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is covered by the Criminal Code.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend was Crown prosecutor for a long time and is, I think, pretty familiar with a wilful insult

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was never called upon to deal with anything so silly as a wilful insult.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Friday, May 11, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move that the name of Hon. T. A. Crerar be taken from the list of members composing the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce and the name of Mr. Robert Forke be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—COAL

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 159 (from the Senate), to amend the Dominion Lands Act respecting the sale or other disposal of coal lands and coal mining rights.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PETITION OF RIGHT ACT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 165 (from the Senate) to amend the Petition of Right Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 160 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edgar Lindsay.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 161 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Marigoli Hare.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 162 (from the Senate), for the relief of Esther Levin.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 163 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hilda Marguerite Watt Black.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 164 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abigal Aileen Beryl McCrea Tull.—Mr. Duff.

DELAY IN BRITISH MAILS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HOCKEN: I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he can give any explanation for the extraordinary delay in British mail reaching this country. For example, the latest issue of the London Times received here was dated April 6th, but it did not arrive until May 7th. There must surely be some reason for this delay of apparently a month in the transmission of mail to Canada.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot offhand give my hon. friend a reply. There has been some considerable delay in the crossing of some of the ships, as the hon. member will have observed. I have no doubt there are other reasons to account for the matter to which he refers. I will direct the attention of the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Graham) to the question and will endeavour to get a reply.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON PENSIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I should like to direct the attention of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment to a telegram which I have received. I know that the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) received a similar telegram, and I am sure other hon. members have received telegrams of the same tenor:

> The Fort William branch of the Great War Veterans Association joins with the Dominion command in demanding from Pension Board immediate statement as to whether it intends to review claims now pending in accordance with Royal Commission findings. Board's refusal to act causing unwarranted distress and hardship among many widows, dependents, and disabled ex-service men throughout the Dominion. Urgently request immediate acceptance.

In view of the report of the royal commission, which has pointed out many defects in the carrying out of this act, I should like to ask: Does the hon. minister feel it within his power to instruct the Board of Pension Commissioners to carry out the intent of the law, as brought before the House of Commons last year by the parliamentary committee, and as explained to the House? If he cannot do that, I should like to find out, if possible, when he intends to bring in legislation which he stated some time ago he was going to bring in, to carry out the recommendation of the royal commission, and settle the discontent which exists very seriously throughout the country among ex-service men.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): It has come to my knowledge that a very large number of telegrams have been received by members of the House, and also by members of the government. As to the interpretation of the Pension Act by the Board of Pension Commissioners, my hon. friend and hon. members of this House are aware that it is entirely within

the discretion of that board. The question of the advisability of amending the Pension Act is for this House and parliament generally to consider. It is the intention of the government to bring down legislation during the present session with a view to remedying the grievances which have been uttered more or less all over Canada by the ex-service men. It is hoped that these amendments will meet the situation. Again repeating myself, I say that, as far as an interpretation of the act is concerned, it is entirely within the power and authority of the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. MANION: The Board of Pension Commissioners, according to the ruling of the commission—I do not wish to discuss it, and I shall not do so except to say one word—having put up certain information to the minister for interpretation, and having finally taken their own interpretation, perhaps not according to what the minister had said, point out that these clauses should be interpreted to a certain extent with different points in view. Under the circumstances, does the minister not think that he might direct the Board of Pension Commissioners to interpret the act in the most broad-minded way possible, and will not he promise the House to bring down the alterations which he suggests at a very early date?

Mr. BELAND: The minister has on repeated occasions, in memoranda addressed to the Board of Pension Commissioners, asked for the most generous interpretation of the act. The contention of the Board of Pension Commissioners is that they have always remained within strict interpretation of the statute. The remedy, therefore, would appear to be in an amendment to the statute, and this amendment, or these amendments. I propose to introduce in the House as soon as possible—as soon as the budget debate is over. Whatever legislation may be adopted by this House or by parliament would not take effect before it is assented to by His Excellency which would happen only at the time of prorogation. But I repeat that I expect that it will be possible to amend the Pension Act so that the complaints which have been uttered during the last year or year and a half will be remedied. That assurance has been given by myself to all those who have done me the honour of corresponding with me either by letter or telegram.

SOUTH SHORE BRIDGE

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) to the fact that an order was agreed to on the 23rd April last, regarding the construction of the South Shore bridge. When may we expect that return?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have been advised that this report will be handed to me in a few days, and I shall be pleased to lay it on the Table.

THE BUDGET

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT BY HON. W. S. FIELDING, MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think the rules of the House permit that you should leave the chair without a motion, but as that will not carry out the object in view, I will move that the House do resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 17 C provides that on Thursdays and Fridays, when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply or Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker shall leave the chair without putting any question. Though that is the letter, it is not the spirit, of the rule, The budget speech must be delivered before the House and not before the committee. Therefore, living up to precedent, I shall put the question: Mr. Fielding moves, seconded by Mr. Lapointe that I do now leave the chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING: The financial affairs for the fiscal year, 1921-1922, which was the last year of which we have the public accounts, call now for only a passing notice. With regard to that year, the year ended 31st March, 1922, it is worth while remembering that while the present government were in power at the time the accounts were made up at the close of the year, they had only been in power three months, and, therefore, it will not be unfair to treat that year as a Conservative year, inasmuch as the Conservative government of the day, in the discharge of their duties, prepared the estimates and voted the money, made the contracts, and practically controlled the expenditure of the year. So that I think we may count that year, practically speaking, as a Conservative year. I am going to ask at this stage, and at one of the other stages during my remarks, that the courtesy of the House be extended to me, which is usual, to enable me to put into Hansard, in the form of a summary some figures which I may present.

Income and Expenditure

The revenue for the year was $381,952,386.99 against ordinary expenditure of $347,560,690.63.

If the surplus is to be ascertained by comparing the ordinary revenue with the ordinary expenditure—and that was the time-honoured way of determining surpluses—then on that year there was a surplus of $34,391,696.36. But there was a capital expenditure of $16,295,332.55. If we take that into account, both ordinary expenditure and capital expenditure, there was still a surplus of $18,096,363.81. Then there were certain special expenditures, including demobilization charges, of $1,526,583.22. So, if we take into account ordinary expenditure, capital expenditure and what is called special expenditure, there still was a surplus of $16,569,780.59. So far this is a story of surpluses; but there is a further statement to be made which quite destroys that happy picture. There were charges for advances to railways of $97,950,645.36. If we take, then, the whole expenditure for the year, ordinary, capital, special and railways, there was a deficit in that year of $81,380,864.77. After allowances for some deductions are made, the net result was that in that year we added to the public debt $81,256,818.04.

We turn now to the year 1922-1923 which closed not many days ago. We have not the complete accounts before us, but there is sufficient information to enable us practically to announce the result. Ordinary revenue amounted to $393,619,000. These are estimates, as the figures are not absolutely final. Ordinary expenditure amounted to about $331,780,000. As between those two items, there was then a surplus of $61,839,000. Capital expenditure, however, represents $14,500,000; adjustment of war claims, $6,700,000; cost of loan flotations, $3,050,000; these representing in all $24,250,000. There was thus a surplus over ordinary, capital and special expenditures, of $37,589,000. But again the railways have to be taken into account. We had to advance during that year $92,190,000 for railways, and $6,060,720 for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, making in all for that charge, $98,250,720. This, of course, takes up all the surplus I have mentioned and leaves a large balance on the other side of the account. If we take everything into consideration for the year, the net result was that we added to the public debt in the year just closed $49,293,086. The receipt of something over $8,000,000 from the British government on exchange account helped us to keep down what otherwise would have been a larger addition to the public debt.

The Public Debt

The addition of nearly $50,000,000 to our public debt in the past year is not a situation that should cause very much satisfaction in any quarter. During the war it was inevitable that there should be large additions to the public debt, and after the war was over there also had to be large additions to the public debt; but the war has been over for several years; we are now getting to a period of peace, so-called, and many will think it is about time that we endeavoured to balance our budget; that is to say, that we no longer have the excuse of the war for spending more money than we receive. I suppose stern economists will say that that is what should be done. I confess, as Minister of Finance, that it would be very agreeable to me if I could present such a statement, and the temptation is strong to pile on the taxes and meet the difficulty. Many people who have the critical spirit, without responsibility, will probably say that that is what a Minister of Finance should do. There is, however, another side to the account. The people of Canada are pretty heavily taxed to-day; between Dominion, provincial and municipal taxation, the burdens of the people are very great, and I am reluctant to add to those burdens now by introducing new forms of taxation. Readjustments there will be, reductions here, changes in various ways; but I do not want at present to yield to the temptation of opening up new fields of taxation. I am going to ask the House and the country to bear patiently for a year or two, perhaps, the condition of affairs, in the hope that the betterment which, we believe, is near at hand, will enable us to bear the burdens without opening up these new fields of taxation to which I refer. I am, therefore, going to ask the House to take the result that we may have to add some little amount to the public debt even yet, rather than introduce new forms of taxation.

It is true that we are adding to the public debt each year, but I note with satisfaction that the amount of the addition is each year diminishing. The figures of our additions to the debt immediately before the war, during the war years and in the years since the armistice, are encouraging. I will now give the round millions. From 1914, the increases in the public debt are as follows:

1914	$ 21,000,000
1915	$113,000,000
1916	165,000,000
1917	264,000,000
1918	312,000,000
1919	382,000,000
1920	674,000,000

1920 seems to have been the banner year in the way of additions to the debt:

1921	$92,000,000
1922	81,000,000
1923	49,000,000

So, while these additions to the debt are deeply to be regretted, there is a little encouragement in the thought that, year by year, we are making the additions less than they have been. I would cherish the hope that with the betterment that, I believe, is coming to Canada in various ways, we shall not have to add very much to our debt in the years to come. I think, probably, our railway situation is going to be improved; I think, probably, with the consolidation of the roads, with the vigorous management we now have, we may reasonably expect that there will be an improvement in that situation, and I have a strong hope that in another year we shall have a better statement as respects the railways, a better statement as regards our finances generally. I believe I express the wish of the House when I say that it is better that we should pursue that course than that we should add to the burdens of the country by opening up new forms of taxation.

Coming now to the present year, 1923-1924, I will put in a statement which will show the figures in comparison with the two previous years. We are expecting an increase in Customs to the amount of $5,600,000, an increase in the Post Office of $250,000, an increase in Dominion Lands of $200,000, an increase in war tax revenue, inland revenue, $7,180,000, other war tax revenues, $85,000. On the other hand, we have to look forward to a decrease in Excise of $5,600,000, a decrease in interest on investments of $9,718,000, a decrease in inspection of staples of $50,000, a decrease in income and business profits of $17,797,000 and a decrease in all other revenues of $1,251,000. The net result is that we expect on this year that our revenues will hardly come up to the figures of last year. I am assuming that the decrease on the whole will be about $21,000,000.

The Main Estimates already submitted to parliament for all services other than railways amount to $353,011,235.73. Advances to railways amount to $73,000,000, advances to merchant marine, $1,500,000, or a total for these two items of $74,500,000. To this must be added something for Supplementary Estimates. I am putting down the figure, approximately, of last year, of $15,900,000, but I fondly hope that it will not be so large and I shall do my best to keep it lower.

Under the present system of taxation the revenue I estimate to be $372,517,000. As between the consolidated fund expenditure of $339,000,000 and the revenue of $372,517,000 we might expect a surplus this year of $37,517,000. Capital expenditure will reduce this by $23,415,000 so that we may hope to provide for a surplus over ordinary and capital expenditure of about $14,100,000. But the railways have to be taken into consideration and we estimate that they will require $74,500,000. This, of course, will consume all of the surplus that I have mentioned and leave a balance on the other side of the account. From these figures it is evident that we must look forward to some addition to the public debt at the end of the year. There will be something saved, however, through the full amount of the estimates not being expended, and I am hopeful that if, as seems likely, at the end of the year we have some addition to the public debt it will be a very small one.

Loan Operations

The loan operations of the last year are partly known already to the House. I mentioned last session the New York loan of $100,000,000. The five-year bonds at 5½ per cent, 1917 Victory Loan, amounting to $182,834,500, matured on December 1, 1922. The holders of these bonds were given the privilege of exchanging maturing bonds for new bonds bearing 5½ per cent interest and taxable as follows: Five-year bonds due November 1, 1927; Ten-year bonds due November 1, 1932. The holders of the maturing bonds took advantage of the offer to the extent of $114,449,250, leaving a balance of $68,385,250 to be redeemed in cash. Of course, with that large amount to provide, in addition, a very considerable sum in temporary loans was involved.

Treasury bills matured during the fiscal year as follows: $24,605,000 due October 1, 1922; $49,215,000 due October 15, 1922; $35,000,000 due November 2, 1922; $35,000,000 due November 15, 1922. Of these bills, $49,100,000 was paid and the balance was extended for six months from the respective due dates at 5½ per cent. Renewals for a further period of one year have been arranged, with interest at 5¼ per cent. The due dates and the amounts outstanding will therefore be as follows:

April 2, 1924	$ 4,680,000
April 16, 1924	41,060,000
May 2, 1924	19,325,000
May 15, 1924	29,655,000

It will be seen, by the extension, that we have been carrying our treasury bills over at what I think will be admitted, under the circumstances, to be a very fair rate, namely, of 5¼ per cent.

Tax Reductions

The estimated revenue that I have referred to here has been based upon the existing system of taxation. We are proposing a considerable reduction in our customs tariff and in the excise duties. If we had no expectation of

an enlargement of business this loss of revenue would of course add materially to the deficit of the year. I am hopeful, however, that the reduction of taxation which we are now proposing will not seriously affect the revenue. We are looking forward to an increased volume of business to a sufficient extent to give us results equal to those of our present system of taxation. An increased business should give us the revenue and offset the loss from the reduction in the duties. A large proportion of the revenue comes from what is called the sales tax. Last year we were obliged to increase the amount of the tax considerably. We must admit that the tax is a burden; and apart from the amount of it, the form in which it has been imposed has given rise to very much discontent. There are varying rates of taxes at the different stages of business enterprises, —6 per cent, 4½ per cent, 3¾ per cent, and 2¼ per cent. Many a good citizen who recognizes that the government needs money and who is willing to pay his fair share of the taxes, objects to the complexity of the sales tax. We are proposing to change it in the hope that we shall improve the situation. Our aim is now to impose this tax at its source, at the first stage of business operations, at which the tax is properly applicable. We propose that the tax shall be 6 per cent and that it shall apply on the duty-paid value both of home-made and of imported goods. Stated in this way the proposal seems a very simple one, and its purpose I believe will have widespread public approval. The working of the system, however, has its difficulties and I hope we have been able to overcome them in the resolutions which I shall lay on the Table.

We are adding to the list of exemptions in the sales tax, five items, raw furs, wool, drain tiles for farm purposes, manuscripts and newsprint. Some new taxes were imposed last year experimental in their character; some of them proved satisfactory while others have not; and I suppose the best thing we can do is to admit that we were mistaken in our judgment and correct the error.

Very much complaint has been made about the receipt tax. Now, I am persuaded that this is a thoroughly sound tax. It has been imposed in Great Britain for many years and no Chancellor of the Exchequer dreams of dropping it. All new taxes are annoying at first; they are irritating. But I think that the worst is over now and I am firmly convinced that the receipt tax is a sound one. I am therefore going to ask the country to adhere to it, for I believe it will be a large means of obtaining revenue, and in the end the people will be quite satisfied.

With regard to the cheque tax, we introduced last year graduated taxes on cheques with a maximum of $2. There has been some complaint with reference to this. It is represented that there are transactions in which several cheques have to be given but which really relate practically to the one business deal, so that in that way the tax operates as a burden. It is also represented to us, and I think with some force, that on the boundary line this tax induces men who have an opportunity to do so to keep their accounts across the border on the other side. There is probably some force in all these criticisms. We do not feel, however, that we are free to give up the tax; it is a valuable source of revenue and we intend to retain it. We propose however that the maximum instead of being $2 shall be $1 only. This reduction will apply also to notes and bills of exchange.

In the course of the discussion of the French Treaty I suggested that the reductions therein made might necessitate some readjustment of other duties. One of the questions raised in that debate had reference to the excise tax on light Canadian wines. The tax has been for some years 30 cents per gallon; we propose now to reduce the duty to 7½ cents per gallon. Canadian wine manufacturers are beginning to make a sparkling wine. The excise tax on this is $3 per gallon. The wine manufacturers represent that this is almost prohibitive and that only a reduction of the duties will permit the industry to expand. We propose to meet this point by reducing the excise tax on Canadian-made sparkling wine from $3 to $1.50 a gallon. Any disadvantage that might otherwise accrue to the wine industry through the French Treaty will be fully met, I am sure, by this readjustment.

Another item concerning which there was a discussion was French brandy. There is a provision in the treaty that there shall be a discount of 10 per cent. It was represented that probably that would operate to the disadvantage of Canadian spirits. I think perhaps that we had better wait a little while before forming a conclusion on that question. In the first place, the reduction does not apply to all brandies; it applies only to certain specified articles described in the treaty as Cognac and Armagnac brandies. These are specialties of France; they are high-class liqueurs and are expensive. I do not think it is reasonable to suppose that any one will give up drinking Canadian spirits of any kind and turn to French brandies costing very much

more than is paid now for the Canadian liquor. I believe that in all probability we shall do well to await the development of events and see how the matter operates. In the meantime it is worth noting that the French Treaty will not be in operation for some weeks. The formalities in closing a treaty generally take time, and we need not be alarmed at any immediate danger in that respect. With regard to the excise duty on wines, as this reduction is intended to offset the provisions of the French Treaty, it will only be brought into operation by proclamation at the same time as the treaty comes into force.

In the observations I have made to-day it will be noticed that I am not touching the Income tax. If there be necessary changes in this respect they will be dealt with later in a separate bill.

Among the taxes imposed last year was an increase in the duty on cigarettes. Ministers of Finance always look upon tobacco and cigarettes as easy marks—if you ever want a few million dollars just clap an extra duty on tobacco and cigarettes. There was a time when whiskey bore this burden, but additional revenue is no longer possible from this source. I confess I thought last year we might get more money by increasing the duty on cigarettes by $1.50 per thousand. However, the figures seem to show there is a falling off in the consumption of cigarettes. My own judgment is that there is no falling off in the consumption, the only falling off is in that portion of the commodity which pays duty. Along the boundary line, I am informed, it is a very easy matter to smuggle cigarettes. There are articles which cannot well be smuggled, and there are articles which may be smuggled very easily. Unfortunately, cigarettes come within the latter class. However, our expectations in regard to this tax have not been realized, and we propose now to strike off the extra $1.50 duty and revert to the old rate.

There were other disappointments. We thought we might get some money from an excise tax on beetroot sugar, but nothing has come of that. The trade interested has complained very much; no revenue has come to us; and, as I am proposing some readjustment of the sugar duties in other directions, we have concluded to abolish the tax on beetroot sugar.

There were several taxes which caused a good deal of irritation, among others the soft-drink taxes. We propose to change the form of these, and instead of 5c. per gallon and 5 per cent, we propose to strike that business at its source by imposing a tax of one cent per pound on carbonic acid gas. We think we will get our money to the same extent and with less trouble.

Customs Tariff Changes

We are not making many changes in the details of the Customs tariff. I will mention some, others will be found in the resolutions by those who study them carefully Nearly every item I shall mention is in the direction of reduction. It is a rare thing in this budget to have any proposal to increase taxation, but there is an exception in the item I am about to mention. We are proposing to increase the duty on raisins and dried currants so they will be free from Great Britain and pay 3 cents a pound under both the other tariffs. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) recently made a trip to Australia in the hope of coming to a commercial arrangement with the Australian Commonwealth. As we know, while he made some progress which gave him some encouragement, he was not able to conclude an agreement. We are advised that in addition to our British preference which we offer to the Australians they are particularly interested in raisins and dried currants, and if we change our tariff so as to offer some inducement to them on these items it will go far to make them content with our scheme and bring about an agreement. In the hope that that may be the case, we are going to provide that the duty on raisins and dried currants shall be increased to 3 cents a pound under the intermediate and under the general tariff, but that they shall be free under the British preference. If Australia makes an agreement, and thus comes under the benefit of the British preference, this will be the rate which will be imposed upon the things that she is most anxious to send us. There is a small duty on raisins and dried currants now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Two-thirds of a cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. The Customs department has had some trouble during the past year with regard to the kind of petroleum which was imported at the Pacific coast, the importers claiming that it was crude petroleum and should be admitted as such. The Customs department ruled that it was a commodity in which some advancement had been made in manufacture and that it could not be admitted as crude. We are proposing now to fix a small duty upon it of 3/10, 4/10, and 6/10 of a cent per gallon. This we think will enable this petroleum still to be brought

in; but as it is a half-manufactured product it is not in a position to claim freedom from duty.

Iron or steel scrap per ton is now dutiable at 50 cents, 90 cents, and $1. We propose to reduce it to 25 cents, 45 cents, and 50 cents.

Boots or other appliances for deformities of the feet are placed on the free list.

Casual donations are allowed to come in free now to the amount of fifty cents duty. We propose to make the item one dollar.

We propose to insert a special item for machinery of a class or kind not made in Canada, designed to manufacture goods not made in Canada; in other words, new industries which will come in. We are not making the machinery free, but we are proposing to give it a drawback which will make it practically 40 per cent of the ordinary duty.

Another article in the way of machinery is also dealt with. It is represented to us that vast quantities of fish waste are destroyed in Canada which could be converted into useful material, such as fertilizers, poultry feed, and so forth, and we propose that machinery of a class or kind not made in Canada, designed for that purpose, shall be admitted free.

We are proposing that hemp seed be put on the free list.

There is an item in the tariff now by which well-drilling machinery for the prosecution of the oil industry is free within certain limitations. It has been represented, however, that the item is rather narrow. We are broadening it out so that it will include practically the whole equipment for well-drilling except motive power.

The duty on stumping machines is reduced and provision is made for a drawback.

Malt flour which is used by bakers is reduced one cent per pound.

The item of printing machinery is broadened out to include some articles which are not mentioned in the present tariff.

A new industry is promised us for the manufacture of artificial silk. It is represented to us that this industry will employ a large amount of labour and we have every reason to believe that if we can make encouraging terms a great industry will be established. We propose to make a classification in which it will be treated largely as silk, and we have every reason to hope this will lead to a very important industry being established.

We propose to adhere to and extend the British preferential tariff. Our proposal is that on whatever duty may be payable according to the varying rates of the British preferential tariff a discount of 10 per cent shall be allowed. This, of course, does not mean a 10 per cent reduction of the tariff rate. Where the tariff rate is 30 per cent the discount of 10 per cent will reduce it to 27 cents; where the tariff rate is 25 per cent, the discount rate will reduce it to 22½ per cent, and so forth. To these reductions we attach two qualifications, the first of which is that they shall not apply in the case of any article where the duty is not above 15 per cent. A duty of 15 per cent will not be regarded as a high one, and it will hardly be expected that we ought to apply these reductions to items which stand at 15 per cent or less. That is one important qualification. There is another one, however, which I am sure the House will receive with satisfaction; we say that this 10 per cent discount shall only apply when the goods are brought direct to the ports of Canada. With Montreal and Quebec in summer, Halifax, St. John, Victoria, Vancouver, and Prince Rupert all the year round, Canada has abundant opportunity to bring her goods into her own ports. We think this is an important step in the direction of the encouragement that many people in our ports have long desired. In this part of our programme we believe we are doing three things which are worthy of commendation. In the first place, there is a comprehensive reduction of duties—and that will be agreeable to those who regard the tariff as a tax. Then, there is an emphasis given to the British preference, which has always found favour among the people of Canada, and then at the end we have this effort to do something for the encouragement of our own ports. We hope the proposal made in this respect will meet with the satisfaction of the House; I am sure it will.

I mentioned that we were having some revision or readjustment of sugar duties. Increases of taxes on commodities are quick to reach the consumer; reductions of taxation on like articles are slower in their operation. The reductions which I have already mentioned will in due time represent a substantial diminution of the burden of taxation.

Sugar Duties

There is another item on another article of commerce to which I now wish to invite the attention of the House. If there is one article of almost universal use among our people, it is sugar. Taxation on sugar is a burden on the whole people, and a reduction of the duty on sugar is one of the most direct methods of granting relief. During the war sugar advanced to very high prices. After the war there was for some time a reduction

until prices became somewhat normal. Quite recently, however, we seem to be returning to war-time conditions with respect to the cost of sugar. Just what may be the cause of this advance is perhaps a matter of controversy. In some quarters it is alleged that speculators in the United States have obtained control of the market and that this is the cause of the rapid increase of prices. But one thing that the consumers distinctly know is that they are again called upon to pay very high prices for this very necessary article of household use. In the United States the feeling is so strong that householders in many places are organizing boycott campaigns against the use of sugar. Nothing of the kind has yet occurred with us, but the consumer is everywhere feeling keenly the burden of the high cost. If, then, we would make some very substantial reduction of taxation, something having a direct bearing on the cost of living, what article is so suitable for the purpose, under present conditions, as the article of sugar? We propose a reduction of 50 cents per 100 pounds on refined sugar and a proportionate reduction on the raw sugar from which the refined article is made. I estimate that in this item we relieve the consumers of sugar of taxation to the extent of $2,500,000.

There is another point I should mention in connection with sugar duties. You know that we have in our tariff what is called the dumping duty, which is designed to apply where illegitimate competition is taking place. There are some lines of trades in which it has not been deemed necessary to apply it; the dumping duty does not apply to refined sugar imported from the United Kingdom. So long as sugar is at a moderate price, that may be all right; the dumping duty would be applied in the case of importations from other countries. But if sugar is going to be at a very high price, as it is now, with the prospect of going higher, then we think a restriction of the dumping duty should apply, and we propose that wherever sugar costs at the point of shipment more than 8 cents per pound, the dumping duty shall hereafter not apply—that is, there will be freedom of purchase irrespective of dumping duty.

Copper Bounty

We have been asked from time to time to do something to encourage industries of various kinds. Where these applications take the form of a request for higher duties, the problem is not an easy one. One of the difficulties of such a situation is that there are many items in the tariff which cannot stand alone for consideration; they are closely related to one another. The article which is the finished product of one man is practically the raw material of another, perhaps of several others. If you increase duties to assist the first man, you disturb the whole scale and all the others will expect compensatory increases. Industrial aid of this kind naturally meets with widespread objection. There is another form in which it may be possible to assist industry without the disturbing results I have mentioned. The granting of a bounty simplifies the case. Many people, willing to see industry aided, would prefer the bounty rather than protective duties, especially if the bounty be of a temporary character and placed on a sliding scale. One merit of the bounty system is that you know precisely what you are paying and can compare the cost with the results. We have given careful consideration to requests made to us on behalf of the copper interests of Canada. Canada is a copper-producing country. Our far western province, British Columbia, is rich in this respect. Yet the copper industry has made but moderate progress. There is a duty of 1½ cents per pound on copper in the form of ingots. A very large enterprise has been established in British Columbia which is encouraged by this duty. The next stage of the copper business is the production of bars and rods, which become the raw material of other manufactures, such as the making of wire. Copper bars and rods are the raw material of wire manufacturers. To assist them, these bars and rods were some years ago placed on the free list for the use of manufacturers in their own factories. All these bars and rods are thus imported free. Neither of these copper products is produced in Canada for the reason that our producers are unable to compete with large manufacturing enterprises in the United States. We sympathize very warmly with the desire to have a larger development of the copper industry in the Dominion. Since a duty on bars and rods would probably necessitate increased duties on the manufactures of a number of articles made from copper, we are unwilling to grant aid in that form. We have concluded that if the copper industry is to be encouraged as we would desire, it will be better to deal with it directly in the way of a bounty than by higher duties on that which is the raw material for other factories. I said that a bounty will be regarded by many as a better form of aid than any increase of protective duties. But even a bounty would be objected to with much reason if it were not of a temporary character. Much has been heard in times past of the importance of assisting infant in-

4 p.m.

dustries. Most folk will be kindly disposed towards the industries while they are in their infancy. But experience has shown that the infant grows up, and when he has attained to all the strength of manhood he is still found clinging to protective duties and claiming that he cannot live without them. A new industry which is to have that kind of experience is not a very desirable one for the country. An industry based upon the natural resources of the Dominion which wants a helping hand at the beginning and is prepared later to rely on its own strength and character is worthy of consideration. We propose to afford a measure of help to the copper industry of Canada on the condition that that help shall take the form of a bounty, that the amount of the bounty shall be held within proper limits and that it shall be reduced from year to year until it is extinguished. We propose to allow a bounty for a period of five years, beginning at 1½ cents per pound and diminishing from year to year until the end of the five-year term. The bounty will apply to copper bars and copper rods manufactured in Canada, from copper produced in Canada, and sold for consumption in Canada, and not to include exports. The privilege now granted to manufacturers to import copper rods and bars for their purposes free of duty will continue. What we desire is that the aid we are giving will enable the Canadian producers to compete as they have not been able to compete before with their American rivals and that they will get a reasonable command of the market. We are placing a limitation of $200,000 per anum upon this bounty. At the beginning the industry will not earn anything like that. As the time rolls on it will probably earn that much, but when it gets to its highest point it cannot get more than $200,000 in any one year.

Bounty on Hemp

There is another industry to which we are going to extend similar aid. We have been working together to encourage the cultivation of hemp, for which article we are assured the soil of parts of our country is particularly adapted. It is believed that with some encouragement a large manufacturing plant can be established in Manitoba, drawing its raw material from the crop to be raised in the immediate vicinity. Here again is a case where the helping hand may only have to be extended at the beginning. There is a large market in Canada for products manufactured from hemp, and other articles of similar character. If we can economically produce the hemp ourselves and turn it into manufactured products in factories within easy reach of the fields in which it grows, surely that is an industry which may be well worthy of the helping hand. We therefore propose to apply in this case substantially the same rule as in the case of the copper industry. Under the aid we are affording, copper rods and bars should be turned out in Canada at an early date. The development of the hemp business will be slower. To complete the plans of the authorities who are giving attention to the promotion of the movement, to raise the crop and to prepare and manufacture the hemp, will take a considerable time. We therefore propose that in this case the five year period shall begin on the first day of July, 1925. By that time binder twine and other products made from Canadian hemp should be ready for the market and the producers will be in a position to claim the bounty. In this case also we propose a bounty beginning at one and one-half cents per pound on the hemp and diminishing from year to year, until at the end of the five years the bounty is extinguished.

In this case, too, we limit our payment to $200,000 per annum. A much less sum would be sufficient at the beginning, but as the enterprise develops its business may be large enough to absorb the full $200,000.

Bounties Granted and Bounties Withdrawn

We are proposing the granting of certain bounties to develop new industries. Let me now draw attention to our desire to put an end to some bounties—

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING:—which we think have served their purpose.

One of the measures adopted under authority of the War Measures Act was the granting of a bounty to encourage the production of linen thread. The bounty was not to exceed $25,000 per annum and was limited to a term of three years. The law allowed an expenditure of $25,000 per annum, but in no year did the actual expenditure reach as high as $6,000. However the three years are over and that bounty will cease. We are not proposing to renew it.

Many years ago provision was made for a bounty of three-eighths of a cent per pound on manila hemp used in the manufacture of binder twine. There was at the time an export duty in the Philippines against hemp coming into Canada, which did not apply to hemp going to the United States. This placed the Canadian manufacturer at a disadvantage to meet which the bounty was granted. The export duty was repealed some years later and no money has been paid under this

authority for some years. We have deemed it well, however, to repeal the act, so that there may be no misunderstanding concerning it.

Some years ago, in the readjustment of petroleum duties, a bounty was provided for in the case of petroleum produced in Canada. The operations carried on under it were never very large. They were chiefly in Ontario and later in some degree in New Brunswick. The operations have dwindled considerably. The total amount paid in the form of bounty in 1922 was $93,636. The amount is not large, and if we had to consider only the conditions which existed when the bounty was applied it might not be worth our while to make any change. But oil has been found in our western country. There is a widespread conviction that we are on the eve of great oil discoveries in the far west and north. The development of great oil wells in that country would of course be in one way a blessing, as adding so much to the natural resources of the Dominion. But from the Dominion Treasury's point of view that which might seem to be a blessing would be little less than a disaster. If there should be, as may very likely occur, great strikes of oil in the western country, the bounties we are called upon to pay would be a very serious charge upon the treasury. We are proposing, therefore, to confine the bounty of one and one-half cents per gallon to those who have already been receiving it, to continue it for one year, until July, 1924, that next year it shall be cut one-half, and that thereafter the bounty shall cease to be paid.

Forest Conservation

The question of forest conservation has of late commanded ever-increasing interest. Where a country has a lavish supply of anything, we are apt to be careless in the conservation of it. Too often it has been assumed that there is no limit to the forest wealth of Canada. Those who have given the matter closest attention realize that with the extensive operations of the lumbermen, the immense damage by fire and by insects, a timber famine in Canada is by no means impossible. Every effort that can be made in the way of conservation should be and is being encouraged. From some enthusiasts there is a call for more drastic methods. It is proposed that we prohibit the exportation of pulpwood. In several of the provinces this prohibition is already in effect through provincial regulations. Only the federal parliament can prohibit any exportation, but where provincial governments are owners of timber lands they can in their leases stipulate the conditions under which operations shall be carried on. In this way several of the provinces have practically prohibited the export of pulpwood. But there are in all the provinces private lands which are not subject to provincial restriction. The object of the movement to which I refer is to prohibit the export of wood by these private owners. Such a policy, while it would find favour in some quarters, would certainly be objected to by the private land owners, who will argue that they should be as free to dispose of the products of their land as other land owners are. Before reaching a conclusion in this matter, we think there should be a more thorough investigation than there has been before and we shall therefore, during the recess, endeavour to find suitable persons, one or more, to inquire into the matter and get all the information which it is possible to obtain before coming to a conclusion.

Tariff Stability

There is a thought which does not receive as much consideration as I think sometimes it should be given in public discussions, and that is the desirability of something like tariff stability. Business men do not like to be always threatened with changes in the tariff. There is no finality in legislation either as respects that tariff or as respects anything else. That which parliament can do to-day it can undo to-morrow. Everybody knows that. Everybody must conduct his business in the light of that fact. Nevertheless it is desirable that something like an assurance of tariff stability should be given to business men. Exceptions will occur. There will be cases where, in the interest of the consumer, reductions in the tariff ought to be made. There will be inequalities discovered in the tariff which should be corrected; there will be errors which should be remedied. Any minister, any government, any parliament must be free to deal with these cases as they arise. But the conditions to which I refer are exceptional. Speaking broadly, it is possible to give the country a reasonable assurance of stability of tariff. Such assurances are very desirable, for no business man would care to enter upon enterprises which may be brought into peril by frequent tariff changes. The tariff as it will be when the changes proposed to-day come into effect will be a moderate tariff and probably as low as the country can afford to have under present condition. Of course we cannot expect that it will be satisfactory to everybody. It will not meet the desires of those who would rigidly apply the principles of free trade. It will not meet the wish of the advocates of high

protection. After all life is largely made up of compromises. In the realm of political affairs orderly government can be possible only where a spirit of compromise exists. Subject to the exceptional conditions such as I have mentioned, I think the country should be content to accept the tariff as it will now stand as one as fair and reasonable as can be prepared under all the circumstances, and business men should be able to carry on the various enterprises without the fear of being soon disturbed by further changes.

Stability of tariff cannot be expected while tariff rates are high. But where the rates are for the most part, as in our tariff, moderate, a reasonable measure of tariff stability should be assured.

Relations With the United States

I want to say before I conclude a word or two with regard to our relations with the United States. With a few exceptional cases, we do not propose any reduction in our general tariff which applies to goods coming from the United States. While we naturally desire to develop trade within the Empire, as we have been doing and wish to continue to do through the British preferential tariff, we do not conceal from ourselves the fact that our trade relations with the neighbouring republic are matters of very grave importance to many of our Canadian people. The congress of the United States in the exercise of its undoubted right, has established what is commonly called the Fordney-McCumber tariff, which is largely a high tariff, and which we realize operates to the disadvantage of Canada. Any desire that we may have towards modification of our own tariff is naturally held in check by the high tariff of the United States. Whatever may have been thought and said and done at other times, there is hardly anybody in Canada to-day who does not feel that better trade relations between the Dominion and the United States are very desirable. I believe I am warranted in saying that to-day there is no class of the Canadian people who do not recognize that it is of the highest desirability that we should have proper trade relations with the United States. The desire of Canada to make a friendly treaty with the United States ought to be well known, and I think it is well known. As to the willingness of Canada to have a measure of reciprocity between the two countries there ought to be no question. A minister of this government went to Washington and informed the government and the congressional leaders of Canada's willingness to enter into negotiations for another reciprocity treaty. They know our willingness in this regard, and I think it is well we should say it again. The position of our government in the matter, therefore, is well known. In 1879 when the national policy, so-called, was framed, there was what was called a standing offer to the United States, and the United States had notice of how Canada would like to deal with them. I want to adopt the principle of that, though not the details of it. I am proposing that we shall put into our tariff laws to-day a declaration of our readiness and our willingness to make an arrangement with the United States whenever they are ready to meet us on fair terms. I propose to put in this clause:

> The Governor in Council may authorize any minister of the crown to enter into negotiations with any authorized representative of the government of the United States with a view to the making of a commercial agreement between the two countries on terms that may be deemed mutually beneficial. Any agreement so made shall be subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

This is a general indication of our willingness to make a commercial treaty with our neighbours. We realize, however, that if this suggestion on our part should meet with favourable consideration, considerable time would have to elapse before an agreement could be made and brought into effect. It would require action by congress. Congress only could deal with the matter in that broad way. Is there not some other way in which the desired end, in part at least, could be reached? Can we do nothing in the meantime? Possibly we can. Under the present law of the United States there is a privilege granted to the President of the United States to make certain reductions if he likes to do so. He may do that without waiting for congress, and, therefore, we propose to insert this clause, having relation to that particular matter:

> If the President of the United States, under authority of the United States' Tariff Act of 1922, determines to reduce by fifty per cent the duties imposed by such act on the following articles, that is to say: Cattle, wheat, wheat flour, oats, barley, potatoes, onions, turnips, hay, fish as enumerated in paragraphs 717, 718, 719 and 720 of the said Tariff Act of 1920, the Governor in Council may by order in council make such reductions of duties on similar articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions of duties similar articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

The previous paragraph makes a standing offer of reciprocity which we know can only be adopted by congress. This paragraph appeals to the President, or intimates to the President, that if he is prepared to exercise

the power which the congress has given to him by way of reduction, we are prepared to meet him on similar terms. I do not know that any good will come from it. I think we are doing right to place on record our desire and determination to meet our American friends on fair terms, if they will meet us.

The Outlook

Canada, in common with other countries, has been passing through a period of severe depression. Some of our farmer friends have come to us from the West with gloomy stories of the condition of affairs in their part of the Dominion. Unfortunately, there has been depression, not in the West only, but in the East as well. Not many months ago, the conditions in the neighbouring republic were in every respect as bad as, and in some respects worse than, in our Dominion. Suddenly, so suddenly as to leave room for doubt as to a continuance of it, a great revival of business has arisen in the United States. Whether there is economic ground for it is doubted by many thoughtful students. The buying power of the western farmer in the United States is still at a low point. Foreign markets are still so much disturbed that the prospects of large sales in that quarter are not bright. Nevertheless, there is a boom on in the United States. I asked a friend who is a careful observer of these things on what he thought the American people found ground for their present activity. His answer was, "By faith in themselves." It really seems that this is the case. It is a sort of "Coué́ism." They resolve that things are going to get better, and they believe that they are better. However that may be, we need not analyze the conditions. We know there is great activity in the United States. Stern economists will wonder what our American friends are going to do with the products they are having turned out so rapidly from the American factories. Meanwhile there is no question that the boom is on. Instead of the unemployment which prevailed so widely but a few months ago, there is now a great demand for labour. Wages which had begun to fall are again on the rising scale. This activity across the border, this great demand for labour at high wages, has naturally affected us in Canada. We are so near to the United States, and it is so easy for our people to cross the border, that when things are somewhat dull over here, and high wages are offered in the United States, there would naturally be such an exodus as there has been during the recent months. But this I believe is only a temporary condition, I believe they will come back. Experience has shown that the United States are usually ahead of us by a few months, perhaps a year, in the change of conditions. The prosperity which comes to them reaches us a few months later. The adversity which sometimes comes to them comes to us a few months later. This experience justifies us in believing that history will repeat itself in this respect. Already we see signs of reviving activity in our country. That we may check the exodus and bring back many of those who have already gone is a reasonable expectation. If we have faith in ourselves, faith in the intelligence, industry and courage of the Canadion people, faith in the vast and splendid resources of our Dominion, we may justly look forward to an early revival of the prosperity of former days.

Resolutions

I beg to give notice that upon the House resolving itself into committee I shall move the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the Customs Tariff, 1907, be amended by repealing section five, and substituting therefor the following:—

5. That the importer of goods entitled to the benefits of the British Preferential Tariff shall be entitled to a discount of ten per centum on the amount of duty computed under such Tariff, when such goods are conveyed without transhipment from a port of a country enjoying the benefits of the British Preferential Tariff into a sea or river port of Canada.

Provided, however, that this discount shall not apply to duties on any of the following articles, viz., wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol, sugar, tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

Provided further that this discount shall not apply in the case in which the duty does not exceed fifteen per centum ad valorem, or, in the case of a specific duty or a specific and ad valorem duty combined in which the computed rate does not exceed fifteen per centum ad valorem, or to goods admitted into Canada which have the benefit of reductions provided for in the Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920.

2. Resolved, that The Customs Tariff, 1907, be further amended by adding after section 8A the following as sections 8B and 8C:

8B. The Governor in Council may authorize any Minister of the Crown to enter into negotiations with any authorized representative of the government of the United States with a view to the making of a commercial agreement between the two countries on terms that may be deemed mutually beneficial. Any agreement so made shall be subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

8C. If the President of the United States, under authority of the United States Tariff Act of 1922, determines to reduce by fifty per cent the duties imposed by such act on the following articles, that is to say:

Cattle, wheat, wheat flour, oats, barley, potatoes, onions, turnips, hay, fish as enumerated in paragraphs 717, 718, 719 and 720 of the said Tariff Act of 1922. the Governor in Council may by Order in Council make such reductions of duties on similar articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

3. Resolved, that schedule A to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter sixteen of the Statutes of 1910, by chapter twenty-six of the Statutes of 1914, by chapter five of the Statutes of 1914 (second ses-

sion), by chapter forty-seven of the Statutes of 1919, by chapter twenty-seven of the Statutes of 1921, by chapter nineteen of the Statutes of 1922, and by Order in Council, be further amended by striking thereout tariff items: 83a, 99, 134, 135, 143a, 168, 235, 242, 281, 328, 348b, 365, 374, 386, 441a, 442, 469, 586, 638a, 670, 690a, 710b, the several enumerations of goods respectively, and the several rates of duties of Customs, if any, set opposite each of said items, and to repeal section 1 (i) of Order in Council, P.C. 16/1556, dated fifth day of June, 1912, designated as item 760 of The Customs Tariff, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duty be inserted in schedule A

Tariff Items	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
72a	Hemp seed for agricultural purposes	Free	Free	Free
83a	Potatoes when imported from a country which imposes a customs duty on potatoes grown in Canada, per one hundred pounds	20 cents	35 cents	35 cents
99	Prunes and dried plums, unpitted, per pound	½ cent	⅔ cent	⅔ cent
99b	Raisins and dried currants, per pound	Free	3 cents	3 cents
134	All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, not covered by tariff item No. 135, when not exceeding eighty-eight degrees of polarization, per one hundred pounds	83 cents	$1.50	$1.50
	when exceeding eighty-eight degrees but not exceeding eighty-nine degrees, per one hundred pounds	85 cents	$1.53	$1.53
	when exceeding eighty-nine degrees but not exceeding ninety degrees, per one hundred pounds	87 cents	$1.55	$1.55
	when exceeding ninety degrees but not exceeding ninety-one degrees, per one hundred pounds	89 cents	$1.58	$1.58
	when exceeding ninety-one degrees but not exceeding ninety-two degrees, per one hundred pounds	91 cents	$1.62	$1.62
	when exceeding ninety-two degrees but not exceeding ninety-three degrees, per one hundred pounds	93 cents	$1.65	$1.65
	when exceeding ninety-three degrees but not exceeding ninety-four degrees, per one hundred pounds	95 cents	$1.68	$1.68
	when exceeding ninety-four degrees but not exceeding ninety-five degrees, per one hundred pounds	97 cents	$1.70	$1.70
	when exceeding ninety-five degrees but not exceeding ninety-six degrees, per one hundred pounds	99 cents	$1.74	$1.74
	when exceeding ninety-six degrees but not exceeding ninety-seven degrees, per one hundred pounds.	$1.01	$1.77	$1.77
	when exceeding ninety-seven degrees but not exceeding ninety-eight degrees, per one hundred pounds	$1.03	$1.80	$1.80
	when exceeding ninety-eight degrees but not exceeding ninety-nine degrees, per one hundred pounds	$1.09	$1.89	$1.89
	when exceeding ninety-nine degrees, per one hundred pounds	$1.09	$1.89	$1.89
	Provided that refined sugar shall be entitled to entry under the British Preferential Tariff upon evidence satisfactory to the Minister of Customs and Excise, that such refined sugar has been manufactured wholly from raw sugar produced in the British colonies and possessions, and not otherwise. Provided further that sugar imported under this item shall not be subject to special duty when the home consumption value at the place of shipment direct to Canada is more than eight cents per pound.			
135	Sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in color when imported by a recognized sugar refiner, for refining purposes only, under regulations by the Minister of Customs and Excise; and sugar, n.o.p., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms, sugar concrete, and molasses testing over fifty-six degrees and not exceeding seventy-six degrees, when not exceeding seventy-six degrees of polarization, per one hundred pounds	35·00 cents	81·08 cents	81·08 cents

Tariff Items	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
	when exceeding seventy-six degrees but not exceeding seventy-seven degrees, per one hundred pounds	35·50 cents	83·116 cents	83·116 cents
	when exceeding seventy-seven degrees but not exceeding seventy-eight degrees, per one hundred pounds	36·00 cents	85·152 cents	85·152 cents
	when exceeding seventy-eight degrees but not exceeding seventy-nine degrees, per one hundred pounds	36·50 cents	87·188 cents	87·188 cents
	when exceeding seventy-nine degrees but not exceeding eighty degrees, per one hundred pounds	37·00 cents	89·224 cents	89·224 cents
	when exceeding eighty degrees but not exceeding eighty-one degrees, per one hundred pounds	37·50 cents	91·260 cents	91·260 cents
	when exceeding eighty-one degrees but not exceeding eighty-two degrees, per one hundred pounds	38·00 cents	93·296 cents	93·296 cents
	when exceeding eighty-two degrees but not exceeding eighty-three degrees, per one hundred pounds	38·50 cents	95·332 cents	95·332 cents
	when exceeding eighty-three degrees but not exceeding eighty-four degrees, per one hundred pounds	39·00 cents	97·560 cents	97·560 cents
	when exceeding eighty-four degrees but not exceeding eighty-five degrees, per one hundred pounds	39·50 cents	99·788 cents	99·788 cents
	when exceeding eighty-five degrees but not exceeding eighty-six degrees, per one hundred pounds	40·00 cents	$1·02016	$1·02016
	when exceeding eighty-six degrees but not exceeding eighty-seven degrees, per one hundred pounds	40·50 cents	$1·04244	$1·04244
	when exceeding eighty-seven degrees but not exceeding eighty-eight degrees, per hundred pounds	41·00 cents	$1·06664	$1·06664
	when exceeding eighty-eight degrees but not exceeding eighty-nine degrees, per one hundred pounds	41·50 cents	$1·09084	$1·09084
	when exceeding eighty-nine degrees but not exceeding ninety degrees, per one hundred pounds	42·00 cents	$1·11888	$1·11888
	when exceeding ninety degrees but not exceeding ninety-one degrees, per one hundred pounds	42·50 cents	$1·14692	$1·14692
	When exceeding ninety-one degrees but not exceeding ninety-two degrees, per one hundred pounds	43·00 cents	$1·17496	$1·17496
	when exceeding ninety-two degrees but not exceeding ninety-three degrees, per one hundred pounds	43·50 cents	$1·20300	$1·20300
	when exceeding ninety-three degrees but not exceeding ninety-four degrees, per one hundred pounds	44·00 cents	$1·23104	$1·23104
	when exceeding ninety-four degrees but not exceeding ninety-five degrees, per one hundred pounds	44·50 cents	$1·25908	$1·25908
	when exceeding ninety-five degrees but not exceeding ninety-six degrees, per one hundred pounds	45·00 cents	$1·28712	$1·28712
	when exceeding ninety-six degrees but not exceeding ninety-seven degrees, per one hundred pounds	45·50 cents	$1·31516	$1·31516
	when exceeding ninety-seven degrees but not exceeding ninety-eight degrees, per one hundred pounds	46·00 cents	$1·34320	$1·34320
	over ninety-eight degrees, per one hundred pounds.	46·50 cents	$1·4250	$1·4250
	Provided that all raw sugar, including sugar specified in this item, the produce of any British Colony or possession, shall be entitled to entry under the British Preferential Tariff, when imported direct into Canada from any British country.			
	Provided that sugar imported under this item shall not be subject to special duty.			
143a	Cigarettes, the weight of the paper covering to be included in the weight for duty, per pound	$4.10 and 25 p.c	$4.10 25 p.c.	$4.10 25 p.c.
168	Malt flour containing less than fifty per cent in weight of malt; also extract of malt, fluid or not, including grain molasses—all articles in this item upon val-			

Tariff Items	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
	uation without British or Foreign excise duties, under regulations by the Minister of Customs and Excise.....per pound and	2 cents 35 p.c.	2 cents 35 p.c.	2 cents 35 p.c.
208b	Bisulphate of soda or nitre cake.....	Free	Free	Free
208c	Dehydrated sulphate of copper for agricultural or spraying purposes.....	Free	Free	Free
235	Liquorice paste not sweetened.....	10 p.c.	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.
235a	Liquorice in rolls and sticks, not sweetened.....	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.
242	Dry red lead, orange mineral, zinc white and white oxide of antimony.....	Free	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
267b	Crude petroleum not in its natural state ·7900 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature, when imported by oil refiners to be refined in their own factories, per gallon.....	3/10 cent	4/10 cent	6/10 cent
281	Fire brick for use in the construction or repair of a furnace, kiln or other equipment of a manufacturing establishment.....	5 p. c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
328	Spectacle and eyeglass frames, and metal parts thereof, n.o.p.....	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
328a	Metal parts, unfinished, for the manufacture of spectacle and eyeglass frames.....	Free	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
348b	Brass and copper scrap..... But nothing shall be deemed brass or copper scrap except waste or refuse brass or copper fit only to be remanufactured in furnaces.	Free	Free	Free
365	Composition metal and plated metal, in bars, ingots or cores, for the manufacture of watch cases, jewellery, filled gold and silver seamless wire and for dental purposes.....	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
374	Iron or steel scrap, wrought, being waste or refuse, including punchings, cuttings or clippings of iron or steel plates or sheets having been in actual use; crop ends of tin plate bars, or of blooms, or of rails, the same not having been in actual use, per ton..... But nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steeel except waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured in rolling mills or furnaces: provided that articles of iron or steel, damaged in transit, if broken up under customs supervision and rendered unsaleable except as scrap, may be entered for duty as scrap.	25 cents	45 cents	50 cents
386	Rolled iron or steel, and cast steel, in bars, bands, hoop, scroll, strip, sheet or plate of any size, thickness or width, and steel blanks for the manufacture of milling cutters, when of greater value than three and one-half cents per pound.....	5 p.c.	12½ p.c.	12½ p.c.
441a	Typewriters and parts thereof.....	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
442	Printing presses, lithographic presses, and type making accessories therefor, also machines specially designed for ruling, folding, binding, embossing, creasing, or cutting paper or cardboard, sheet feeding machines, when for use exclusively by printers, bookbinders and by manufacturers of articles made from paper or cardboard—including parts thereof composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, brass or wood; machinery and complete parts thereof for printing by photographic methods on plates for use on lithographic and offset presses.....	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
448c	Stamping machines and complete parts thereof.....	10 p.c.	15 p.c.	15 p.c.
467a	Machinery, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and parts thereof, for the manufacture of fish meal, stock and poultry food and fertilizers, from fish and and the waste thereof.....	Free	Free	Free
469	Well-drilling machinery and apparatus, and parts thereof, of a class or kind not made in Canada,			

Tariff Items	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff	General Tariff
	drawn or seamless iron or steel tubing over four inches in diameter, for drilling for water, natural gas and oil, and for prospecting for minerals, not to include motive power	Free	Free	Free
502a	Staves of wood, n.o.p., not less than five-eighths of an inch in thickness, further manufactured than sawn or split but not further manufactured than listed	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
524b	Fabrics of cotton or other fibre including cord fabric, for use in the manufacture of pneumatic tires	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
583a	Artificial silk yarns or filaments or artificial fibre silk yarns or filaments produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes, not more advanced than singles, not coloured; artificial silk tops and waste or artificial fibre silk tops and waste produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
583b	Artificial silk yarns, n.o.p., threads or twists or artificial fibre silk yarns, n.o.p., threads or twists, produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes, coloured or not	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
583c	Artificial silk fabrics or artificial fibre silk fabrics produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes or of which artificial silk or artificial fibre silk is the component part of chief value, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
583d	Manufactures of artificial silk or of artificial fibre silk produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes or of which artificial silk or artificial fibre silk is the component part of chief value, n.o.p.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.	37½ p.c.
586	Coal, anthracite and lignite; anthracite and lignite coal dust; coke	Free	Free	Free
611b	Specially constructed boot or appliance made to order for a person having a crippled or deformed foot or ankle	Free	Free	Free
638a	Hat sweats; hatters' tips and sides when cut to shape. The articles in this item when imported by hat and cap manufacturers for use exclusively in the manufacture of hats and caps in their own factories	Free	Free	Free
663a	Cyanamid or lime nitrogen	Free	Free	Free
670	Emery wheels; carborundum wheels and stones, n.o.p.; manufactures of emery or of carborundum	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
670a	Carborundum wheels or stones not further manufactured than moulded and burned	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
672a	Sticks or canes cut into suitable lengths for umbrella, parasol or sunshade or walking sticks, further manufactured than in tariff item 672 but not further finished than bent, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols, sunshades or walking sticks for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
690a	Casual donations from abroad sent by friends, and not being advertising matter, tobacco, articles containing spirits or merchandise for sale—when the duty otherwise payable thereon does not exceed one dollar in any one case, under regulations by the Minister of Customs and Excise	Free	Free	Free
710	(*b*) Usual coverings containing goods, not machinery, subject to any ad valorem duty, when not included in the invoice value of the goods they contain	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	20 p.c.
	(*bb*) Usual coverings containing machinery subject to any ad valorem duty, when not included in the invoice value of the goods they contain	7½ p.c.	15 p.c.	20 p.c.

4. Resolved, that schedule B to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter twenty-six of the Statutes of 1914, by chapter forty-seven of the Statutes of 1919, chapter nineteen of the Statutes of 1922, and by Order in Council, be further amended by striking thereout tariff items 1029, 1030, the enumerations of goods, and the rates of drawback of customs duties set opposite to each of the said items, and to repeal Order in Council P.C. 17/846, dated the twenty-first day of April, 1922, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of drawback of customs duties be inserted in said schedule B.

Tariff Item	Goods	When Subject to Drawback	Portion of Duty (Not including Special Duty or Dumping Duty) Payable as Drawback
1029	Materials	When imported by manufacturers of hat sweats and hatters' tips and sides and used in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	99 p.c.
1030	Materials	When used in the manufacture of articles enumerated in tariff item 236	50 p.c.
1031	Sugar not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms, sugar concrete and molasses testing over fifty-six degrees and not exceeding ninety-six degrees of polarization.	When used exclusively in the manufacture of syrups and molasses enumerated in tariff item 140, not to include syrup and molasses produced in the process of refining sugar. Provided, however, that such drawback shall not be paid unless the claims as presented by a manufacturer at any one time aggregate twenty-five dollars	30 p.c.
1032	Oil	When used in the manufacture of manila rope, not exceeding one and one-half inches in circumference, when used exclusively in the fisheries	99 p.c.
1033	Glass tubing	When used for the manufacture of glassware and other scientific apparatus for laboratory work in public hospitals	99 p.c.
1034	Barilla or soda ash	When used in the manufacture of sal soda	99 p.c.
1035	Machinery, and parts thereof, and dies valued at more than five hundred dollars each, of a class or kind not made in Canada.	When used in manufacturing or producing goods of a class or kind not manufactured or produced in Canada prior to the twelfth day of May, 1923	60 p.c.
1036	Materials, including all parts not finished	When used in the manufacture of goods enumerated in tariff item 448c	40 p.c.
1037	Copper in blocks, ingots, pigs or bars	When used in the manufacture of rods for use only in the manufacture of trolley, telegraph and telephone wires, electric wires and electric cables	99 p.c.

5. Resolved, that any enactment founded on the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into force on the twelfth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, and to have applied to all goods mentioned in the foregoing resolutions imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day, and to have applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as amended by chapter six of the Statutes of 1914, chapter twenty-eight of the Statutes of 1918 and chapter twenty-seven of the Statutes of 1922 by repealing paragraphs (g) and (h) of section two hundred and seventy-nine thereof and substituting therefor the following:

(g) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, six dollars per thousand;

(h) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, eleven dollars per thousand.

2. Resolved, that any enactment founded on the preceding resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the twelfth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three.

3. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as amended by chapter twenty-seven of the Statutes of 1922, by repealing section 378 thereof.

4. Resolved, that any enactment founded on the preceding resolution shall be deemed to have come

into force on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three.

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and amending acts and to provide:

1. That the maximum amount of stamp tax payable on a cheque, bill of exchange, promissory note, advance on securities, overdraft, receipt by a person for money paid to him by a bank chargeable against a deposit of money in the bank to his credit, express company's money order or traveller's cheque, or post office money order be reduced to one dollar.

2. That after a date to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council the excise tax on wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, containing not more than forty per centum of proof spirit be reduced to seven and one-half cents per gallon, and the excise tax on champagne and all other sparkling wines be reduced to one dollar and fifty cents per gallon.

3. That the existing provisions respecting tax on sales be amended by providing for the imposition of a consumption or sales tax of six per centum on the sale price of all goods produced or manufactured in Canada, including the amount of excise duties when the goods are sold in bond, the tax to be payable by the producer or manufacturer at the time of the sale thereof by him, and of a like tax upon the duty paid value of imported goods, the tax to be payable by the importer, or transferee who takes the goods out of bond, at the time when the goods are imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption, subject to the following conditions, that is to say:

(1) A manufacturer or producer who produces goods to the value of ten thousand dollars or more during any fiscal year shall take out an annual license, the fee therefor not to exceed two dollars; the minister may direct that a manufacturer or producer, who does not manufacture or produce goods to the value of ten thousand dollars a year, and who uses a substantial portion of goods which are exempt from the tax in the manufacture of goods which are liable to the tax, shall take out a license and shall be subject to the same conditions as the licensed manufacturer or producer.

(2) A wholesaler or jobber who sells not less than thirty per cent of his total sales of goods to a licensed manufacturer or producer to be used in articles to be produced for sale, may be granted an annual license, the fee therefor not to exceed two dollars. Such licensed wholesaler or jobber shall give security that he will keep proper accounts and render true statements of sales to licensed manufacturers or producers and pay any tax imposed by the said act.

(3) The said tax shall be payable by a licensed wholesaler or jobber at the time of the sale by him to other than a licensed manufacturer or producer of goods the price of which shall include the amount of excise duties, if sold in bond, or the price of which shall be the duty paid value thereof, if imported.

(4) The taxes imposed by sections 16A, 19B, 19BB and 19BBB of The Special War Revenue Act shall apply to goods sold or imported by:

(i) His Majesty in the right of His Majesty's Government of Canada;

(ii) His Majesty in the right of His Majesty's government of any province of Canada, for the purpose of resale;

(iii) Any railway operated by or under the authority of the Legislature or the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province;

(iv) Any commission, board or public utility which is operated by or under the authority of the Legislature or Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province.

(5) The said consumption or sales tax shall not be payable in the following cases, that is to say:

(a) on goods exported; or

[Mr. Fielding.]

(b) on sales by a licensed manufacturer or producer to another licensed manufacturer or producer of goods to be used in the production of articles for sale; or

(c) on goods imported by a licensed manufacturer or producer to be used in the production of articles for sale; or

(d) on goods sold by a licensed manufacturer or producer to or on goods imported by a licensed wholesaler or jobber whose sales are to be accounted for in accordance with the provisions of paragraph two of section three of this Resolution.

(6) A manufacturer or producer who does not produce goods of a value over ten thousand dollars a year, unless he comes under the provisions of paragraph one of section three of this Resolution shall not pay the said consumption or sales tax on goods produced by him, but he shall pay the tax on importations.

(7) A refund of the amount of the said consumption or sales tax may be granted in the following cases, that is to say:

(a) to a wholesaler, jobber or other dealer on goods sold to a licensed manufacturer or producer to be used in articles produced for sale; or with the consent of the wholesaler, jobber or dealer a refund or deduction may in the like case be granted to a licensed manufacturer or producer; or

(b) to a licensed manufacturer or producer or a licensed wholesaler or jobber in respect of goods on hand on the 1st of August, 1923, and which are to be used in the production of articles for sale, no refund to be allowed in respect of goods on hand after the 31st of December, 1923; or

(c) on goods manufactured or produced in Canada when satisfactory evidence is produced that such Canadian goods are at a disadvantage by reason of the fact that like goods may be imported into Canada free of duty, such refund or reduction not to exceed twenty-five per cent of the said tax otherwise payable; or

(d) on imported goods on which customs duties have been refunded on exportation; or

(e) to a manufacturer, producer, wholesaler, jobber or other dealer, of taxes paid under sections 16A, 19B, 19BB, 19BBB of the said act on goods sold to His Majesty in the right of any province when His Majesty in such right is exempt from taxes in respect of such goods.

(8) That the "duty paid value" of any article be defined as meaning the value of the article as it would be determined for the purpose of calculating an ad valorem duty upon the importation of same into Canada under the laws relating to the customs and the customs tariff whether such article be in fact subject to an ad valorem or other duty or not, and in addition the amount of the customs duties, if any, payable thereon.

Provided that in computing the "duty paid value" of tea purchased in bond in the United Kingdom the amount of the customs duty payable on tea for consumption in the United Kingdom shall not be included in the value of such tea for purposes of this act, 12-13 Geo. V., c. 47, s. 12 Am.

4. That schedule I to the said act be amended by striking thereout the items respecting confectionery and beverages.

5. That schedule II to the said act be amended by striking thereout the item respecting beverages and by adding to the said schedule the following item:

"Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, per pound, one cent."

6. That the provisions of the said act respecting stamp tax on receipts be amended by providing:

(i) That paragraph (b) of subsection four of section fourteen of the said act as enacted by said chapter forty-seven be amended to read as follows:

"(b) a receipt or document in the nature of a receipt which is taxable under section twelve of this act."

(ii) By adding provisions for the better enforcement of said section fourteen.

7. That the provisions of this resolution, except the provision proposed by section two, shall come into force on the first day of August, 1923.

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Petroleum Bounty Act, 1909, being chapter forty-six of the Statutes of 1910, by providing that the bounty shall be payable on crude petroleum having a specific gravity not less than .8235 at 60 degrees Fahrenheit's thermometer, produced from wells or from shales or other substances mined in Canada which have actually produced crude petroleum before the date of the coming into force of the act to be founded on this resolution.

The said bounty shall be paid at the following rates, that is to say:

On such crude petroleum produced on or before the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four, the bounty of one and one-half cents per imperial gallon provided in the existing law shall be paid;

On such crude petroleum produced on or after the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four, and not later than the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, a bounty of three-quarters of one cent per imperial gallon shall be paid.

On and after the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, no bounty shall be paid.

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal The Act respecting Bounties on manufactures from Manila Fibre in Canada, being Chapter five of the Statutes of 1903, the act to amend the act respecting the manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada, being chapter five of the Statutes of 1907, and regulations made thereunder.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to make a few remarks which I am able to do more easily because my friend was kind enough to let me have information as to some of his figures this morning. Before dealing with the budget, I would like to present my compliments and congratulations to my hon. friend. It is a very nice thing to be able to do that which you like to do and have pleasure in doing. I have great pleasure in congratulating my hon. friend on the presentation of his seventeenth budget. It is hard to realize that this is his seventeenth budget, because he is showing such an evidence of youth all the time. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the supreme evidence of youth is the ability to learn, and I want to congratulate him upon the manner in which he is still learning and taking his lessons to heart. Last year we told him in connection with the cigarette tax what was going to happen, that we had there a tax so high that if anything higher was tried it would kill business and destroy the revenue. My hon. friend said "No, we are going to get an increase of half a million." But there is a drop in the revenue of $1,200,000. But the hon. minister is not the Bourbon that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is so fond of speaking of. He sees the figures, he learns and he repents. Further than that we told him what would happen in the case of the beet sugar tax. That was a tax that was directly against the farmer and against a primary producing industry, we told him what would happen. Again he has learned, and he has taken the duty off. Besides that, my hon. friend is showing what an apt pupil he is of to-day's conditions. We know he had a great deal of trouble with the French Treaty, and we explained, and explained and explained in this House just exactly my hon. friend's errors in connection with that treaty; —how if he had first had a duty on luxuries which he was dealing with, that would have enabled him to get a proper treaty with France. We are again delighted to get this further evidence of my hon. friend's youthfulness of mind and adaptability, because to-day he turns around, applies what we have been saying, and tells us that the one real excuse for the imposition of a three-cent per pound tax on raisins and dried currants as against a three-quarter-cent per pound tax at the present time is simply because, if that is done, there is some opportunity of making a proper trade treaty with Australia. Again I congratulate my hon. friend; but most of all I desire to congratulate him upon his newfound faith. When I say "new," I say "new" simply because I have reference to what my hon. friend has said time and again from this very seat on the tariff issue. Why, he finds to-day that there is necessity for stability in business. It has taken him a long time to find that out.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Some hon. members laugh, but the other day we had a discussion as to what is going on in the United States and the reasons therefor. There is progress there; they have no idea that this manufacturer or that manufacturer, or this kind of business or that, is to be put out of business overnight. They are not drifting; they have some idea where they are going. Yes, they have prosperity in the United States, and my hon. friend says that times have been bad in Canada. But my hon. friend now thinks there is a real necessity for business stability in Canada, and that you cannot have business stability unless you have tariff stability.

My hon. friend has made another wonderful discovery, which I think is the most hopeful

discovery of them all, namely that the tariff is a low tariff. My hon. friend is absolutely and perfectly right. But I do not like to leave the situation as my hon. friend leaves it. I do not think Canada is in such an awful position as he seems to think. It is true that we are not doing as well as other countries. I do not know that it is incumbent upon the opposition to give apologies and reasons for that. It is true that only last session we were found, by the government that came into power, to be in a better position that any other country was in. But, notwithstanding the fact that we are suffering from a delayed and repressed recovery in this country, it is also true that you cannot keep Canada down, and we are going ahead now. Our trade figures are not bad figures now, although they ought to be better. While our trade figures are not what other countries have had, while we cannot point to the tremendous changes that they can point to in the Mother parliament, while we are piling up deficits as against surpluses reported in the Mother parliament, yet the country itself, the real fundamental business of the country itself, is, at the bottom, sound. We are increasing our exports; we are increasing our activities to some extent, although not as much as I would like to see them increased; but Canada is sound, and Canada will come through, no matter what government is in power.

I want to make just one or two remarks as to the figures submitted by my hon. friend. In the first instance, he very fairly pointed out that the kind of surplus we have to-day is an old story. We had the same thing before. In 1921, we had a surplus of $150,000,000, and still we had a very large increase in our debt. In 1922, we had a surplus of $115,000,000. It is also true, as my hon. friend says, that our whole financial trouble at the present time really has reference to the railway situation. I am going to ask my hon. friend hereafter just to pay a little more attention to that railway situation. I cannot understand how it is that the railways this year cost this country $92,000,000, unless it be that the new management wanted so to swell the vote and the expenses this year that, perforce, an excellent showing must be made next year. Look at the report brought down by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). That hon. gentleman made, as we all thought, a good showing this year. In the year 1920, I think we had a deficit of $36,000,000. In the year 1921, we had a deficit of $16,000,000, a reduction of practically $20,000,000. For the year 1922, we had this year a report read on the floor of the House that there was an operating surplus of $4,000,000 as against a deficit the year before of $16,000,000. Yet, in some way or another, the full appropriation asked for, an appropriation which was asked for on the figures of the year before—and though an appropriation is asked for, it is never intended that the money shall be spent unless it is absolutely necessary to spend it—amounts to $92,190,000 which has been drawn on account of railways. I do not know, of course, why it is drawn or anything about it; but without knowing much about it, I suggest to my hon. friend that he should do just this simple little thing—look into the details of the appropriation as made by him last year, check those details and see just how much money has had to be switched from one detail to another in order to make up that amount. I am sure that is something to which my hon. friend may very well give his strictest attention.

Just another word as regards the accounts. My hon. friend points out that we are going behind. So we are. As he told us, the deficit, the addition to the debt before other matters are taken into consideration, will be $61,000,000. Then we have refunds of exchanges, and the net result of it all is, as he tells us, to bring the net addition to the debt down to $49,000,000. The refunds of exchanges amounting to $8,000,000, cannot, of course, be taken into consideration in this year's operations, because they have nothing to do with that at all. That exchange was earned years ago, and the amount was simply fixed this year. If that were not taken into consideration, we have an addition of $57,492,339 to our debt.

That is the addition to the debt which flows out of the operations of the government this particular year; and my hon. friend I am afraid is sending us off, not with a benediction on this year's work, but practically with an admonition to look to a deficit of $58,000,000 next year, because he tells us that his estimated surplus next year will be $14,100,000 apart from railway obligations. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the situation is really a little better than that; I think that probably my hon. friend is taking too gloomy a view of matters, just as I thought he did last year. Last year his estimate for customs was $103,000,000; he has collected over $15,000,000 more, so that he is out in that respect about fifteen per cent. In other words, his spectacles were fifteen per cent too black in that case. Then again, in the case of the income tax, his estimate was $60,000,000; in this direction he was out $12,797,000 or over twenty-one per cent. The thing that is extraordinary to me

is this, that my hon. friend to-day—that is, assuming that I took down his statement correctly—discounts the collections on income and excess business taxes some $17,797,000. I think that was the figure he gave; he will correct me if I am wrong. Surely my hon. friend is not taking the view that the country is in as bad a position as that estimate indicates. Last year we were told in the address that we were in an excellent position; but we were told in the budget of that year that the year previous had been a very bad one. The exact words of my hon. friend were:

> This tax is levied on income of the past year, which was not a good business year. Indeed, I think it was a year of exceptional depression.

And in connection with a year of exceptional depression, the year 1921, he wrote down the collections in respect to income and business profits taxes from $101,500,000 to $60,000,000, yet, as I say, he collected $72,797,000. This year he is going to make his collections on the income tax and the business profits tax materially lower than he made his estimate for a very bad year. What is the trouble? I admit, of course, that my hon. friends have been in power fourteen or fifteen months; I admit that business has been harassed and bothered by a hundred and one kinds of pin pricking taxation; I admit that we have experienced uncertainty, and all that sort of thing. But I do not think that the effect of my hon. friend's government is as bad as he thinks it is. The year 1921 he told us was a year of exceptional depression. What does my hon. friend call this year? What kind of language would he apply to it if he is to discount our income and excess business taxes still further? Why, Mr. Speaker, he is making the figures in regard to direct taxation and consumptive taxes much worse even than they were last year. The year before that, when we were responsible, we raised, if I remember rightly, 32 per cent of all the revenue from direct taxation, income and business profits taxes. This year so far—and again I am speaking from recollection, although, I think, correctly—the government has raised only 24 per cent. And we used to be chided and scolded all the time because we were not doing a great deal more in that direction. What does my hon. friend think he has done to business?

I want again to congratulate my hon. friend on becoming an advocate of industry. That is another discovery we have made to-day. He wants to help the artificial silk industry; he wants to help the growing of hemp in Canada and the manufacture. We have not had an opportunity yet of going through the resolutions, and I am not going to say anything about that phase of the budget until I have had a chance to study these resolutions. The hon. member I have no doubt is sincere in his conversion in this respect. And all this is to be done in the interest of trade and to ensure that stability which he finds so sadly lacking in Canadian industry to-day. I shall not go any further now, Mr. Speaker, and therefore beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

The House again in committee on Bill No. 54, to provide for an investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 22—Distribution of report.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): When this section was last under discussion the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) emphasized the wisdom of making public any report by a commissioner under the provisions of the act. I intimated to the committee at the time that I would subsequently discuss the matter with the hon. member to see if we could arrive at a clause which would be satisfactory to both of us. I beg therefore to propose the following amendment which is agreeable to my hon. friend, and if it meets with the approval of the House, I hope it will be adopted. The amendment is:

> To strike out the first sentence contained in lines 24, 25, 26 and 27, which are as follows:
>
> "A copy of any report may, if the minister so directs, be sent free of charge to any person and to the representative of any newspaper in Canada who applies therefor, and the report may also be published in the Canada Gazette."
>
> And substitute therefor the following:
>
> "Within fifteen days after its receipt by the minister, a report (other than an interim report) of any commissioner shall be made public, unless the commissioner is of opinion that the public interest will be best served by withholding publication, and so states in the report itself, in which case the minister may exercise his discretion as to the publicity to be given to the report in whole or in part."

The committee will observe that the limitation of fifteen days is placed in this clause in order that whatever the particular circumstances of the case may demand may be taken into account. I would also suggest that the word "distribute" in line 27 be struck out and the word "publish" be substituted therefore. The clause would then read:

> The minister may publish and supply copies of any report in such manner and on such terms as to him seems most desirable.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 27—Contempt of registrar or commissioner.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought this section was standing over for a definition of the word "insult" by my hon. friend.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This will have to be left to whomever the remark is addressed to, to decide. The clause is similar to one which is contained in the Combines and Investigations Act, 1910; it is also similar to a clause in the Industrial Disputes Act. This simply protects a registrar or commissioner in the same manner as a judge from being insulted by persons who may appear before him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The judge of a court determines what is contempt of court and what is not; he has the authority and the qualification to do so. The registrar is not given any authority here, even if he had the qualification to decide what is an insult. I do not know who drafted this bill, nor do I know who drafted many bills that have been brought down this session, but I can tell the Prime Minister who did not draft it. It was never drafted by the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I say, that language is taken from the Combines and Investigations Act of 1910. Section 31 of that act reads as follows:

If, in any proceedings before the board, any person wilfully insults any member of the board, or wilfully interrupts the proceedings, or without good cause refuses to give evidence, or is guilty in any other manner of any wilful contempt in the face of the board, any officer of the board or any constable may take the person offending into custody and remove him from the precincts of the board, to be detained in custody until the conclusion of that day's sitting of the board, and the person so offending shall be liable, upon summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars.

The registrar or the commissioner stands in the place of the board in this bill. I do not think the section is a very important one, but if it seemed wise to give that protection to the members of the board in a former act, I think it would be equally wise to give it under this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I doubt if anybody will ever insult the registrar, indeed, I do not know that many will ever see him unless at a social gathering so I would not worry about the substance of the clause. But it just shows bad draftsmanship; nobody is given power to decide what is an insult.

Mr. McMASTER: Where does the bad draftsmanship come in in that clause?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the registrar is not given any power to decide whether there is any wilful insult or not.

Mr. McMASTER: If a man is given power to hold an investigation, it is not unreasonable that he should have the powers of a judge—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: —in preserving decorum in his courtroom.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then why not give it to him?

Mr. McMASTER: Is not that what the clause gives him?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, that is just what I am complaining of, he is not given this power at all. He is not to be a judge, so he is not competent to exercise the powers of a judge. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this too: the word "combine" is defined in clause 2, but it is used all through the bill just as if it had never been defined at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A combine is defined as something that works to the detriment of the public, and so on, and subsequently the registrar is commissioned to decide whether some combine works to the detriment of the public. I am curious to know who drafted this bill. Will the Prime Minister tell us?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might satisfy my hon. friend when I mention to him that the bill as drafted was submitted to the Justice department and gone over by its officers and approved.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was only as to the competency of this House to pass the measure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all, it was as to the drafting. Particular reference was made to each section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Prime Minister not tell us who drafted this bill? The English and general structure of the bill is not reviewed by the Justice department except on special occasions. All I can say about the draftsmanship of this clause is that it is no better than the plan and the whole structure of the bill.

Section agreed to.

On Section 31—Appointment of registrar and commissioner and employment of requisite technical and special temporary assistance, etc.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I forget whether the Prime Minister or his Minister of Labour told us in committee that there was to be only one registrar.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then why other offices in the various cities?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It does not mean other permanent offices; it applies only to temporary offices which the commissioner might require when holding an inquiry outside of Ottawa.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The cheapest way would be to use the court houses.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is probably what would be done.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Our exchequer court judges have that right. I do not know why we should hire offices merely to conduct investigations. I think it is absurd.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with my hon. friend that we should use the court-house building wherever we can get it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this clause in effect repeals the Civil Service Act so far as this institution that is going to be erected is concerned. This clause says that the permanent employees shall be under the Civil Service Act, then it goes on to say, all except the registrar, the commissioners, the technical experts. Who in the world is going to be there who would not come under one of these various classifications? The government decides who is technical and who is not. I venture to say that you can invoke the word "technical" as an excuse in connection with every single one in the service so far as the purposes of this bill are concerned. Why is the Civil Service Commission not competent to appoint in this case, as they appoint to-day, officers of the Geodetic Survey, officers of many technical departments of the government? Either wipe the whole thing out, or make the ordinary provisions apply here. Of course the main purpose of the bill is to get a chance to appoint some officers, and this is the clause which, if it passes, enables the government to put their friends in any of the offices that are going to be set up. I would like a photograph now of all who are going to be appointed by the Civil Service Commission if this clause passes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend deliberately misconstrues the purpose of this clause. Nothing could be more emphatic than that by this provision any such appointments as can reasonably be regarded as permanent appointments under this act will be made by the Civil Service Commission. The clause reads:

> All persons permanently employed under this act shall be subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, 1918, and amendments thereto, and other similar acts bearing on the Civil Service of Canada.

That is a clear statement of the intention of the government with respect to all the permanent appointments under this measure. In connection with individual inquiries, where commissioners have to be appointed, and the like, no one would contemplate to-day, in connection with a royal commission, asking the Civil Service Commission to name the clerks necessary to carrying out its work. If we had to go to the Civil Service Commission each time an individual inquiry was to be made and ask them to designate such persons, I do not think we would get very far in facilitating the procedure The bill as drafted simply allows the necessary lati-

5 p.m. tude to permit investigations to proceed in the most efficient and most economical manner. The section also provides:

> The Governor in Council may appoint any British subject to be, ... a commissioner thereunder.

It is clear that the government should have the right, in the case of an important appointment like the registrar, to proceed as it does in connection with the appointments of deputy ministers. Similarly, the provision respecting commissioners should be the same as the provisions respecting commissioners under the Inquiries Act. The responsibility rests with the ministry as to the class of person to be appointed. But these are clearly not appointments which the Civil Service Commission is in a position to make with the same guarantee of qualifications as when the appointment is made by a minister of the Crown. The section also says:

> The minister may employ such technical and special temporary assistance as may be required to meet the special conditions that may arise in carrying out the provisions of this act.

That clause has been drawn to meet special conditions. In other words, it is assumed that the Civil Service Commission will make the necessary appointments in the case of all ordinary classes of work, but if a commissioner is making an inquiry, say, at Vancouver one day and at Winnipeg another, and an inquiry into one industry here and another industry there, he should be free to engage the class of temporary assistance that may from time to time be needed in the particular locality in which he is working.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the minister quite sure that he is right on that question of the deputy minister? I put it to him in all sincerity; would he not be saved a great deal of trouble if, say, in connection with the appointment of a deputy minister to the Post Office Department the responsibility had been on the Civil Service Commission? Perhaps, if that had been the case, the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) would never have been ill and would still be here. Nor would my hon. friend himself be in the midst of so much turmoil in that connection; there would not have been the charges that have been made against the responsible minister and against a reputable member of a department that he is wire-pulling and doing all sorts of things to get a job. Does my right hon. friend not think that in the interests of good government and ordinary decency it would be well to avoid that kind of thing by having these matters placed in the hands of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I only wish I were in a position to assure my hon. friend that the unfortunate and, I regret to say, somewhat serious illness from which the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) has suffered was due to anything relatively so insignificant as what my hon. friend has thought it well to mention. I again assure him that the illness of the Postmaster General has had nothing whatever to do with any happenings in any department of the government.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the leaders of the Opposition are bringing to bear upon the discussion of this clause what I might call the acidulated method and the humorous method. The former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is responsible for the humorous method and the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) for the acidulated method. I do not think that either of the hon. gentlemen is right. The people of Canada want a bill of this sort. The vote the other night was a very striking testimony of the desire of the Canadian people that such legislation should be enacted, because with all the eloquence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, eloquence which was exercised in no unmeasured terms, only twenty-one of his followers, including himself—if that is not an Hibernianism—responded to the division bell to vote against the bill. Now, the objections raised by the hon. leaders of the Opposition are not well founded. Both of them are, or were at one time, distinguished members of the bar; but evidently they are not familiar with admiralty practice. In admiralty practice the judge calls in nautical assessors to help him, just as in this case the registrar will call in expert technical assistance to help him in his investigations. Is the right hon. leader of the Opposition serious in his pretension that the Civil Service Commission should be had recourse to in order to find out what technical or expert assistance should be obtained to enable the work of the registrar to be carried out with wisdom and despatch? I hardly think he can be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member say that that applies only to the temporary technical men?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: I think that is the meaning of the bill. I have carefully read this clause—and I trust my vision is not obscured by a disdain of, and a contempt for, the whole legislation which, I am sorry to say, I think obscures the vision of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. But as I understand clause 31, its meaning is that the ordinary permanent officials who will be attached to the office of the registrar will be chosen in the ordinary manner by the Civil Service Commission, but that the registrar himself and the registrar's temporary assistants from time to time of a technical or expert nature will be chosen by the minister under whose department this investigation will be carried on. It seems to be a reasonable and perfectly proper suggestion. I can hardly think, therefore, that the two methods of criticism are well founded.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry I cannot imitate the delightful, the mellifluous turn of phrase of the hon. gentleman, much less his charm of manner, but I will try to approach within reasonable distance, his admirable logic in arguing the meaning of this clause. I do not pretend ever to have beeen an adornment to the bar—

Mr. McMASTER: You would if you had remained there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —but I think I arrived at the stage, long years before I came to the bar when I could reasonably understand English. The hon. member says, and the Prime Minister reiterates, that under this clause only temporary appointments can be made by the government and by the minister whether commissioners or whether technical. That is what the hon. member said, and the Prime Minister reiterated it. He was also good enough in his speech to say that I had deliberately misconstrued the section. Now,

I am going to put myself in the hands of the committee:

All persons permanently employed under this act shall be subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, 1918, and amendments thereto—

And so forth. And then:

—notwithstanding anything in the said acts or amendments thereto.

If there was no exception to the application of the Civil Service Act to permanent employees why is the proviso there at all? Certainly the registrar is a permanent employee and he is to be appointed by the government without regard to the act. I ask my hon. friend does he now say that technical employees must be temporary?

Mr. McMASTER: I think that is the reading.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, my hon. friend does not think so. I can measure the intelligence of the hon. member better than he can himself in this regard. The section says that permanent employees shall be appointed subject to the Civil Service Act but paragraph (a) provides that the Governor in Council may appoint any British subject to be registrar, or any British subject to be a commissioner.

Mr. McMASTER: "And".

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is the proviso:

—and (b) the minister may employ such technical and special temporary assistance as may be required—

And so on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my hon. friend contend that his argument applies to technical assistance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it does not, why is the word "notwithstanding" used in the first part of the section? That word would not be used if that were not to be the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite agreeable to transposing the word "temporary" and having it read "such temporary technical and special assistance as may be required".

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will have a different meaning.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was what was intended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the way it is now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We are changing it to get over my right hon. friend's objection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Appointments can be made to positions that are permanent, otherwise the word "notwithstanding" would not apply in that case at all. I want to say to my right hon. friend that in the practical working out of this bill the phrasing will not make very much difference. The government will employ practically all the persons they can; they will make the appointments and work the appointees in in some way even though they are supposed to be only temporary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend must not judge this government by his own.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am judging my right hon. friend's government by its own actions and I will give a few instances to bear out my contention. I want to point out that a well-known Liberal organizer in Alberta, Mr. May, was appointed Immigration agent in the United States.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the hon. gentleman would. He never cares for particulars. I am giving instances—

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —of what I expect is going to be done.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order. I submit that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has no right, in the discussion on this bill, to indulge in the criticism of the administration of the Immigration department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no, the Civil Service Act.

Mr. McMASTER: Oh, the Civil Service Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I want to draw your attention to, Mr. Chairman. I am pointing out what the government has already done. I was illustrating my contention of what the government are likely to do under this clause by what they have already done. They have appointed the Liberal organizer in western Canada to be Immigration agent in the United States.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Since when was Mr. May a Liberal organizer? I never heard of it before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has been most of his life.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon. He never was a Liberal organizer for one moment or for one day, he was a Liberal candidate and was defeated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The right hon. gentleman is very much at sea.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think he is.

Mr. McMASTER: I again rise to a point of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the Minister of the Interior could speak of Mr. Ingram of Manitoba. Was he not a Liberal organizer?

The CHAIRMAN: I must draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the Opposition to the fact that a point of order has been raised.

Mr. McMASTER: I was going to show that this discussion has been caused by the right hon. leader of the Opposition's reference to the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization. It demonstrates that the point of order was well taken. Now, if I might reply to my right hon. friend while I am on my feet—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has no right to the floor except to state his point of order.

Mr. McMASTER: That is true.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the right hon. leader of the Opposition wish to discuss the point of order?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there was any; it was an abortive point of order which the hon. gentleman raised.

The CHAIRMAN: No, the hon. member for Brome asked for the chairman's ruling.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will shift my ground and the point of order will not then apply. I realize how sedulously anxious the hon. gentleman is to prevent this information coming out with respect to these Liberal organizers. I know he is very ingenious in getting the sunlight stopped but he should remember the injunction of his leader.

Mr. McMASTER: The sunlight?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the sunlight. His right hon. leader says the sunlight should be thrown on certain secret transactions. According to the Prime Minister this bill is going to do for the social system what the sun does for the physical universe. Did not the hon. member get that lesson from his chief during the second reading of this bill? If the sunlight is to be diffused why not let it be directed upon the acts of this government who are appointing immigration agents despite the provisions of the Civil Service Act? However, if I am stopped from proceeding any further in that direction—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I interrupt the right hon. gentleman to say that the appointments to which he refers were not made despite the Civil Service Act, nor was any attempt made to evade that act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who appointed those men?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I appointed them and I did not evade the Civil Service Act in one single instance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You just paid no attention to it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No; I beg my right hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What right had the minister under the Civil Service Act to appoint them?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Civil Service Act gives authority to appoint a person for a period of ninety days.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under conditions of emergency.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where was the emergency in appointing those Immigration agents in the United States? The emergency was in the Liberal camp.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The emergency arose the other day. Let me say this to my right hon. friend: The gentleman who occupies the position of Deputy Minister of Immigration was undoubtedly an organizer—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):—and was appointed by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and we had the right to appoint him too under the act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not disputing that but I do say that my right hon. friend has no right to question my power to make an appointment under the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If you make the appointment under the act. You have no right to appoint Immigration agents that is different.

The CHAIRMAN: This discussion is getting out of order if it has not already reached that stage.

Mr. McMASTER: It was out of order long ago.

Mr. SHAW: I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he should transpose the word "temporary" in the manner indicated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have an amendment here to do so. In order to make clear the intention of the section I would move that the word "temporary" in line eleven of section 31 be transposed and inserted before the word "technical" in line twelve.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I wish to say with regard to the second and third subsections of section 31—

The CHAIRMAN: We have not reached that yet, we are on subsection 1 of section 31, and the Prime Minister has moved an amendment.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The same words occur in two other clauses following, which would make it abundantly clear that the word "technical" was in a class distinctly by itself, and distinct from the word "temporary."

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved that in subsections 1, 2 and 3 of section 31, the word "temporary" be transposed to appear before the word "technical" wherever the word appears before the word "assistance."

Mr. MEIGHEN: In view of the fact that there is no definition of the word "temporary" in this bill, may I ask what is the Prime Minister's idea of the maximum length of time a temporary employee should serve and be paid?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It would depend on the length of the inquiry. There might be some inquiries lasting a couple of days, some a couple of weeks and some a couple of months. The reference here is to the commissioners, to get the necessary clerical or expert assistance in carrying out the inquiry.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The United Shoe inquiry lasted for some years.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They were not going all the time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they were, and the government has degenerated since, so that I fancy the expression "temporary employee" will be interpreted with much elasticity.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member said the other day that the officers had nothing to do under the old act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This only applies to the extent that they had anything to do. They had nothing to do under the old act, save in the one case. There was one case and it was very lengthy, almost as lengthy as it was worthless.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 32—Technicality not to invalidate proceedings:

Mr. RYCKMAN: Does the Prime Minister mean by section 32 that steps can be taken irregularly or not in accordance with the procedure laid down in the act, and that then the final determination will be the action of the registrar, and that would be as binding as if it were regularly taken and without any departure from the procedure? It seems to me that it is an unusual clause, and I would like to know its history. It may be in the Combines Investigation Act of 1910, which I have not had the pleasure of reading recently.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is where it came from—section 42 of the Combines Investigation Act and also the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, which has been on the statutes a great many years. It has been found useful in the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, just to meet the possible quibblings of persons who wish to obstruct the proceedings before the commissioner and it may serve a similar purpose in connection with investigations before the registrar. The intention of the government is to make it a workable machine, and it is well known that in most of these inquiries parties who are interested in blocking the inquiry are going, wherever opportunity presents itself, to raise some technical objection or some quibble. The idea is to get rid of that kind of ambuscading, as far as possible.

Section agreed to.

On section 33—Governor in Council may take necessary regulations:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to find out from the Prime Minister what regulations are contemplated and what is supposed to be done? What is there that we have not already covered by the act?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am afraid I cannot answer off-hand. As an act of this kind is put to the test and cases arise under it, there will develop or be disclosed undoubtedly reasons for laying down certain

general regulations that should be complied with by parties, for example, making the application, as to the form of the application, and also the time and matters of that kind. The same power is given under similar legislation to which I have referred, the Industrial Disputes Act, and regulations there have been found useful. They were not put in the statutes because they were not important enough to find a place there, but they are of assistance in trying to preserve a certain uniformity of procedure.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would like to ascertain whether this legislation would in any way interfere with the rights of parliament as they are being exercised now by the Committee on Agriculture in making inquries of a similar character and giving great publicity to certain wrongs, and perhaps to certain cures. Under this act it may develop that it is not quite within the purview of parliament through a committee to investigate even the things that are assigned to this special structure which we are creating to-day. I would like to ask the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) what his idea is in regard to the question I have raised.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Parliament must be supreme in everything.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): This cannot be treated as in any way interfering with the rights of parliament?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, no.

Section agreed to.

On section 34—Trade unions not affected:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Prime Minister tell us what he understands by reasonable protection? Would the word "reasonable" there have the same meaning as it would have with reference to other combinations?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It would have exactly the same meaning as it has where this clause appears in the criminal code. My hon. friend knows that this section is taken from section 2, subsection 2, 9-10 George V, chapter 45, Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919. There is a similar clause in section 498 (2) of the Criminal Code, the original of which was enacted by 63-64 Victoria, chapter 46, section 3. Perhaps, I can answer my hon. friend's question as to the meaning by saying it has just the meaning he had when he passed the Combines Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked the minister's conception of its meaning, and I accept the compliment he pays me when he says he can-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

not define it better than referring to the language I used myself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend knows that any construction he or I put on it would not affect the interpretation the courts would put on it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know, but I wanted the Prime Minister's opinion on it.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the title carry?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend asked me, on the seconding of the bill, what was the difference in the interpretation clause between the phraseology and the effect of the phraseology and the definition relating to combines from that which appears in the code. I think possibly for the purpose of record I had better place the distinction on Hansard. It is a little technical, but I have it in detail. This memorandum reads:

The difference between sec. 498 of the Criminal Code and the crime created by secs. 26 (a) and 2 (a) of Bill 54.

Sec. 498 of the Criminal Code reads as follows:—

498. Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars and not less than two hundred dollars, or to two years' imprisonment, or, if a corporation is liable to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars, and not less than one thousand dollars, who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company:

(a) to unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article or commodity which may be a subject of trade or commerce; or,

(b) to restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any such article or commodity; or

(c) to unduly prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any such article or commodity, or to unreasonably enhance the price thereof; or,

(d) to unduly prevent or lessen competition in the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply of any such article or commodity, or in the price of insurance upon person or property.

2. Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to combinations of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees. 63-64-V, c. 46, s. 3.

Subsections (a), (b), (c) (d) of section 498 should be compared with the following subsections of section 2.

Section 498 (a) of the code reads:

To unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article or commodity which may be a subject of trade or commerce.

Clause 2. (a) (3) (i) of the present bill reads:

Limiting facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing.

The word "limiting" is substituted for the words "to unduly limit." Section 498 (b) of the code reads:

—to restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any such article or commodity.

Clause 2. (a) (3) (vi) of the present bill reads:

Otherwise restraining or injuring trade or commerce.

Section 498 (c) of the code reads:

To unduly prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any such article or commodity, or to unreasonably enhance the price thereof.

Clause 2. (a) (3) (ii) of the present bill reads:

Preventing, limiting or lessening manufacture or production.

That is, eliminating from it the words "unduly" and "unreasonably." Section 498 (d) of the code reads:

To unduly prevent or lessen competition in the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply of any such article or commodity, or in the price of insurance upon person or property.

If that is to be compared the present bill, clause 2. (a) (3) (v) reads:

Preventing or lessening competition in, or substantially controlling within any particular area or district or generally, production manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, storage, transportation, insurance or supply.

In the above section it will be seen that section 498 contains the word "unduly" in subsections (a), (c), and (d), whereas such word does not appear in the corresponding provision of section 2. The test in section 2 of whether a crime has been committed is whether what has been done has operated, or is likely to operate to the detriment of, or against the interest of the public whether consumers, producers or others. This is the test which is substituted for the word "unduly."

Section 498 applies only to persons who conspire, combine, agree or arrange with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company to do any of the acts set out in subsections (a), (b), (c) and (d). Section 2 (a) is wider in that the limitation with respect to conspiracy, etc., is not mentioned, and it extends to "any actual or tacit contract, agreement, arrangement or combination which has, or is designed to have" any of the results mentioned in the rest of the paragraph.

Section 2 (a) extends not only to the matters which have already been enumerated and contrasted with the corresponding sections of 498, but also to:

(1) Mergers, trusts and monopolies so called;

(2) The relation resulting from the purchase, lease or other acquisition by any person of any control over or interest in the whole or part of the business of any other person.

(3) Any actual or tacit contract, agreement, arrangement or confirmation which has or is designed to have the effect of,

(iii) fixing a common price or a resale price, or a common rental, or a common cost of storage or transportation; or

(iv) enhancing the price, rental or cost of article, rental, storage or transportation.

It will thus be seen that section 2 (a) is substantially broader than section 498, and more applicable to modern conditions.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question in connection with a report sent to me to-day of a debate in the Manitoba legislature dealing with the combination of steamship companies, in which report the legislature has declared that it will ask this government to provide other penalties or remedies for the discrimination by those transportation companies which is complained of; that the coastal laws be suspended so that the companies which have made combinations shall meet with the competition of American ships, and that the use of the canals and waterways be denied to transportation companies that continue to conspire against the public interest and especially against the transportation interests of the West.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the question?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I want to know if the Prime Minister would say whether those penalties are still available together with other penalties that are provided for the correction of parties conspiring against the public interest.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly it is open to parliament to enact by way of legislation any remedy that it thinks best to meet the situation.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Or the Governor in Council can exercise his powers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. That, I think, will be the great advantage of legislation of this kind. It will enable the government and the public to know the facts with respect to any particular situation, and in that manner it will likely suggest the most effective remedy, whether it is to be found within the confines of the legislation or not.

Title agreed to.

Bill as amended, reported.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A bill like this should not be read the third time the same day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thought my right hon. friend was anxious for the sun to come out soon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I had the same faith in the sun coming out as my right hon. friend has I would be glad that the bill should be read the third time to-day but it has as close a relation to the sun as it has to the nether elements.

Mr. McMASTER: That is somewhat cryptic.

Motion stands.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend section 487 of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing that a master or mate upon application as therein provided may, if his application be approved by the pilotage authority, be thereupon examined, and if found competent, a pilotage certificate may be granted to him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain.

Mr. LAPOINTE: By section 487 of the Canada Shipping Act apart from the pilotage districts of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, the master or mate of any vessel can apply to the pilotage authority to pass an examination as pilot, and the pilotage authority, after the ordinary examinations and upon the payment of the dues, is compelled to deliver a certificate to that master or mate. The object of the resolution and of the bill is, that instead of making this compulsory on the pilotage authority, to make it discretionary. The pilotage authority, instead of "shall deliver the certificate", "may deliver the certificate" after it has approved the request. The necessity for this has been shown to the department in a special case this season in the pilotage district of Miramichi. At this place the channel is narrow, and any accident that takes place there would block the traffic altogether. It is not a very important district, and the pilot could not make a living if the most important ships that go there were relieved from the obligation of taking those pilots on those ships. It is very important to the port that pilots should be retained there to bring foreign ships in. The only purpose of the resolution and of the bill which will be introduced based upon it is, in special cases, to empower the pilotage authority to refuse the examination of a master and mate and to place the small pilotage districts on the same level as Quebec, Montreal, St. John and Halifax in this regard.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. RYCKMAN: Who is the pilotage authority?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Governor in Council under a section of the Shipping Act can at any time nominate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as pilotage authority for any port. For the port of Miramichi, for instance, the minister is the authority.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 166 to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

The House again in committee on Bill No. 136 to amend the Immigration Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 3—Certain persons to be deemed to belong to the prohibited or undesirable classes:

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Acting Minister of Immigration): When the bill was last under consideration exception was taken to the amendment to the Immigration Act which is proposed in section 3 of this bill. This section proposes to repeal section 41 of the act and replace it by the old section which was embodied in the act up to the time that the present section was adopted. That old section, which it is now proposed to re-enact, provides:

Whenever any person other than a Canadian citizen advocates in Canada the overthrow by force or violence of the government of Great Britain or Canada, or other British dominion, etc.

Objection was taken to the words "any person other than a Canadian citizen" on the ground that they implied a reflection on British subjects who were not Canadians. I propose therefore to strike out the words after the word "any" and substitute in their stead the word "alien," so that the section will now read:

Whenever any alien advocates, etc.

Mr. MORRISON: Why not say "any person" instead of "any alien"? There is no reason why a Canadian citizen should not be amenable to the law in this respect.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This section relates to immigrants who are subject to deportation for the offences described. A Canadian citizen could not come under the section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has failed to protect himself. An alien is forbidden to advocate the assassination of any official of the government, but apparently he may advocate the assassination of any member of the government.

Mr. JACOBS: Which is sometimes justifiable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why not simply leave it at assassination, without any qualification? If anyone advocates the assassination of anybody, that surely is a sufficient offence.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am simply adopting the old wording; I have not changed the language of the old section at all. Exception was taken to the fact that, by implication, permission was given the department to deport a British subject, and the amendment I now propose is intended to meet that difficulty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not objecting to the amendment, but I would strike out the words "any official of the government of Great Britain or Canada or other British dominion," etc., and simply say "assassination." I do not know why officials of the government should be particularly sacrosanct.

Mr. JACOBS: Particularly if appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps it is the immigration agent the minister wants to protect.

Mr. BAXTER: Listening to the budget this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I thought this provision was going to be dropped, that the withdrawal of the duty on hemp was for the purpose of getting the proper kind of rope for hanging these people instead of sending them out of the country. What is the purpose of the government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the section can be improved why not improve it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For ten years we have got along all right with this wording, and it is well to be careful not to change the wording of any particular clause without considering its effect upon other parts of the bill. However, I have no particular objection to striking out the words my hon. friend complains about. He is complaining that the section applies only to officials of the government and not to citizens?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Why should it be any more a deportable offence to advocate the assissination of an official of the government than the assassination of anybody else?

Mr. JACOBS: We are also providing against the assassination of Lenine and Trotsky, because this section applies to all foreign governments.

Mr. McMASTER: I submit with a good deal of confidence that assassination is undesirable under all circumstances, and in regard to all persons, and if it is advisable to retain this clause, I do not see why the words "of any official of the government of Great Britain or Canada, or other British dominion, colony, possession, or dependency, or of any foreign government" should not all be stricken out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I mean.

Mr. McMASTER: Any person who advocates assassination is ipso facto undesirable and should be deported.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Strike out the word "the" before assassination. If a person advocates assassination he at once becomes an undesirable.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: Assassination applies only to the murdering of those high in authority, not to ordinary individuals.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Make it apply to ordinary individuals. I want the protection to apply to ourselves.

Mr. CARROLL: Should not the word "assassination" be supplemented by another word?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: "Assassination" is a good word. Do you like "murder" better?

Mr. CARROLL: I would suggest "assassination or murder."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the difference?

Mr. CARROLL: There is a legal difference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the section would be clear in this form:

> Whenever any person other than a Canadian citizen advocates in Canada the overthrow by force or violence of the goverment of Great Britain or Canada, or other British dominion, colony, possession, or dependency, or the overthrow by force or violence of constituted law and authority, or by assassination, or shall, by word or act, and so on.

The whole idea is to look after assassination which tends to overthrow government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Better leave the section as it is, I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Strike out the word "the" before assassination.

Mr. McMASTER: It seems to me that assassination with a political complexion is no more heinous than assassination of an ordinary sort.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the term "assassination" apply to the ordinary individual?

Mr. McMASTER: I think so. An assassin is a person who kills another. I do not think the person assassinated has to be in a higher position in the scale of society than the murderer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move:

That the word "the" before "assassination" in line 21 be struck out and that the following words after "assassination" be struqk out, "of any official of the government of Great Britain or Canada, or other British dominion, colony, possession or dependency, or of any foreign government."

Mr. BAXTER: Would that enable us to get at anyone who is attempting to interfere with a foreign government?

Mr. McMASTER: Are these remarks merely for the ear of the right hon. leader of the Opposition?

Mr. BAXTER: Yes, it is just a private conversation. I think we should retain the words "of any official of the government," and so throw protection around the hon. Minister of the Interior.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Exception was taken by the shipping interests to the amendment to section 52. In order to meet their objections I beg to move that section 6 of the bill be amended to read as follows:

Subsection one of section fifty-two of the said act, as enacted by chapter twenty-two of the statutes of 1919, is amended by striking out all that portion of the said section preceding the word "such" in the ninth line and substituting therefor the following:

"52. (1) Upon arrival of any vessel in Canada from any port or place outside of Canada, it shall be the duty of the transportation company, owner, agent, consignee or master of a vessel to deliver to the agent or inspector in charge of the port of entry such lists as may be required by the minister containing the names of all officers, seamen or other persons employed on such vessel which lists shall contain whatever information the minister shall prescribe, and before the departure of any such vessel the minister may also require—"

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does that mean?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is an amendment to section 52. We are striking out the increase of fine and also meeting the objection taken by the shipping interests that they have to prepare manifests simply for the use of the Department of Immigration, but that actually are never used except to trace someone who becomes a public charge and whom it becomes our duty to deport. Under the amendment we will use the manifest deposited in ordinary course with the secretary of the Shipping Association, rather than compel the purser on every trip to make out a separate manifest for the department. This, however, will not apply to foreign bottoms.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Am I correct in understanding that under the present law a manifest is made out specially for the Department of Immigration?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Both on arrival and on departure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the whole effect of the amendment is to render that unnecessary in the case of British bottoms?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. They have been using a separate manifest for the department; we now propose not to ask them for that but to accept the manifest filed with the secretary of the Shipping Association at the port. That applies only to British bottoms; we still reserve the right to ask the owners or masters of foreign bottoms who have not deposited such a manifest to make one for our use.

Mr. CARROLL: Has the department a complete record of the entry into Canada of all immigrants who came here legally?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: Does this amendment meet with the approval of the shipping federation?

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 154 (from the Senate), to incorporate Trans-Continental Assurance Company.—Mr. Carroll.

Bill No. 155 (from the Senate), to incorporate National Surety Company of Canada.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 156 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Austin Trow.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 157 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Jean Buchan—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 158 (from the Senate), for the relief of Louisa Wemp.—Mr. Simpson.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

The House again in committee on Bill No. 136, to amend the Immigration Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock an amendment had been moved to clause 6 of the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister tell us what the purpose of the amendment is?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I did that before the committee rose at six o'clock. In discussing this matter with the shipping interests they were anxious not to have to provide a double manifest as they are required to do under the existing act. One manifest they file with the secretary of the British and Canadian shipping interests, and the other with the Immigration department. This second manifest we do not use for any purpose except for reference when we find a sailor who is liable to become a public charge upon the country, and who therefore is liable to deportation. We agree to accept the manifest of the secretary of the Shipping Association, rather than have the purser make out a second list. The shipping interests are objecting to the increased fines, and, therefore, I have struck out section 6 as it stands in the bill, substituting the amendment before the committee as an amendment to subsection 1.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That clause 6 is an addition to the present clause 6.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I am striking out clause 6 in the bill and substituting the amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 52 is really subsection 1.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS

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

Harbours and rivers—Esquimalt, B.C., dry-dock under construction, $1,500,000.

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Public Works): The first item $1,500,000, is a vote to continue the construction of a dry-dock at Victoria. The amount of this contract was $4,217,400. In 1921-22 $1,164,872 was expended. Of the apropriation for 1922-23, on the 31st March, $547,700 had been expended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How near completion is that dry-dock?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract expires in January 1924. There have been certain delays and probably an extension will be required. Although the contract should be completed in 1924, I would not think the dry-dock would be ready for operation before 1925.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government is responsible for the delay. Did the government not hold up the work for quite a while?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There was some delay last year by the failure to vote supply in the Main Estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister sees his error, I hope, and is duly repentant. Has the minister a report that he can lay on the Table, that the government received as to the necessity of this dock, the probable utility of it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is not a new project; it has been under consideration for many years. Negotiations were carried on years ago and a site purchased for the construction of this dry-dock. All that went by the board; but in 1919-20, my right hon. friend and his government entered into a contract to construct this dry-dock. There was some hesitation on the part of this government as to the advisability at the time, with conditions as they were following the war, of entering into the construction of two dry-docks on the Pacific coast within a few miles of one another. This government, on coming into office, found that an expenditure of $1,000,000 had been made at Victoria, and although there was a doubt as to the advisability of continuing the construction of these two dry-docks, one at Esquimalt and one at Vanvouver, it was considered advisable, after careful investigation had been made, to continue construction of the dry-dock at Victoria. In the Supplementary Estimates of last year, an appropriation of $1,000,000 was passed for continuation of construction, and the work has been proceeding since that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister stated that this matter was deferred for investigation. What was brought to the minister's attention

during the investigation that contributed to the decision of the government to go on with the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think there should be any doubt in my right hon. friend's mind as to the attitude of the government on taking office. The declaration was made by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he was contending in the countryside for election and the election of his party, that contracts which had been entered into would be investigated. We found on the Pacific coast that two contracts for dry-dock purposes had been entered into, and these with other contracts were held up. As regards the work at Victoria, as I have already explained to the committee, there had been an expenditure of $1,000,000, and after a thorough investigation and going into the requirements of shipping on the Pacific coast, we concluded we would be well advised to continue construction of that dock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister got to the point at the last minute, but he was not very explicit. The point that I asked him was not as to any historical account. I know that pretty well myself. I asked him what were the results of the investigation that prevailed with the government and decided it to go ahead. He mentions that after investigating the necessities of shipping on the Pacific coast, the government decided to continue the construction. Does he mean by that the government was convinced that the necessities of shipping really required that dry-dock?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): After the investigation which the government made, and taking into account the fact that there had been a very large expenditure on the dock and also the increased shipping and development on the Pacific coast, the government was convinced as to the advisability of continuing construction of that dock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Supposing there had been nothing at all spent on it, would the government then have seen fit to go on with the work? Did the necessities of shipping so impress the government that it would have gone on with the work even had we not commenced it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The government in that case would have been in an independent position to make its own investigation and to define its own policy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government made an investigation and the minister has the result. Will the minister say to-day that the late government went on too soon with the construction of the dry-dock?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would say that that government went on too late. That dry-dock should have been constructed in 1912-1913. If it had been constructed then, it would have served a useful purpose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly it would. Then will the minister say that we did not commence it too soon in 1919?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It would have been very useful during the war period.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister think we commenced too soon in 1919?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it would have been much better to have commenced at an earlier date, as we would then have had the use of the dock during a time when it would have been of great service, not only to British Columbia, but to the Empire generally.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not my point, and I do not know why the minister does not answer my question. Perhaps it would have been better if we had known when the war was going to break out. We, however, did not commence the dock in 1912. If we had followed the advice of my hon. friend's friends, there would have been a number of things that we would not have commenced. As, however, we did not commence the dry-dock before the war, or during the war, does the minister say that we were too early in commencing it in 1919? I know this is a poser.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): So far as I am concerned there is no poser. My right hon. friend has no reason to worry about my position as regards the dry-dock. My party had, in 1911, a contract for the construction of a dry-dock on the Pacific coast. When we came into power in 1921, we took conditions as we found them, and we are carrying on, I believe, to the satisfaction of the people on the Pacific coast in the matter of dry-dock policy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not what I asked.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am answering the question and my right hon. friend can interpret my answer. I think it is a fair answer, and so far as I am concerned there was no poser in his question. We are proceeding with the construction of this dry-dock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is simply dodging the question. I am going to keep

on a little longer, perhaps some time longer. I am asking the minister: Keeping in mind that we did not commence during the war or before the war, did we commence, under all the circumstances, too early in 1919 at the time we did commence? He can answer that by saying yes or no.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will give my right hon. friend the same answer that I gave before, that he commenced construction of the dry-dock too late.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How then does the minister justify his support of his leader who denounced us for commencing it too soon? Is that the poser for the hon. gentleman? I do not hear any answer to that. I presume I may assume that this is just another instance of the whole humbug that was perpetrated throughout the entire year. The minister, I presume, by his silence will acquiesce in that description.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We do not need to acquiesce at all. My right hon. friend would like to develop a situation at this time, but the situation is not there for him to develop. If he thinks he can get any glory out of his policy in the matter of dry-docks, he is privileged to take all the glory he can get. As regards ourselves, we are carrying on. I think, in the interests of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not seeking glory at all; I was seeking a frank statement from the minister. He declines to answer whether we commenced too soon in 1919 or not. He dodges the question by saying that we should have commenced in 1912. I asked him then: Assuming that we had not commenced in 1912, had not gone on during the war, under all the circumstances did we commence too soon in 1919? He declines to answer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is a matter of opinion entirely. My right hon. friend can have his own opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know my opinion exactly and I will say it. I will say that we did not commence too soon. Will the minister have the courage to say yes or no?

Mr. GOULD: Will the dock when completed be large enough to accommodate the largest vessel plying on the Pacific, or will the department be called upon in the future to ask for more money to enlarge it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The present dimensions of the dock are such as to afford sufficient accommodation, I understand, for the largest ships afloat.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much money has already been spent on the work, and how much more is it estimated the construction will require before the dock is completed?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): When the item was first introduced I gave the expenditures in 1921-22 and in 1922-23. There was an appropriation in 1919-20 of $500,000, there was only expended of that sum $4,994. In the year 1920-21 there was voted $500,000 of which $13,536 was expended; in the year 1921-22, $1,300,000 was voted and that year the expenditure was $1,164,000. In the year 1922-23 the expenditure was $547,720.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But how much is it estimated will be required to complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Something over $2,000,000.

Mr. GOULD: What was the total estimate in the first place?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister's figures could not be right if he gave his details correctly. He did not give details aggregating that sum by nearly a million dollars.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have given it year by year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I added the figures.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I understood the figure last given by the minister to refer to the amount still required to be spent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the minister was giving the committee what had been already spent.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount estimated as being necessary to complete the work I should say, would be roughly $2,300,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the minister told us that the total already spent is some $1,600,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And to complete the work it will require $2,300,000. Now, owing to delays we shall have to wait until 1925 to have the use of the dock.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not necessarily. Some of the delays were due to failure in voting supply in the Main Estimates last year; there was a delay of two or three months. Further delays have also been occasioned by

certain occurrences in connection with the work which have held up progress somewhat. I should think that the contractors should be through in 1924,—at the end of 1924 at any rate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the work cost more because of the suspension of operations on the part of the contractors, and if so, how much?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): During the suspension of work there were certain operations that had to be continued of necessity and expenditures had to be made in connection with them. These expenditures were necessary for keeping the pumps going, taking care of the machinery, plant equipment, etc., for which the contractors have made a claim. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the amount of the claim?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It amounts to $69,600.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is pretty expensive procrastination. Is that the only item though that the government will be called upon to provide for on account of this suspension of work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is all that I know of.

Mr. GOULD: What was the total estimate for the whole construction in the first place?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount of the contract is $4,287,000.

Mr. GOULD: The amount already expended and the amount estimated as a further requirement will total somewhat more than that, will it not?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There have been no additions except in one regard. An additional expenditure has been found necessary in the matter of certain yardage of rock which it has been found exceeds the yardage estimated originally by the engineers. This is a discrepancy that might occur in any engineering problem of this kind, and that is the only extra that I know of.

Mr. MacLAREN: What are the dimensions of the dock?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The length is 1,188 feet, the width at entrance is 126 feet on the sill and 135 feet at the coping level. The depth of the sill at spring-tide is 40 feet. The dock will have two inner walls located 400 feet and 750 feet from the entrance respectively, thus making it possible to accommodate boats from 350 to 1,150 feet in length.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where are the ships being taken care of now pending the completion of the dock?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some of them are being accommodated at the old dock at Esquimalt and others are going to Seattle and to other dry-docks on the coast.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the great bulk of them are going to Seattle?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So that because of a year's delay the country will lose all that is now going to Seattle. That will be another portion of the harvest that we shall reap from the hon. gentleman's procrastination.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, unfortunately; but it is only one year's delay as compared with many years' delay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But there is this difference between the delay in this case and the many years' delay my hon. friend refers to: We were not out any money all that time; this time we are out money, we are out the damages to the contractor, we are out the use of the dock, we are out the trade that results, and all that as a penalty on the country for the election propaganda of the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Mr. CAHILL: And we are out the Tory government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Which is another penalty.

Mr. GOULD: When the contract was let in 1919, I take it that it covered the whole construction and was intended to take care of the completed job. In other words, I should think that the contract price quoted them would be the total that the contractor would receive. I cannot see therefore why, if there has been any delay in carrying out the contract, the contractor should get this $60,000 that the minister has referred to. Is that amount to be added to the contract price?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter is under consideration, and if the amount is allowed it will be added to the total cost of the dock.

Mr. GOULD: In 1919, prices were high and any contractor would be inclined at that time to put in a high tender. Labour costs gen-

erally, however, have gone down, as also have prices in other directions. I think therefore that the contractor who tendered in 1919 should be compelled to live up to his contract to the last cent, and I would urge upon the minister to see that this is done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope that the hon. member will not forget to ask next year what was done in that regard.

Item agreed to.

Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour improvements, $135,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In explanation of that item I may give the following particulars:

Port Arthur—	Dredging
To complete contract with Messrs. O'Brien & Martin, slip 2,350 ft. long by 100 ft. wide to depth of 26 ft. at mouth of McIntyre river in front of grain elevator under construction by Parrish & Heimbecker, Ltd..	$22,500 00
To dredge a slip 1,760 ft. long by 175 ft. wide at bottom to a depth of 25 ft. below low water in front of grain elevators under construction by Jas. Stewart and the N. Bawlf Grain Co., both of Winnipeg, Man..	81,500 00
To complete payments to Messrs. Chambers, McQuigge & McCaffrey on the final estimate for their contract for the construction of a rubble mound extension 1,850 ft. to the Bare Point breakwater	2,042 14
Fort William—	
To complete contract with Messrs. O'Brien & Martin for construction of 1,000 ft. rubble mound extension to breakwater	23,500 00
Inspection, contingencies, office, etc.. ..	5,000 00
Total amount required 1923-24..	$134,542 14

The amount asked for is $135,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there any other considerable expenditure contemplated for this harbour this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is under consideration a further extension of the Bare Point breakwater.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What would be the probable estimate for that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the item before me. Probably $200,000 would carry on the extension that is considered necessary at this time. If my right hon. friend is familiar with the situation at Port Arthur he will know that this breakwater gives protection to a shore line where there are constructed a dry-dock and some pulp mills and elevators. The Grain Growers' Co-operative and Richardson's elevators are still exposed, and it is hoped to extend the breakwater this year to give these structures protection, but it has not been finally decided upon yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that the Grain Growers' elevator or the Saskatchewan Co-operative's?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think both the Grain Growers' and the Saskatchewan are in that locality.

Mr. MANION: I did not think there was any work contemplated of such an extensive character as that mentioned by the minister. Is the part that is to be extended simply to protect works that are now in existence?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MANION: You are not extending the breakwater in the other direction for works contemplated in the future?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Item agreed to.

Quebec harbour—Champlain dock—to complete, $96,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose this is carrying out the programme laid down last year involving a total cost of a million and a half dollars?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a revote. I think it has been carried for a couple of years. It is required to complete the construction of the Champlain dry-dock under contract with Messrs. M. P. & J. T. Davis as follows:

To complete items of contract..	$55,748 80
Toilet building for use of crews off steamers in the dock and men engaged in repairs..	21,924 10
Installation of soot blowers, feed regulators, and 3 electric motors and gears in pump house..	12,700 00
Inspection, contingencies, etc..	5,500 00
Total..	$95,872 90

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not part of the million and a half dollar harbour improvements there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is just the completion of the Champlain dock?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose the government is receiving the same complaint as to no business being diverted to the harbour of Quebec which was a constant source of political fuel to the hon. gentleman a few months ago?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not heard of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman cannot attend council, I am sure.

Item agreed to.

St. John Harbour—improvements, $860,000.

Mr. BAXTER: What amount has been spent in the past, how much is it anticipated it will be necessary to spend in the future, and then what will we get for the outlay? Also, does this include anything for the west side, or is it simply for the improvements at Courtenay bay?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of this amount $809,385 is required to complete the Courtenay bay contract, which has been under way for some years.

Mr. BAXTER: That is just the dock and the dredging?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. BAXTER: No wharves?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, these are the other particulars:

Courtenay Bay contract amount required to complete	$809,385
Maintenance of harbour works	20,000
West St. John—protection of concrete exposed to sea action	10,000
Fort Dufferin—repairs to breastwork	3,500
Staff maintenance	18,000
Total	$860,885

There is no provision in this amount for the breakwater which my hon. friend speaks of.

Mr. BAXTER: Roughly, what is the amount that has been spent in Courtenay bay, so that with the $809,000 we may have the total cost?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Practically, $8,000,000.

Mr. BAXTER: So it will be pretty nearly $9,000,000 before it is all done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Practically.

Mr. BAXTER: Is the minister hopeful of being able to do something this year for the extension of the breakwater to the island?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I can only inform my hon. friend that the matter is receiving consideration. The government are fully alive to the importance of protection work at that point, but we feel that we should complete this large undertaking that has been under way for some years.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not find any fault with the completing of the large undertaking that has been under way for so many years. I have always had grave doubts as to the advisability of ever having undertaken the project in that particular place—Courtenay bay. However, it was a fad of the hon. minister's predecessor, and no doubt the dock will be useful, but we will never get the full benefit of that expenditure until wharves are put in the basin to connect with the Canadian National Railways, which will mean considerable further expenditure. Several million dollars of the country's money have already gone into important works on the west side of the harbour, but the most modern, the best built, and the deepest berths there are not capable of being utilized during certain weather conditions, and never will be until the breakwater is continued to the island. I am not attacking the minister. He has been down to St. John and I will give him credit for having shown all the interest that could be reasonably expected of a minister. I think he is sympathetic. But I would like to carry the project a little beyond the point of sympathy. The completion of the breakwater is only a matter of good business; indeed, it is vital, for otherwise it will simply be a matter of carrying in a useless condition these other valuable works that have cost a lot of money and on which the country is bearing the interest charge. I would urge as strongly as I can that at least a beginning be made this year. The community of St. John, as the minister knows and as a good many hon. members know, spent quite largely of its own means to make a winter port out of the harbour. They have been helped by governments regardless of the political faith of those governments, and more will have to be done. After all, St. John and Halifax are to be the great winter outlets of this country on the Atlantic coast. The community has sent delegation after delegation to government after government here, but one thing after another has turned up. This Courtenay bay project has interfered; the war has interfered; and the difficulty of finance has interfered, and still we find in the winter seasons more vessels—perhaps the condition was not so bad last winter as it had been on previous occasions—lying out in the stream, waiting for berths, than there ought to be. I say it does not make good business in the port— and all the time there are two splendid docks which these vessels cannot utilize because a gap about a quarter of a mile long is not closed between this breakwater and the island. I would like to lend to the minister some of the vehemence that I and the community in general feel like expressing on this subject, so that he might use it in council

with a view to effecting these purposes the consummation of which the whole community so strongly desires.

Mr. MacLAREN: What would be the estimated cost for the completion of the breakwater?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The last tender we received on that work, I am informed, was $750,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When was that tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Eight or ten years ago, I believe.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be more expensive now. That is the Negro Point breakwater, intended to extend to Partridge island?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What amount has been spent on that in the last four or five years?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is an extension of work done, I believe, a great many years ago. I have not before me the figures as to the cost of the original work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has no money been spent on it in the last four years?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Only for maintenance and repairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the work in good shape now as far as it has gone? Is it serving as a breakwater yet, to the extent to which it has been built?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The work was constructed twenty or thirty years ago. I am advised that it is in good condition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would join in the appeal of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter). I visited the district, and it really appears to me that the millions that we have put there are not going to be available for service until that breakwater is completed. The breakwater is the protection of the investment, and I hope it at least will be carried on concurrently with the completion of the other work.

Mr. MacLAREN: Do I understand that no estimate has been made since the estimate of ten years ago?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No new tenders have been called for since that time. The department has made frequent investigations and estimates, but I do not know that they are below that amount, which was the lowest tender received. Some tenders were as high as a million dollars and more.

Mr. MacLAREN: I thought it was customary for the department to make some estimate of its own.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is no item bearing on that, and I have not the information here.

Mr. MacLAREN: If that is the case, one cannot hope that the matter is being very actively looked into at the present time. I would remind the minister that several years ago there was a natural breakwater there which was removed for the purpose of the extension of the harbour facilities. The Negro Point breakwater has been only partly
9 p.m. completed, so that there has been no entire replacement of the natural breakwater that formerly existed. I am sure the minister will agree as to the reasonableness of the suggestion that the harbour should be put in as good a position as it was in years ago. We are voting $860,000 for the completion of the Courtenay bay works, but we are not providing for the completion of the breakwater which is the protection not only for these works but for the wharves and piers on the other side of the harbour I would urge upon the minister, therefore, the importance of proceeding with this work, not only for the protection of the existing government works, but also to put the harbour in as good a condition as existed previous to the taking away of the natural breakwater.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I assure my hon. friend that we are not unmindful of the matter as it has been pressed by him. It is a question of finance and the ability to do work of this character at the present time. The matter is receiving serious consideration.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to torture the hon. minister, but earlier in the session he told me that the department was making some further investigation and that he was expecting a further report. Of course I do not know that it would be judicious to have the figures given out if a report has been made, because that might affect any future call for tenders. But if the minister has a further report, I would like to ask whether it shows any serious increase in the cost of doing the work. The condition at the port of St. John probably is of very little interest to a large part of the Dominion, and yet it ought to be of very great interest to those who do not believe that their own locality is the whole of Canada. That condition compels me to say something as to the work that has been done, and the work that is, in a sense, being wasted for want of something more

being done. For a distance of about a quarter of a mile from the main channel of St. John harbour in towards the shore, and for a distance, I would think, of nearly half a mile along the length of the channel, mud and boulders which used to be visible at low tide have been dredged at thirty-two feet below water level. That work cost, if my memory is correct, about 90 cents a cubic yard of material removed. The soil that was removed was carried out beyond this breakwater that we are speaking of. Every tide, and there are two of them a day, brings some of that material back into the big ditch that it cost millions of dollars to make, which was excavated in order to establish wharves for ocean steamers. Two large piers were constructed. Three more, I think, could be constructed and if they were built we would have space for at least a dozen large vessels. We probably do not need all that space at the present moment; but following a course that has been pursued for many years—I am not laying this at the door of the minister alone—the country will be faced some time with the necessity of redredging this large area. If we had that breakwater completed it would save the cost, to some extent, of redredging that area in the future; and I am trying to get the attention of the committee so that the minister may have reasonable support if he comes here at a later stage and says that it is good business to close that gap now, even though we cannot afford to build any more extensive wharves within the area which it protects. I am only appealing in the name of common sense and plain, decent, business economy. I believe the minister is sympathetic. I believe he is convinced of the utility of this work, but I think he fears, because of financial conditions, to put a project—even of the magnitude of perhaps a quarter of a million dollars for a beginning—before the House. I want to encourage him to do so, but I would like to evoke enough real attention and study to this problem, so that members should feel that it was no mere waste of money for the sake of pleasing a locality, but that it was a vital step in enabling Canada as a whole to handle her traffic within her own ports and borders instead of letting it pass through the ports of a foreign country.

Mr. KELLNER: Before the item passes I would like to ask the minister if he expects any extra ports will be needed in eastern Canada in view of the clause contained in the budget speech this afternoon.

Mr. BAXTER: Pardon me a moment. I do not know whether the hon. member's remark was intended to be facetious, or whether it was intended for a sneer but I am going to say that what was announced this afternoon in the budget speech was in my opinion a bigger thing than ordinary politics. It was a realization of the policy of Canada for Canadians, a thing that people with whom I have been associated have been talking of, dreaming of, and hoping for. I am glad to see that at last it is made part of the national policy of Canada, and I am prepared to back up a proposition of that kind no matter by whom, or how, or when it is introduced.

[Mr. Baxter.]

Mr. KELLNER: It was the minister's opinion I asked for, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, you got mine.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We on this side entertain great hopes that the tonnage and shipments coming in and going out of Canada will in the course of a few years, under the rule and regime of the Liberal party, be greatly increased not only in the ports on the Atlantic but in those on the Pacific as well.

Item agreed to.

Toronto Harbour—improvements, $250,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We certainly should have information on this large item. We should be told what was spent last year, how far the work has progressed, if the present vote is intended to complete it, and the nature of the work still remaining to be done.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount of $250,000 is required for the following improvements in Toronto harbour undertaken some years ago:

To complete the present contract for the construction of western breakwater	$204,228
To complete contract for dredging at eastern entrance..	17,415
Redecking west pier of eastern entrance.. ..	4,600
Office maintenance, salaries, etc..	18,000
Inspection, contingencies, etc..	5,757
Total amount required..	$250,000

The estimated total cost of the work authorized to be done under the present contract is $3,803,244.64. The amount which is now being voted will complete the contract.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I should like to ask the minister if he has taken into his favourable consideration the question of completing the agreement which the government has entered into with the city of Toronto. This is not a matter of favour, except as to the time when the government will implement its contract with the city. I know the minister

is well aware how much depends on the carrying out of this agreement and I should like to know, because the time is opportune—in fact the date has long been overdue—when we can expect that agreement to be brought to a happy completion.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The government realizes the importance of this work, for the carrying out of which a contract was entered into with the city council and harbour board of Toronto. We are now trying to complete the scheme which has been undertaken. It is true that the work has not moved as rapidly as we could have wished but I am hoping that ultimately it will be carried through to completion.

Mr. HOCKEN: Would the minister tell us how much the government has agreed to contribute and what amount has already been contributed?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The government has spent approximately $6,500,000 and it will take $1,500,000 to complete the undertaking entered into some years ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before we leave this item, would the minister tell us what progress he has made in relation to the emergency which has arisen in Portage la Prairie? I want to draw attention to one error that the minister made in the previous discussion. He sought to chide me for having neglected to provide, while I was in office and in response, to appeals, for the correction of the error of 1908, in order that water might flow around the bend and thus take care of the sewage. I had no recollection of any appeal whatever, or of the question ever arising. Since then I have obtained from the Department of Public Works a copy of all the correspondence, and I find that my recollection is quite correct. That matter never arose at all. What was appealed for at that time was the dyking of the banks, in order that floods might be prevented. That was under consideration, and reports of engineers were made looking to the curing of the situation arising therefrom, but the matter in issue between my hon. friend and me was a wholly different matter. No appeal was made by the municipality and no appeal was made individually. I draw that fact to the attention of the minister, so that he will not fall into that error in the future, and that he will be more careful in a controversy to adhere to the issue and not to obscure it by something which has nothing to do with it. What progress has been made? He will recall that he stated to the House that it was the intention of the government to provide for an extension of the sewerage system down to the present flow of the river, providing only that such was constructed at reasonable cost. That was the definite undertaking of the minister? His estimate then of what that would cost was $45,000 which he intended to contribute, but he made the statement very clearly twice, in answer to me, that the government's intention was to provide the extension at whatever cost it might entail; that is the money that would be required to complete it, if it were reasonably conducted. I understand that since he has made an offer wholly different from that. I do not know just what has taken place of recent date, but I hope to get a favourable report from the minister of this subject, and the time is now very close at hand when it will become a matter of increasing seriousness.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In reply to my right hon. friend, I wish to state that there is no misunderstanding. It is probably not worth while reviewing it, but in 1917 and 1918 the engineering department did request of the government that certain works should be done on the channel that had been dug in order to prevent what has occurred. My hon. friend suggests that this is not in the correspondence. Well he probably has had more time than I have had. I understand he has had the correspondence, but the reports I had from the engineering department indicated that that was the condition at that time. In regard to the advance that was made since then, I do not think we have much to report to the House. In the previous discussion I suggested to the House that we had an estimate of $45,000. Since that time it has been revised by the engineering department, and we are advised that it can be done for $35,000, and the city of Portage la Prairie has been so advised. Within the last few days there have been tremendous floods in that area, and we are awaiting reports from them. I think the matter will be up for discussion later, when the Supplementary Estimates are before the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have read the correspondence very closely. The minister was complaining that there was no response on the part of the late government. There was no appeal to the late government and no request by anybody. What was requested was a different matter. I know the minister will recall it, if he will wait until I have made my assertion. I am aware that the minister of the time obtained a report from the engineers, in response to an appeal for dyking the river, not to any appeal with respect to the sewerage at all. The matter never came up, and

would not come up till there was some need of it. In response to that appeal the engineer recommended that certain things be done with a view to meeting the situation, and, incidentally, in the course of that report stated that it would have the other effect as well. The weir would provide for the water flowing round the bend. That was a wholly different matter. How could he suggest that the failure to provide the weir was at the door of the late government, when the matter was never called to their attention? Nobody drew it to their attention. The correspondence clearly disposes of that. So much for that subject. The minister had no warrant to inject into the controversy anything in the way of a remonstrance against the administration in relation to the bend in the river and the sewerage. Now the minister revises his estimates, but does he not see that that does not affect the issue at all, because the minister's undertaking in the House was, provided of course the city were satisfied to accept it, that the government was prepared to provide as much money as was reasonably necessary to continue that sewerage system down to where the water actually flows? Is the minister still ready to abide by that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have had the opportunity of reading a letter addressed by my right hon. friend to the mayor of Portage la Prairie following the discussion recently on this item, and I have no doubt a similar letter will be written to-morrow to the mayor of Portage la Prairie, advising the mayor as to how he held the minister up, and how he made the minister say this and that. There is no doubt in regard to the position of the government. My hon. friend says there is no responsibility on his part, and that no representations were made. Who are the agents of the government? The Public Works engineer in that district, who did make reports, advised that a weir be put in in order that the water might go round the bend and prevent what has happened. Now I can quite understand that my right hon. friend, although a member of the government, might never have heard of that before. It is quite easy to understand that, but I claim that the agents of the government did foresee the danger at that point and recommended to the government that certain works should be undertaken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no mention of the danger whatever—not the least. The report simply stated that this would meet the request for dyking the river, and at the same time would provide a weir for turning the water round. No government in the world would propose to provide against a contingency that was never called to its attention. The minister tries to intimate to the House that I wrote an unfair letter to the mayor at Portage la Prairie. I would ask him to read that letter.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not have it here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the minister should have so intimated. I merely stated the facts to the mayor, and I transmitted Hansard in order that the city would know where it stood. That was my plain duty to the council of Portage la Prairie. I recited what had taken place in no boastful tone at all. I think it is the duty of one who interests himself in this matter—and I take some interest in it, and I have some interest in it from many standpoints—to report what does result. That alone was done. I think it is the duty of the minister to state the position of the department fairly. I ask him, is he still ready to do that? I do not know that it will be of any value, but it may be. I know the city council feels that it should not be saddled with the cost of maintenance of that extra sewerage outlet, which I think is about a mile and a half, some considerable distance at all events. They feel that the government is fully responsible and should bear that cost. Is the minister prepared to abide by what I understood to be his undertaking before, which I never thought he would have varied, save by reason of the intimation that since has been given to the city council. Has the minister's undertaking been in any way varied?

Mr. LEADER: I am sorry I was not in at the opening of this discussion, but evidently the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) is discussing matters pertaining to Portage la Prairie. About two weeks ago, while I was out of the House temporarily, word was sent to me that he was also discussing Portage la Prairie. He was finished when I got in; but on reading Hansard I noticed that he said he should apologize. I would like to accept the apology, but I am afraid he is unrepentant. As hon. members no doubt are aware, I am fully conversant with matters pertaining to Portage la Prairie. I have worked in connection with this matter; I have done all I possibly could, and I may say that the government have met our request in a favourable mood. I think they have offered to do what I believe is the square thing. They have offered to take care of the sewage system in Portage la Prairie and replace it, put it back where they found

it. I do not think you could ask the government to do anything further than that, and I do not believe the people of Canada, much as I respect my constituents and all that, could be expected to take care of the sewage system of Portage la Prairie forever. If the government will assume responsibility for the situation which has developed there, if they will go so far as to put the situation back as they found it, they cannot be expected to go further than that, and the citizens of Portage la Prairie would consider that they were only doing their duty in that regard. The Minister of Public Works speaks of a letter that the hon. member for Grenville sent to the Portage la Prairie Graphic. I am responsible for handing that paper to the minister, and to show that the hon. member for Grenville is a third-rate politician. I would be glad if the minister would read that letter to the committee to-night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to pursue the subject just a little further. If the minister will state that the undertaking is as stated by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, I am quite content. That will suit me exactly. If the government is really in the position that it is prepared to put the city as it was, from which place it was dislodged by the action of the former government, of course a Liberal government, that is quite satisfactory to me, and I am prepared to accept that wholly.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This matter seems to be of very considerable interest to my right hon. friend, and it has been pursued to some extent. I am going to take occasion just now to make a reference to the hon. member who represents Portage la Prairie. He has given us valuable assistance. Last summer, during the harvest season, when he was busily engaged in his home work, he left the fields, took the train hurriedly, made a trip to Ottawa and laid this whole matter before the government or the Department of Public Works. He also brought up the question of certain river bank protection. We have had investigations made since then, and we have carefully followed the matter. Why my right hon. friend should want to pursue this matter to-night when the item is not under discussion, when a little later on, as he knows, Supplementary Estimates will be up, and this subject will be up for discussion, and to have me reaffirm the statement I made some two or three weeks ago, I cannot understand, except that I am advised that the mayor representing the city council of Portage la Prairie is now on his way to Ottawa, in order that he may further pursue this subject. The department's mind is made up; it was freely expressed to my right hon. friend and to members of the committee not long ago. We have not changed our minds, and my right hon. friend, who has recently perused the files, knows from his perusal that there is a letter setting forth to the mayor of Portage la Prairie the undertaking which the government are prepared to make in that matter. Why we should be pressed to reiterate a statement to-night, I cannot for the life of me see. It may be the desire of the right hon. gentleman to make representations at this time, before the mayor who is now on his way here at the expense of the citizens of Portage la Prairie has an opportunity of making his representations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I knew the matter was discussed as to the mayor coming down. I did not know that it had been decided that he should come. I was anxious for the reaffirmation, for only one reason as I explained, because the letter of the minister was not strictly in accord with the undertaking as I understood it. He now says that the government has not changed its mind. That is satisfactory to me, and I am glad to have an intimation that the subject is to be taken care of in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. LEADER: If I am in order I should like to say another word.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion has been all out of order for the last hour.

Mr. LEADER: I should like to ask the minister if he has anything more to offer the mayor and the solicitor who are coming down to Ottawa than he has already offered to the representative for Portage la Prairie?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We will be very glad to hear the representations of the mayor and the solicitor of Portage la Prairie. The department are prepared to deal fairly in this matter. If the government of Canada or if the department have made a mistake, we realize that we should try to remedy it, and there should be no great worry if that is done. The disposition of the department was explained early in our dealings, and we are prepared to carry through on that basis.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—chargeable to collection of revenue—graving docks, locks and dams, etc., working expenses, etc.	
Graving docks..	$145,800
Harbour and river works, etc..	61,000
Collection of public works revenues.. ..	5,000
	$211,800

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where are these works?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The first item deals with the Champlain graving dock and the Lorne graving dock in Quebec. The Esquimalt dock is the old dock at Esquimalt, Vancouver Island.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, two docks at Quebec and one at Vancouver Island.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what way is the money being spent—for repairs, emergencies or extensions of the docks?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is for salaries, repairs, maintenance and operation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is there an increase this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are three items in connection with the Champlain docks:

Scraping and painting of two casings of gate,..	$7,200
Fire hose and reels..	5,475
Incidentals and contingencies, repairs..	1,000

In connection with the Lorne graving dock this amount of $51,800 is required to provide for the staff, maintenance and repairs:

Requirement for 1923-24 compared with previous year

	1922-23	1923-24
Staff..	$13,975 25	$13,285 25
Materials, supplies, tools, sundries, etc., for operation and maintenance of dockyard, shops, buildings and dry-dock proper	4,892 94	4,500 00
Materials, supplies, tools sundries, etc., for the operation and maintenance of steam-hydraulic mechanical equipment	1,870 50	1,500 00
Purchase of electric energy.. ..	600 00	780 00
Water service..	600 00	600 00
Diver's service..	100 00	100 00
Coal..	6,158 00	6,255 00
Repair works..	4,897 00	9,959 33
Fire pump..	3,200 00	
Fire hose..		1,500 00
Incidentals, unforeseen and contingencies..	900 00	1,000 00
Rebuilding coal shed..		4,168 00
Repairs to rolling caisson, entrance gates, etc..		8,200 00
Total..	$37,193 69	$51,847 58
Say..	37,200 00	51,800 00

The expenditure on the Esquimalt dock is the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not understand why these items should be separated from the votes for harbours and rivers of the different provinces. Doubtless they have been done before, but why is it done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Many of these works are revenue producers and they are kept separate on that account. This has always been done.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would suggest that it would be much better for every purpose, while they may be kept separate by reason of their producing revenue, for them to be put under the votes for the different provinces so that we may see just how much is being devoted to these specific purposes in each part of the country.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is the usual practice, and I can see the wisdom of it. For instance, there is a vote of $7,500 for the Burlington channel bridge; that is an operating cost. In connection with French river dam the cost of operation is $3,500, but there is also a revenue account in this case. There is no revenue from the Kingston bridge which was built some years ago, but the cost of operation and maintenance is $12,000. The expenditure on St. Andrew's rapids, lock and dam, is $27,000; and there is a revenue from the Selkirk repair slip.

Mr. MANION: The costs are for caretakers, etc.?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, and for the operating staff.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Has the minister had any communication from the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario in regard to the question of damming some of the waters of the St. Lawrence with the idea of developing waterpower on the St. Lawrence and in that way affording the commission an opportunity of developing a large amount of power which could be used for industry in eastern Ontario and in a portion of Quebec? I believe the question has been under consideration, but I do not know whether the government has been in touch with the Hydro Electric Commission or not.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No proposals have been made to the Public Works department, but I understand that the matter has been before the Department of Railways.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Prince Edward Island and Mainland, $7,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Presuming that this vote is for the maintenance of the lines, can the minister give the committee information as to what revenue has been derived from them, say for last year? Evidently we spent $7,000 last year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am sorry I have not the revenue in my notes. These are operating costs. The cost of staff and maintenance will follow closely the figures of last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The total vote was expended.

Mr. MacLAREN: What is the difference between the government telegraph lines and the telegraph lines operated in connection with the railways?

Mr. KING (Kootnay): The telegraph and telephone service of the government has been largely a pioneer service. These lines have been built to remote places that have not been attractive enough for private capital. The lines have served a very useful purpose. There is a marked difference between our telegraph lines and those of the railways. As I have said, we reach remote places whereas the railway telegraph lines serve those territories tributary to the railways. We are now trying to unload certain of this work in territories served by the railways which have recently been acquired, and there has been co-operation between the railways and the Dominion telegraph service.

Mr. MANION: What department undertakes the collection of the revenue from these lines?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The work is done by our department.

Mr. MANION: I see that the expenditure on the whole of this item No. 360 is somewhat less than it was last year. Would he tell the committee how much revenue came from the whole of these different lines of telephone?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am sorry I have not that information. In this detailed statement of expenditures the revenue collected apparently is not taken into account. I shall be pleased to give my hon. friend that information at an early date.

Mr. MANION: Could the minister give a rough estimate?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would hesitate to do so, but I can inform my hon. friend that the service is being run at a loss.

Mr. MANION: I took it for granted. Of course, I know a great deal of this work is being done for the benefit of sections of the country which are non-revenue producing to a great extent, but it would be interesting to know in a general way if we are losing 50 per cent, 25 per cent, or what percentage on such an item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the printed annual report of the Public Works department the required particulars will be found.

Mr. EVANS: Between what points are these lines run in Saskatchewan that entail this expenditure?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In Saskatchewan, Qu'Appelle—Onion Lake section, 63 miles; Battleford—Isle La Grosse section, 298 miles; Moose Jaw—Willow Bunch section, 212 miles, making a total of 573 miles. The department is arranging to abandon certain lines in that area. There will be a considerable expenditure incurred in taking down the pole lines and salvaging the material, but eventually a saving of $10,000 or $12,000 a year will be effected.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Are these lines built entirely at the expense of the Dominion, or is there any contribution towards their cost by the provinces and the municipalities?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think there are any contributions from the provinces or the municipalities. Occasionally an individual or groups of individuals will undertake to furnish the poles or do a certain amount of labour for the convenience given by these lines. The department takes advantage of such offers, but generally speaking the expenditure is made directly by the Dominion government.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Are any extensions proposed this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There will be some minor extensions. These will appear in the supplementary votes probably. They usually come up from year to year.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): This item is entirely for maintenance?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and Maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service	$233,500 00
Saskatchewan	61,900 00
Alberta	113,700 00
British Columbia—Mainland	111,200 00
British Columbia—Vancouver Island district.	136,900 00
Yukon System (Ashcroft-Dawson)	277,000 00
Telegraph and telephone service—generally.	10,000 00

Mr. MANION: Do these items embrace all the different telegraph and telephone lines of the government outside those used by the railways?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think so.

Mr. MANION: Do any of the other departments—the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for instance—control lines of this kind, or are they all handled by the Public Works department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Interior department maintain certain telephone lines in connection with their Forestry branch.

Mr. MANION: Just short local lines?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. The Marine department carry on radio-telegraphic work on the coast; that is distinct from the lines controlled by the Public Works department.

Mr. MANION: But there are no lines of any extent outside those handled by the Public Works department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think not. In regard to revenue, I find in the annual report of March 31st, 1922, the total revenue was $290,131.34.

Mr. MANION: Is that for these lines we are discussing?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, but for the year 1922.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Public Works—salaries, $639,300; contingencies, $75,000.

Mr. MANION: What is the increase in this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The increase is caused by the making permanent of 38 employees, the consequent transfer from other appropriations to civil government, and the re-establishment of a vacancy in the Telegraph branch, less 8 positions dropped, due to retirement or resignation. The statutory increases account for $13,100. There are 38 transfers from other appropriations, seven from Works salaries, sixteen from Engineering salaries, fourteen contingencies and one Ottawa building repair appropriation, making a total of $63,300. There has been a decrease due to six resignations, eight retirements, two deaths, and four transfers, three from civil government and one to civil government. The total decrease amounts to $20,115. There is a net increase of $61,265. As a matter of fact the pay-roll of the department is less this year than last.

Mr. MANION: That is including temporary and permanent employees?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MANION: I do not know what the policy in the past was, but I notice this session the same reply has been given in regard to various other departments—that the increase in salaries is because a number of temporary employees have been made permanent. Is that a new policy, or has the government decided upon this procedure for all the departments?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It had been the practice in the government service for a man who got a position to be appointed temporarily, on probation, and as time passed he either got a position in the permanent service or did not. In the blanketing-in lists recently adopted in my department there were men who had held important positions in the service for quite long periods of time. One was an engineer who had been in the service some twenty years. In the case of persons holding positions of a permanent character, doing work which is of value in the service, there has been a disposition to make them permanent. This is carrying out a policy adopted by the late government following the reclassification and rearrangement of the service It makes the estimate before us look larger, but where this item has been increased others have been reduced. The employees concerned are merely transferred from one pay roll to another.

Mr. MANION: I entirely agree that when a man has been for some years in a temporary position he might well be put on the permanent list. But has there been any systematic policy under which a man is transferred to the permanent staff after having been on the temporary list a certain length of time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No definite policy.

Mr. MANION: Was there no method by which a man would be automatically transferred to the permanent staff after having been on the temporary list, say, two or three or four years?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I understand that those who were brought in by order in council were considered permanent employees; others remained on the temporary list. But since 1919, after the reclassification, there has been a disposition to place on a permanent basis persons who have been in the service many years and are performing important duties.

Mr. MANION: I think that is a proper policy. The minister mentions the case of an engineer who had been twenty years on the temporary staff. It seems a ridiculous thing that a man like that, apparently a capable employee, should work so long and only at the end of the twentieth year be placed on the permanent list. I suggest that it would be

worth the minister's consideration and the time of some of his colleagues to endeavour to work out some scheme whereby a person listed as temporary who had given efficient service and performed necessary duties for a given length of time should be transferred to the permanent staff.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As appointments are made now, they are given by the Commission either permanent or temporary standing; they enter the service on that definite basis. At present, therefore, there is not so much difficulty on that score.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Can the minister say how many temporary employees there still are—in other words, how many have not been transferred to the permanent staff?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not that list here, but it has been worked out in the department. There is a very large number of employees who are not on the permanent list—caretakers, elevator attendants, firemen, engineers, and so on. Many of them work at prevailing rates. Under this vote we show thirty-eight employees as having been brought in and classed as permanent.

Mr. CARROLL: Thirty-eight temporary employees?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Clerical and technical temporary employees who
10 p.m. have been in the department for some years and whose services are necessary.

Mr. CARROLL: What are the occasions which necessitate appointments to temporary positions in the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Pressure of work. Years ago appointments were made to important positions and permanent standing might not be given for a considerable length of time. When extra work makes temporary appointments necessary, the commission now issues a certificate designating the appointment as temporary.

Mr. CARROLL: These employees, I assume, would know that their appointment was temporary and that their services might be dispensed with at any time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MACLAREN: How does the personnel compare in number with that of the previous year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is a decrease of twenty from last year.

Item agreed to.

National Monument on Connaught place, $10,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): When we were in committee before, this item was held up at the request of one or two members, who had some hesitancy about voting an expenditure of $10,000 in connection with the building of a national monument on Connaught place. I am rather sorry the Prime Minister is not in his seat because he would express more felicitously the desire of the government in this matter than I can. It has been felt by the government that we should erect something in the nature of a national monument in the capital city of Canada to commemorate the deeds of our men overseas, a monument of a national character such as would express the sentiment of the nation in that regard. As I say some objection was taken when the vote was brought forward but I do not think it is at all unreasonable—in view of the fact that we have undertaken the expenditure of a very large sum of money in France to erect fitting memorials to the heroism and endurance of our soldiers in the Great War—that we should ask for a small expenditure at this time in order that plans and designs might be prepared for the erection of a permanent memorial in Ottawa to indicate to the world Canada's opinion of the gallant part Canadians played in that struggle. The opinion of competent authorities will be sought in choosing a suitable design, and we are asking for the present amount in order that the work may be started and carried to a successful completion.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Does the present amount cover the cost of preparing plans?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is just a preliminary amount.

Mr. MacLAREN: I notice on the central pillar at the entrance to these buildings an inscription denoting that it has been erected in recognition, among other things, of the valour of our men who went overseas?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is now proposed to have a second memorial? In what respect does the present memorial fall short of its purpose?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I might say a word as to what the government had in mind in making this proposal. In every country in the world the spirit of the nation has found some expression in regard to great events in the form of permanent monuments if the occasions have been sufficiently worthy of such recognition from the national point of view. The government felt that a

monument should be erected in the capital of Canada expressive of the feelings of the Canadian people as a whole to the memory of those who had participated in the Great War and had lost their lives in the service of humanity. The thought was that the most appropriate centre in the capital should be chosen for such a monument. I may say, without suggesting any finality in the matter, the idea was that something in the nature of a great column erected in the triangle just opposite the post office, which is the very centre of the city of Ottawa, would be the most suitable form of monument and locality. My hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren) has referred to the column in the parliament buildings; I think he has reference to the central pillar in the main entrance. That column has an inscription on it commemorative of the services of our men in the Great War. I do not think it is intended as a national monument in any sense of the word. The same column contains a commemorative reference to confederation. Indeed, I think the pillar is more or less symbolical of our relations with the British Empire as a whole; the column arising out of a symbolical sea being representative of the British Isles and the dominions whereas the columns on each side are symbolical of the various provinces of the Dominion. I believe the architect's whole plan is more or less symbolical of these ideas. But the monument to be erected to commemorate the deeds and services of those who participated in the Great War is intended to be a national monument in the national capital. There are in many Canadian cities monuments which those cities themselves have erected; but there is, as yet, no monument of a national character in the capital of the Dominion. The government has received representations from different quarters that such a monument was rather expected on the part of the Canadian people. Even if such representations had not been received the government would have felt that having regard to the events of the past, the part which Canada took in the war, and the valour of her sons, something of the kind commemorative of their heroism, sacrifice and service, should be erected in the capital of our country.

Mr. KNOX: What is the estimate of the total cost?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That will largely depend on the design that is accepted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the custom, in most cases of this kind, is to advertise the purposes in view and call for designs from architects and sculptors, leaving to a committee the choice of a suitable design and to fix the maximum of expenditure.

Mr. KNOX: I should think the government would have in mind some maximum of expenditure for a monument of this kind.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would say offhand $50,000 or $75,000 but I am speaking without any knowledge of the nature of the design and what may be recommended. We must, if we decide to erect a monument, make a start. Designs having been received, it will be the duty of those who have to make the choice to make a suitable selection. Then we can come to parliament and ask for a sufficient vote to carry the proposition out.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me that at this time a protest ought to be made against the government going on with a work of this character and that on several grounds. First of all we should not be asked to make a preliminary grant without having some very definite idea as to the actual expenditure involved. If this $10,000 is spent on plans we shall probably have the government coming next year with a very elaborate scheme and one of the pleas for a larger expenditure will be that this vote has been spent and it ought not to be spent in vain. At this time when we are trying to save money, and restricting departmental expenditures which could render necessary services and desirable to the people, I think we might very well economize on such a project as this. There are people all over this country who are struggling to meet the enormous burdens of debt that we are now carrying. We are adding, this year, we were told only this afternoon, $50,000,000 more of debt. I speak for at least one section of the people when I say that, however desirable it may be to add works of art to the capital, we ought not at this particular time, with the people burdened with debt as they are, to incur any more expense than is absolutely essential. Further than that, there are a great many of those who went overseas who are not fully provided for at the present time. This government cannot see its way to provide anything for the unemployed, and there are thousands of men who spent several years overseas who are to-day suffering and whose families are suffering. In connection with the proposed monument, I had a rather bitter letter sent me from a woman in the West, whom I know very well. I think I shall read it, because it reveals the feeling, not of the few, but of hundreds of re-

turned men and of their wives. I have hundreds of them in my own constituency, and in this regard I speak for the returned men themselves This woman, whose husband was out of work, had to put her children away for a time in order that she might work and try to keep things going. The letter reads:

> May I suggest that instead of spending money on the fallen, they spend the money for the clothing, feeding and sheltering of the men who had the great misfortune to return to Canada with their lives. It is no fault of theirs if they are not among the so-called "glorious dead". Had these men returned they would be in the same category as their living comrades—in the bread line and the recipients of old clothes (by appeals in the press), doles, poverty, Hastings Park, etc. Canada has already forgotten those men who served Canada for the profiteer, and saved poverty and misery for themselves. Yes, our children will remember when they see their fathers and brothers who did come back, sick, miserable and in want. We are told there is no money to provide decent constructive work. No, but they could find money for war and for the destruction of life, but nothing to conserve life.
>
> Thinking people are tired of this hypocritical cant about the dead, let us attend to the living. We dress up the dead with cenotaphs, etc., and we refuse the living bread.

I am not accusing the government, in attempting to erect a monument, of forgetting the living, but I do say that until there can be fuller provision made for the living, we ought to hesitate about erecting a monument in marble. One other thing which I think ought to be said is this: that in commemorating the war there ought to be the utmost care exercised as to the character of that commemoration. No man of this generation is likely to forget the Great War. It has touched too many of our homes. We are struggling beneath an enormous national debt because of this great war. The whole world to-day is upside down to a large extent because of the war, and I for one want to protest once more that, however we may accord the utmost sympathy to the men who risked their lives and the many who gave their lives at the front, we must be very careful lest in any sense whatever we glorify war or militarism. If there is any monument erected at all, whilst it might contain some tribute to the men who gave their lives, it also ought to point out that, after all, war is, from the beginning to the end, a miserable failure. The monument ought to commemorate the failure of the war to obtain one of the slightest things for which we went to war. In saying this I speak not merely from the standpoint of a few individuals, but for a very large section of the working class, and, in addition to that, for a large section of the people of Canada, who as a rule do not get their opinions before the public. I feel that I could not let this opportunity pass without protesting against the erection of a monument of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am surprised at the remarks of my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). If he assumes the government has any desire to glorify war he is entirely mistaken. There is a great difference between glorifying war and glorifying patriotism or glorifying sacrifice, the greatest patriotism and the greatest sacrifice which the country has ever known. That is what the government seeks to glorify in the monument, and what I believe the nation hopes to see glorified. When my hon. friend speaks about caring for the poor and the hungry, I think it is not unfair to remind him of a reference or two that might appropriately be made at this time. There is a saying which my hon. friend will recall, to the effect that man does not live by bread alone.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Man cannot live very well without bread.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, and he cannot live without the other. If it is a choice between living without bread and living without a spirit that is ready for sacrifice, I think the majority of men would prefer the spirit of sacrifice to bread. It is the spirit of heroism, the spirit of self-sacrifice, the spirit of all that is noble and great, that was exemplified in the lives of those sacrificed in the Great War, and the services rendered by the men and women who went overseas; and the nation will be dead the minute it loses that vision. It is that vision which the government wishes to keep alive in erecting a monument of this kind. Every point my hon. friend has urged might have been put forward by the Pharisee and his associates who rebuked the woman who broke the alabaster box of ointment over her Saviour. Why, they said, it was a waste. It was all thrown away. Its contents might have been sold and given to the poor. They were unable to appreciate the spirit of sacrifice and understanding that really accounts for all that is noblest and best by way of inspiration in the world. Everything in life is not to be measured by its mere utility value. There is a side of life loftier than that of the mere material satisfaction of daily physical needs. I do not think I need emphasize that point with my hon. friend. I think he appreciates it as well as any one, but what I am protesting against is his venturing to assert, in the name of labour or any group in the community, that the government should not seek to perpetuate in the minds of our own and future generations in this country the greatest service, the greatest

sacrifice ever rendered by the nation in a cause which was the greatest the world has known in the history of human freedom.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I wish to dissociate myself, in any apparent criticism of this item, from the remarks of my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). He has spoken of the debt which we in Canada owe. It is a large sum we all know, but we are able to pay it. We owe a debt to the soldiers who have gone overseas and made the supreme sacrifice, and this is one way in which we are able to pay part of it, and one way which I hope, we will not overlook or neglect. My only object in asking the minister for information—and I sincerely hope the item will be carried—is to ensure that the most careful and thorough investigation will be made by the government, that suitable plans will be prepared and procured that this item will not be lost sight of in the pressure of the many other items and important business of this country. I quite agree with the remarks of the Prime Minister, and I sincerely hope that we will soon have erected a monument somewhat in keeping with the sacifice and the service which our soldiers have given overseas.

Mr. MILLAR: I am very anxious to see economy practised, but I could not oppose this motion. I believe, with the member for Centre Winnipeg, that it is wise that we should educate our people against war. Nevertheless, after they have made the sacrifices that were absolutely necessary during the recent Great War, I think it is well we should commemorate those sacrifices. With the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox), I too would like very much if we could know at the present time more nearly what this monument is going to cost, and if it would be possible to get plans without the expenditure of even the sum of $10,000. I do not know whether that is possible or not; but as has been said after $10,000 has been expended one feels, well, that we do not like to waste the $10,000, and even though the monument may cost a sum that we do not feel like expending just yet, that expenditure may be used as a leverage to go on. The necessity for money and for relief from the burden of taxation at the present time is at present very great, but I hope that, at least in a few years a monument will be erected to commemorate the great sacrifices of our soldiers at the front. As I said before, I am anxious for economy. In fact, while I have not criticized the expenditures that we have just passed at the instance of the Minister of Public Works, if I had the opportunity of using the knife on them, I would cut out quite a goodly number where expenditures are made on harbours for merely local traffic. When the case is one of through traffic, I can see the reasonableness of spending money from the Dominion treasury; but where it is only for local traffic, merely a local affiair, I cannot see any reason why it should not be left to the provinces or even to the towns and cities to construct their own harbours. As regards this appropriation if the plans cannot be secured for a less amount than that, I am willing to support it.

Mr. MANION: As regards another section of this item, the National Gallery of Canada, I notice that the expenditure has increased by 100 per cent, from $50,000 to $100,000. Can the minister explain what that increase means?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That appropriation was discussed and passed some time ago.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): These items under "Miscellaneous" are all carried except the last one.

Mr. MANION: I thought the whole item No. 168 went together.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are all passed except the last, the National monument.

Mr. MANION: I understand, however, that even when one item is left, we can discuss the others.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This matter was discussed at the time, and my hon. friend will find in Hansard of that date a full explanation why the additional amount was granted.

Mr. MacLAREN: I quite undertsand, regarding the estimate for the National monument, that the amount should be indefinite: but I think any such sum as is mentioned, $50,000 or $75,000, will not in any way provide the memorial that the Canadian people would wish to have. I would suggest to the government that if delay is not material, when a monument is erected, it should be put up in accord with the ideals of our people, and that would involve a much larger sum than the one suggested. If a monument is to be erected, as I think one should be, it should be done on somewhat of a grand style.

Mr. IRVINE: I was very much interested in the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) as regards this question. I was also interested in what was said by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). Perhaps there is a little confusion of mind between the Prime Minister

and the hon. member for Winnipeg. I do not suppose that the latter meant to convey any idea that he was opposed to memorializing the heroism of our Canadian soldiers. I do not think anybody is opposed to that. But this is a matter worthy of much more thought than this House is giving to it, and, perhaps, worthy of more thought than the government has given to it so far. I am just wondering if to build a heap of stone is, after all, the best way of memorializing greatness. I think we shall all be willing to concede the great courage which the Canadian soldiers manifested, and we shall be willing to erect a monument, whether in stone or in some other form, that will express in the best possible way our appreciation of that courage. But if we are seeking to express our appreciation of heroism, would it not be well if it took a little heroism to do that? Can we not find a way of expressing our appreciation of the greatness and heroism of our soldiers that will take a little heroism on the part of legislatures and of Canada? For instance, could we not memorialize them with a statute or, if necessary, more than one statute that would give a shred of reflection of the liberty for which they died, that would be an embodiment of a shadow of the ideal for which they poured out their blood? I do not object to your building a monument that will reach to the stars, if you will, and then it would not express their greatness. But surely there is something deeper, more beautiful, of greater utility than that, and that could be found, perhaps, in legislation, in such an alteration of the economic system under which their brothers are spared to live, under which their children will grow up, that will be a nobler monument than a heap of marble or of rock. So I would suggest that before we hastily decide to follow precedent, to follow the ancient countries that have built their memorials to war, we would seek if haply, we might not find a better way of expressing our appreciation of the greatness of the Canadian soldiers who died in a way that was supposed to end all wars, and who died thinking to bring liberty and peace—and all such words that we have been so fond of mouthing.

One more thought. It looks a little incongruous that we should convert into marble or rock, actual material that seems to be needed by those who happen to have been spared from the great conflict. If we are going to beautify Canada, or Ottawa, or any other city, or any part of the world for that matter, as a means of expressing our respect for our dead, it might be well to wait until we can do that without suffering, if indeed we are so pinched as a nation. That, of course, I do not believe; I do not believe in this miserable prating about economy, and I am prepared to vote against economy of the kind that we have been talking about. But seeing that the government and the people and the House think so, then let us wait until we can do this without a man standing aside and wondering at a dead soldier getting more than a living one. I should like to see a memorial built when the living soldiers can say: "We are not suffering because of that." That is all I think my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg meant to convey, and I would submit that as a thought to the government. There is no hurry. Perhaps this is not the best way of commemorating the dead; but when we do this, let us do it in the best possible way, and I do not know that this would be best expressed in a monument of rock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that I doubt very much whether he or the hon. member to whom he has alluded would have the privilege of speaking in this House to-night the words of liberty which they are professing to utter, but for the sacrifices of the men whose heroism the government is seeking to commemorate in this simple way? The least the nation can do is to erect in its capital some memorial that will be worthy, in its appearance, in its symbolism, in the greatness of its noble position, structure, proportion and beauty, of the spirit that was exemplified in that great sacrifice. My hon. friend has referred to labour. Where do all the great works of art come from? They have been for the most part contributed by those who, born amid humble surroundings through years of struggle and toil, assisted here and there by such bits of inspiration and aid as the nation could give them, have come through their art to be numbered among the country's greatest. When a nation loses what is signified by its art it loses its own spirit, and when it loses the remembrance of the sacrifices and heroism by which it has gained the liberty it enjoys, it loses all the vision that makes a people great.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not want to take up too much of the time of the committee, but I do not wish the implication of the Prime Minister to go unchallenged. There was nothing in what I said that would not express just as much gratitude to the soldiers of Canada as the Prime Minister has expressed; neither have I suggested that we should not build a monument. That is not the point.

The question I raised was whether the proposed monument was the best form in which we could express our gratitude to the soldiers; and in the second place I wondered whether we could not undertake this work at a time when we were economically in a better position to do so. I still think that this perhaps is not the best way, and also that there are other things more necessary to be done at this time. So that in my view it would be well for us to wait a little longer in order that we might carry out in a much better way what is now intended. That is all I said and it is not necessary to throw out the suggestion that anyone is failing to appreciate the sacrifices of the Canadian soldiers.

Item agreed to.

Public buildings—Quebec—Terrebonne—New public building (Governor General's warrant, December 19, 1922), $26,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): During the recent unfortunate fire in this community the Dominion public building was destroyed. A desire was expressed by the citizens that the building should be immediately restored, and owing to the fact that a great many of the people in the community belong to the labouring class it was suggested that it would be of greater advantage to them if the restoration could be undertaken almost at once in order to provide labour for those who had suffered so severely from the fire. The government asked for the Governor General's warrant to undertake the work, and this vote is to confirm the warrant.

Mr. JELLIFF: What is the character of the building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a post office and customs building.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): What is the total cost of the building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): About $35,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the minister's reason for the warrant to be that there were certain persons out of work because of the fire. I do not object to the building being restored, but what was the reason for the warrant?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A public building was suddenly destroyed by fire and there was no way of providing money for its restoration except either to wait until parliament met or to ask for the Governor General's warrant The latter course was followed. My explanation I think is a fair one. The town of Terrebonne is composed largely of labouring people and after the fire many of them who had lost their properties were in distress.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The fire, then, extended beyond the public building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, practically the whole town was burnt.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, that is different.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was felt that some measure of relief could be given by undertaking the immediate restoration of the public building.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That explains the matter, and it seems to be the proper thing to do.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Owen Sound, wharf construction—further amount required, $1,320.05.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the five cents for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This item is to complete the payment on the final estimate of a contract amounting to $97,470. There has been paid $96,150, and the vote is to meet the balance.

Item agreed to.

Port Elgin—alterations to breakwater—further amount required, $960.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does this complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is meant by "alterations to breakwater?"

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was necessary to open up a portion of the breakwater to make a vent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For vessels?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Sheguiandah—wharf reconstruction—further amount required, $1,300.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much has been spent on this reconstruction so far, and does this complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount of $1,300 is required to complete payments on a contract for the reconstruction in cribwork of the superstructure of the wharf of Sheguiandah, which is 225 feet long, 125 feet being 20 feet wide and 100 feet being 40 feet wide, and to repaint the warehouse. The amount of the

contract was $5,496.44. I find that the appropriation is so far reduced that it will only be possible to pay at present to the extent of $4,240, leaving still to pay a balance of $1,256.44.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does this finish the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

LEGISLATION—HOUSE OF COMMONS

Legislation—House of Commons—salaries (including H. P. Arsenault as Chief Translator—Bluebooks—at an initial salary of $3,480, from 1 April, 1923, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act or amendments thereto), $236,545.

Mr. SPEAKER: In explanation of this item, Mr. Chairman, I may say that the staff of translators was short of two or three men last year, and as Mr. Desaulniers, was chief of the Blue Books branch, was superannuated, the question came up of replacing him. There were several men competent for the position, but I had to make a choice which would justify itself not only on the point of professional ability, but also on the point of discipline and administration, and out of the several candidates who were mentioned the name of Mr. Arsenault seemed to me to be the one which would be best favoured by the staff because of his administrative ability and official authority. He is not a newcomer, he has been ten years on the staff. I may say that those who were competitors for the position were agreeable to his election.

Mr. MANION: Have we not divided the staff into two parts really, and put Mr. Arsenault in charge of one part and someone else in charge of the other?

Mr. SPEAKER: We have abolished the position of assistant chief. We have appointed Mr. Arsenault as chief of the Blue Books and Mr. Paradis as chief of the Law Branch translation. They are two very important positions because the reports are read in Europe not only in France but in other countries where the French language is most familiar, and consequently we must have excellent translations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is it necessary to name the official? Does it not come under the Civil Service Act ordinarily, and is not this an appointment outside of the provisions of the act?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and no. The Civil Service Commission have an examination, of course, but all these appointments would have to come before the committee anyway, because the organization of its staff is under the purview of the House of Commons. But when the competition took place before the Civil Service Commission there were, I think, three or four candidates, of whom two were most prominent, Mr. Arsenault and Mr. Keliher? Mr. Keliher himelf came to see me at the time and said he preferred to be in the Hansard branch where we had a vacancy. So we appointed Mr. Arsenault. But as the commission declared that Mr. Keliher should be in Mr. Arsenault's place, we had to come before the committee and word the item as it appears in the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In view of Mr. Keliher's attitude towards the question, could not the commission have changed their nomination?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what I intended, but it was done during my absence in Europe, and I found the estimates as they are. At all events, I would have to come before the committee with the name of Mr. Arsenault in the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand Mr. Keliher is quite agreeable?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, he came to see me and said he was quite willing to go to the Hansard branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does anyone feel that he has been passed over?

Mr. SPEAKER: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reason I ask is that I heard from some source, I cannot remember which at the moment, that there was some disappointment in relation to the appointment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, no.

Item agreed to.

Expenses of committees, extra sessional clerk etc..	$ 77,950 00
Contingencies..	46,385 00
Publishing Debates..	60,000 00
Estimates of Sergeant-at-Arms..	177,442 50

Mr. SPEAKER: The committee will notice quite a substantial decrease. We intend to make a further decrease this year.

Item agreed to.

Library of parliament—salaries, $43,660.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have no details whatever given us with regard to the Department of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say to the hon. gentleman that this year there is a total decrease in the expenditure of this branch of nearly $2,000, although we had to increase the number of cleaners because of the much larger area to be looked after. The committee will realize that it is quite a job to super-

intend this immense building, but notwithstanding the amount of work involved I am sure the committee will notice with pleasure that there has been the decrease in expenditure that I mentioned and a decrease in the staff of five.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I notice in connection with this vote one or two items that should hardly go unchallenged, especially as under them members would seem to be more or less the beneficiaries. I notice the salary of the manager of the joint restaurant is $2,520, and the maintenance of the restaurant $20,000. I cannot understand why such a large sum should be set apart for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): The details will be found on page 20.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As the restaurant is supplied with space, light, heat, furnishing and equipment of all kinds free, it should not cost the country such a large sum as this. I believe that someone has figured it out at about $100 for each person who is entitled to use the restaurant. If the charge for meals is too low, it should be increased. I cannot think we are justified before the country in putting on it a heavy account like this for what is after all simply a convenience for members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The restaurant is under the direction of a joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate. It so happens that we had a meeting at the beginning of the week. This salary of the manager of the restaurant was fixed at the meeting which was held during last session. It is a committee which has been in existence since confederation, and I may say as an old member—in fact, looking around me, as the oldest member of the House—that in all my parliamentary life we have never had a restaurant which gave more satisfaction than the present one. It must be borne in mind that not only the members but their wives share in the benefits afforded by the restaurant, and that we must have a man there who is familiar with restaurant management. We are very fortunate in having Mr. George. I am sure if he were manager of the Chateau Laurier, here, or the Ritz Carlton in Montreal, or any other large hotel, he would receive a much larger salary than that which is paid to him as manager of our restaurant. I have this to say for Mr. George: he came here, I think, as a page; he has been here thirty-five or forty years, and as we say in common parlance, he "knows the ropes." He is diligent; he is sober—naturally; he is very intelligent, and gives excellent service. As I have said, this increased salary has been fixed by the joint committee on the restaurant, comprising members of both Houses. If my hon. friend will think of what is paid to managers of large hotels and even to restaurants in cities and towns, he will realize that this amount is not excessive.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not objecting to the manager's salary in any sense whatever; I have been quite misunderstood. I see in the estimate one item for the manager's salary, $2,520; maintenance, $20,000; and, in the supplementary estimates, a further sum of $7,500. That is a total of $30,000 for the maintenance of this institution. I do not criticize the salary of the manager; I presume it is none too high. I am not criticising in any sense the service rendered by the restaurant. But it does seem to me that from the standpoint of the public at large, $30,000 is a very large sum to pay over and above the granting of a room with free light, heat and equipment. I doubt whether we are justified in asking the public to put up that $30,000, which after all, we know must be paid from the taxes of the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: It must be remembered that in the carrying on of the restaurant we must have a personnel which is not employed the whole year round, and my hon. friend knows that you cannot get servants, domestics, as cheaply to-day as you could some years ago. The food is excellent; there has been no complaint in that respect. Of course it costs a little money, but it is a matter that is in the hands of the legislators. If it is the desire to abolish the restaurant, hon. members have only to say so, but as long as we maintain it for the members, the senators and the principal employees, we must expect to have to pay something. But I made an examination of the accounts the other day, and I am pleased to be able to say that for the first time we shall be able out of the profits—because the restaurant is now a profit-making institution—to apply something in abatement of the expenditure involved in maintenance. So that if under Mr. George the restaurant continues to be well managed, I am sure my hon. friend will next year find that figure for maintenance much decreased.

Item agreed to.

Library of parliament—	
Salaries	$43,660 00
Books for the General Library, including binding	18,000 00
Books for the Library of American History	1,000 00
Contingencies	12,500 00
To provide for the cost of printing reports	1,000 00
	$76,160 00

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the resolution carrying, but I have been impressed, as one who has now got to be a pretty old member of the House, by the fact that there is a great deal of money wasted in the library. Although I use it about as much as the average member, if not more—I am sorry to say, not as much in recent years as formerly—I am sure there is a great deal of stuff bought for the library that I do not think anyone sees from one year's end to the other. I think it would be well to bring home to the librarians the wisdom of revising the whole purchase programme to see if economies could not be effected by curtailing some of the things for which we now vote very considerable sums. The library also is getting cluttered up, and there is scarcely room to get around. I know it has been rearranged lately and very much improved in that respect, but I would think that something should be done to bring the reading matter that is in the library more in conformity with the actual needs of members of parliament. It seems to me it now spreads into too large a field and that much that is there is not worth the room it occupies.

11 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. gentleman is quite right. Last year there was a meeting of the joint committee on the Library of Parliament, which is composed, as in the case of the restaurant committee, of members of both houses, and on that occasion we decided to remove to the Archives building many of the files of old papers that were accumulating in the library. I agree that a better choice of books might be made. The trouble with the library is that it is at present in a transient stage. As the right hon. gentleman knows, when the construction of this building was decided upon, plans were made to extend the library, but in view of the extra cost involved it was decided to postpone these suggested changes. The result is that many valuable books were never seen on the shelves but are stored away below the Senate lobby and in an area extending nearly up to our portion of the building. The purchase of books, reviews, encyclopædias, etc., might be a little more judicious than it has been. The librarian of to-day, or to express myself more correctly the up-to-date librarian, differs totally from the librarian of yesterday. To-day the conduct of the library amounts to a science. The library of congress at Washington is a magnificient library. They have there probably the most elaborate organization I have seen in that regard. Over there the management of libraries has developed into a science and in the universities lectures have been given on the art of becoming an efficient librarian. So far we have not enjoyed that advantage in Canada but our institutions of this character are developing. We now possess libraries, thanks to the munificence of Carnegie and other benefactors of humanity. For the future I believe we certainly ought to adopt the views of the right hon. gentleman and see to it that our parliamentary library is especially adapted to the needs of parliament.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad that the Speaker has called attention to the modern scientific libraries. It would appear that with the immense amount that is being spent on our library, and with the large number of books we already possess, there ought to be some better arrangement for caring for them than exists at present. I think anyone who knows anything about libraries will recognize there is a handicap our librarians suffer from that cannot very well be overcome. I refer to the lack of stock room. Undoubtedly that is a very great inconvenience. The books are packed into a space that is really not sufficient for more than a quarter of their number. Not only is the arrangement bad, but the structure is far from being modern. I wonder sometimes whether, until such times as we have a suitable library building, the library could not be departmentalized and certain sections of it placed in other parts of the building, making it more available than it is to-day. Further, I should like to suggest that although the librarians are kindness itself we ought to have some more modern system of indexing and cataloguing than prevails at the present time.

The hon. the Speaker has referred to the congressional library. At Washington, they have worked out a system of cataloguing and indexing that might be very well applied to our library here. The system is being adopted in many small libraries throughout the country and is proving a very great convenience to anyone wanting to consult the institution. Further than that, it would be a very great advantage to all the members if some system were adopted for filing clippings, magazine articles and legislative material dealing particularly with topics that concern us in parliament. I remember a few years ago visiting the state library in Wisconsin where Mr. Charles McCarthy, who was rather a genius and tremendously interested in this work, had evolved a very valuable scheme for making available to all the members of the state legislature the information that existed

with regard to any subject that was likely to come before the members of the House. Although I happen to be a comparatively new member, I would respectfully suggest that the system that was worked out with regard to the legislative department of the Wisconsin state library might very well be investigated by some of our departmental heads with a view to adopting it or adapting it, with possibly some modifications, for our use in Canada.

Item agreed to.

Senate—salaries and contingent expenses, $162,040.

Mr. MANION: I was going to suggest that as we have passed a great many items and it is now after eleven o'clock it would be a good idea to call it a day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If there is any objection to this item I will agree to its consideration being delayed. However, I have looked over the items pretty carefully and I think that on the whole there is a considerable reduction in the amount. What there is in the way of increases appears to be simply increases that would be permitted by statute. I doubt whether there is any particular point in regard to the estimates that hon. members would wish to discuss before they are passed. They are adopted, I believe, pretty much as a matter of form in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then they would not take much time to pass when they are next considered. I do not know whether any particular objection is entertained in regard to them or not, but if we get as much done every day as we have done to-day, we will not be here long.

Item stands.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.08 p.m.

Monday, May 14, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY EVENING SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With the consent of the House, I move, seconded by Mr. Fielding, that on Wednesday, the 16th instant, and on subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the session, the sittings of the House shall in every respect be under the same rules as provided for other days.

Motion agreed to.

]Mr. Woodsworth.]

THE BUDGET DEBATE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): With the consent of the House, I beg to move that the order for consideration of the motion for Mr. Speaker to leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Ways and Means have precedence over all other business, except the introduction of bills, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

SATURDAY SITTINGS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Will the Prime Minister tell us when the government proposes to commence Saturday sittings? It is very hard for the ordinary country legal practitioner to remain in attendance in Ottawa while the courts are being held throughout the country. I know that other members of parliament will find it difficult to remain here, and if the session is going to be stretched out to a very great length it will cause great inconvenience to many members. Therefore, I should like the Prime Minister to let us know when Saturday sittings will be commenced, and when we may hope for a termination of the session.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am not in a position to give my hon. friend a definite reply. He is, perhaps, as capable of judging of the length of the session as I am. I should certainly say that during the present month the government would not consider the holding of Saturday sittings. Whether such sittings may be advisable or not a little later on will depend on the work which comes to the House from the committees. My hon. friend may be assured the government will keep in mind the point he has mentioned.

DELAY IN BRITISH MAILS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Postmaster General): On Friday last the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) asked a question concerning delay in the transmission of newspapers from the Old Land to Canada and gave an example of one paper that was in transit from 6th April till 7th May. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in replying pointed out the extraordinary conditions that had prevailed during the past season—great storms in the ocean and almost calamities for the railways. Besides, sometimes there are delays at the beginning. A weekly paper is published, say, on the 6th,

but the first sailing to carry the mail may not take place until a week from that date—a week lost to start with. Take the case the hon. member has referred to. He referred to the date, April 6th. The paper was probably despatched by the British post office by the Marloch, sailing from Glasgow on 13th April and due to arrive at St. John on the 21st. This is one of the slower Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, and on this particular trip she had one of the worst passages she ever experienced, and did not arrive at St. John until the 29th of April—eight days over-due. The mails were forwarded from St. John on the same day, but owing to a washout on the line the train did not get farther than McAdam junction, and had to return to St. John. Permission then had to be obtained to run the train east of Moncton and via the Canadian National Lines to Montreal. This was done, but the train did not reach Montreal until the 3rd of May. As a result, the mails reached Toronto Friday evening the 4th. Owing to these delays, these mails reached Toronto at the same time as British mails from the Montcalm and the Canada, thus throwing an immense volume of mail at one time upon the Toronto post office and causing more or less congestion. In this way the particular paper in question was not delivered until Monday morning the 7th of May. The delay in its transmission as set forth above will be seen however, to be wholly exceptional. I might add that on 11th May, the day the hon. member asked the question, the London Times of 1st May was in the reading room —just ten days.

Mr. HOCKEN: Was the Marloch the first ship that sailed after the date of publication?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not be sure, but it was the first ship which the British government used for the transmission of mails.

Mr. HOCKEN: Does the British government not use the Canadian Pacific railway steamships, and did not the Empress of Britain sail before the Marloch?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think not.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is my information.

Dr. A. M. LOWE

CANADIAN CITIZEN IN NORTHERN CHINA CAPTURED AND MALTREATED

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I should like to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister a matter which has been referred to me, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read this telegram which is from the firm of Lowe, Buswell Company, Limited, of Vancouver, and addressed to Brigadier General Clark and myself:

> You will have read in newspapers that Canadian citizen A. M. Lowe was beaten bound and made captive in northern China afterwards released on representations British consul. Urge you take up matter in session demanding explanation from Chinese government and substantial damages for outrage. Doctor Lowe member this firm and born in Victoria, B.C., resident in China two years. Your attention this matter will be very much appreciated.

Has the government taken cognizance of this incident and made any representations in protection and in behalf of Canadian citizens to the government of China, asking for the usual explanations and damages, if such, according to custom, are deemed warranted.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): A communication very similar to the one which my hon. friend has just read was received from the same firm by the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) towards the latter part of last week and was referred to the Department of External Affairs. I ascertained at the time that the Under Secretary of State for External Affairs had already instituted an inquiry into the incident to which my hon. friend has made reference. My hon. friend will appreciate that conditions are very much disturbed in China at the present time. Mr. Lowe was one of fourteen or fifteen, I think, who were similarly treated. He was released immediately after his capture, and the government of China made some apology; our government notwithstanding is making representations as to the incident with a view of seeing what reply the Chinese government may wish to make.

MANITOBA GRAND JURIES

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Manitoba legislature has passed a resolution, I believe unanimously, asking that it be relieved of the expense of grand juries—indeed, that the grand jury system be abolished. It has petitioned the government to introduce this year legislation amending the code so as to make the desired change. Does the government purpose doing so?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would like the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) to reply to this question. As soon as he takes his seat, I will direct his attention to the question.

*WHEAT BOARD LEGISLATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the government yet passed its order in council bringing into effect the extension of the wheat board legislation of last year?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not yet.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there a difference of opinion?

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 160 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edgar Lindsay.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 161 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Marigoli Hare.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 162 (from the Senate), for the relief of Esther Levin.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 163 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hilda Marguerite Watt Black.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 164 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abigal Aileen McCrea Tull.—Mr. Duff.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

LABRADOR GOLDFIELDS, LIMITED

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Labrador Goldfields, Limited, been incorporated under a federal charter?
2. What is the capital of the company and the number and face value of the shares?
3. What are the names, place of residence and occupation of the applicants for the charter?
4. Is it a fact that part of the ground on which the company has announced to have obtained leases from the Newfoundland government is in disputed territory between the latter and the Dominion government?
5. Is it true that the Federal government has waived or intends to waive its possible rights of sovereignty on above mentioned position of the ground supposed to be covered by leases by the Newfoundland government to the said Labrador Goldfields, Limited?
6. Has the government received or any member thereof, representations to the effect that the details of the very peculiar way of disposing by parcels of the leases has been hatched in the city of New York and the possibilities of gold findings on the Labrador coast heralded in the papers of that city?
7. Is it the intention of the government either directly or through the Quebec government to place before the public, before it is too late to protect them, whatever information they may have with whatever possibilities there are of gold finding?
8. Is the government aware that the Labrador Goldfields, Limited, have on the market for sale and selling as fast as possible, lease of ¼ of one acre of their 25,000 leased acres, at the initial cost of $200 in cash for each quarter of an acre which would net them $20,000,000 with very problematic return for the investors?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

*See correction, pages 2740 and 2741.

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes.

2. Capital, $50,000 divided into 5,000 shares of $10 each.

3. Honora Charlotte Bellew and Beatrice Frances Ann Bellew, stenographers, Mary Lawlor, spinster, John Brown, contractor, and Arthur Thomas Forbes, bond broker, all of the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec.

4. No official information of the precise area of the claims held by the Labrador Goldfields Limited under mining leases granted by the Newfoundland government, but if it may be assumed from the published advertisements of this company that their claims are situated on rivers flowing into Stag bay, then the whole of the area covered by their leases is within the disputed territory.

5. No; the Dominion government neither has waived nor intends to waive any rights of sovereignty which belong to the Dominion in its own right or in that of the province of Quebec over or within the territory covered by the leases referred to; and it is not probable that the Newfoundland government can acquire any advantage by acts of administration while the boundary case is pendente lite.

6. No information.

7. The provisions of the company's act requires a prospectus to be filed and contracts to be referred to, liability for mis-statements is provided for. The government has no information regarding finding of gold on the property of the company.

8. No information.

RHINELAND OCCUPATION

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What was the cost to Canada for the Canadian army of occupation that was sent into Rhineland?
2. Did Germany or Canada pay for that cost?
3. At what date did this occupation cease?
4. Is the government aware that the American forces on the Rhine did not cost the United States a penny, that the Germans were paying the whole bill?
5. If Germany did not foot this bill for Canada, why did Canada receive a different treatment than the United States in that matter?

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD:

1 and 2. It was estimated by the Overseas Ministry that the cost to Canada for the Canadian army of occupation amounted to $7,350,956.70.

At a conference of prime ministers, and representatives of the United Kingdom the Dominions and India, the allocation of the sums received from Germany was decided upon, Canada's share being $6,314,500. This amount has been paid.

3. March, 1919.

4. No information.

5. Answered by 1 and 2.

MR. GEORGE WEDGE

Mr. CHAPLIN:

1. Is George Wedge employed in the transformer house of the Railways and Canals department at Thorold?
2. If so, how long has he been employed by the Department of Railways and Canals?
3. Has he always performed his duties satisfactorily?
4. Is he now being discharged? If so, why?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. About ten years.
3. As regards the department, there have been no complaints.
4. No.

PORT ARTHUR ELEVATOR

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. What was the total amount of No. 1 standard screenings at the government elevator at Port Arthur for the years ending August 30th, 1920-21-22?
2. What was the total amount of revenue received in each of the above years from all screenings?
3. Were the said No. 1 standard screenings recleaned in the said elevator?
4. If so, what was the total revenue for each year:—(a) from the recleaned screenings, (b) from the refuse screenings?
5. During the said years, to whom, at what price and what amount did the government sell, (a) No. 1 standard screenings, (b) recleaned screenings, (c) refuse screenings?
6. Were the said screenings at any time offered to public tender?
7. Did the government officials mix the grain extracted from the said screenings with other grain in the elevator?
8. In accounting to the shipper for screenings, as provided by law, was said accounting and payment for the No. 1 standard screenings before being recleaned or only at the rate allowed for refuse screenings?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: This question requires information from Fort William, and, I notice, covers a period of three years. Unless we have the report, we may allow it to stand for this week; but if the report does not come along next week, we may have the question stand as an order for return.

Question stands.

COLONEL J. A. SPONAGLE

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Was Colonel J. A. Sponagle of Middleton, Nova Scotia, appointed Port Physician at Margaretville, Annapolis county? If so, when?
2. Did the said Colonel Sponagle serve overseas as medical officer of the 25th Battalion?
3. Were the said Colonel Sponagle's services dispensed with after the year 1921?
4. Was the customs officer at Margaretville notified by the department in future Dr. F. S. Messenger of Middleton would be employed instead of said Colonel Sponagle?
5. Did the said Dr. Messenger have military service overseas?
6. What was the reason for dispensing with the services of said Colonel J. A. Sponagle?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. This officer was struck off strength, the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 16th February, 1920.
4. No.
5. There is no record of Dr. F. S. Messenger having served overseas with the Canadian Forces as an officer or other rank.
6. Lieut. Colonel Sponagle was struck off the strength the Canadian Expeditionary Force on general demobilization.

FUNGUS AND INSECT CONTROL

Mr. LADNER:

1. What is the organization of the two services dealing with fungi and insects respectively of the forests of Canada?
2. What are the relative duties and the relative compensations provided for the technical staffs of the two services referred to?
3. Does the government consider these two services, namely:—That which deals with fungi and that which deals with insects, of equal economic importance?
4. Has the department during the last ten years carried out any investigation with respect to damages in the forests of British Columbia, under Dominion control, caused by fungi and by insects?
5. If so, in what years were such investigations carried out and of what did the investigation consist?
6. Is it the intention of the government during the summer months of 1924 or 1925 to carry out investigations relative to the causes and control of damage caused to forest trees in British Columbia by fungi and by insects?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. As far as diseases of forest trees caused by fungi are concerned, this work is done in a subdivision of the division of botany of the Central Experimental farm, Ottawa. In the Entomological branch of the Department of Agriculture, there is a definite organization known as the Division of Forest Insects. Officers of this division investigate insect outbreaks of forests and their control in the various provinces.

2. The duties of a forest pathologist, include the study of the damage due to fungi, the ecological conditions predisposing forest trees towards disease, the taxonomy and morphology of fungi, together with a study of economic control measures possible under prevailing lumbering conditions. The staff of the section dealing with fungi of forests—apart from the general direction of this work by the divisional chief, as far as his other duties will permit, consists of one permanent plant pathologist, with a salary of $2,400—$2,760, and a number of seasonal men of minor qualifications whoes salaries and expenses amount to approximately $8,000. The duties of the entomologists attached to the division of forest insects, are to study the life histories

of important forest and shade tree insects, the natural control of the same, as well as all phases relating to artificial control. The amount, including salaries, devoted to forest insect investigations in 1922 amounted to approximately $22,100.

3. It is difficult to make comparisons between these two services, but just at present insects are working more injury to forests than fungi. But the injury effected by fungi is frequently less obtrusive, although it may be quite as great as that caused by insects, hence it is not possible to say definitely whether one is of more economic importance than the other.

4. Only occasional observations as to damage caused by fungi have so far been possible in British Columbia. Certain definite studies of conditions relating to the outbreak of white pine blister rust were made during the past year and a half. Investigations have been carried out, during the last ten years, with respect to damages caused by insects in the forests of British Columbia.

5. With respect to fungi: The investigations have been carried on since September, 1921, and consist principally in determining the areas in British Columbia affected by blister rust and investigations of the susceptible secondary host plants, including a study of distances fungus spores are carried. With respect to insects: Every year practically, particularly since the establishment of a division of forest insects in 1914. Since this latter year investigations have related particularly to the spruce budworm, the forest tent caterpillar, the fall webworm, various species of bark-beetles, borers, etc. From biological investigations conducted, information of great value was obtained based upon which control operations were directed.

6. Yes.

MR. GEORGE FRENETTE

Mr. HANSON:

1. On what date was Mr. George Frenette dismissed from the civil service as postmaster at St. Jean l'Evangeliste?

2. Why was he dismissed?

3. How long was the post office located where it stood prior to the dismissal of Mr. Frenette?

4. Were any petitions received by the Post Office Department pleading for the reinstatement of Mr. Frenette as postmaster?

5. Did the department receive any official report as to the convenience of the locality of the post office at St. Jean l'Evangeliste under the postmastership of Mr. Frenette? If so, what was the substance of that report and by whom was it signed, and on what date?

6. Did the Post Office Department advise the Civil Service Commission that the locality of the post office under the postmastership of Mr. Frenette was inconveniently situated and if so on what date was such advice sent to the Civil Service Commission by the Post Office Department?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Office moved from the residence of Mr. George Frenette to residence of Mr. Charles Alfred Green on 26th December, 1922, on a report from the member for the constituency, Hon. Charles Marcil, to the effect that the site of the office did not serve the convenience of the great majority of the patrons.

2. Office moved to a site more convenient to the majority of the patrons.

3. Since 1st April, 1896.

4. Yes.

5. On 16th February, 1923, a report signed by S. Tanner Green, District Superintendent, Quebec, was received, to the effect that 51 families receive their mail at St. Jean l'Evangeliste post office; 12 families are located on high ground on a stretch of three miles north-west from the parish church; 24 families live on the lower level on a stretch of one mile. The remainder of the families who receive their mail are located on the south side of the Nouvelle river, and have their exit by a road close to the residence of Mr. Green. Mr. Frenette's residence would be more suitable for the twelve people on the hill, but Mr. Green's residence would be more suitable for the people who live on the lower level, and also those who are located on the south side of the Nouvelle river. The parish of St. Jean l'Evangeliste, which has a population of 1706 is served by six minor post offices besides the St. Jean l'Evangeliste post office, the latter being the only money order office. Looking at this question from that aspect it may be stated that 606 people occupy territory situated west of the parish church and the residence of Mr. Frenette, or an area which extends eight miles; 549 people live east of the parish church, on a tract which extends three miles to the vicinity of the Robitaille post office. The remainder of the population, 497 people, are located on the peninsula to the southward. Out of a population of 1706, 1046 must pass by Green's door to go to the church, and among the 51 nearer patrons of the office, 39 have to pass Green's door to reach the residence of Mr. Frenette.

6. The Post Office Department advised the Civil Service Commission on March 27, 1923, to the effect that as the department had decided to remove the office to the vicinity of Mr. Green's residence in the middle of the village and near the railway station, where it would afford better public service to the majority of the patrons of the office, it was considered that Mr. Frenette's application to keep the post office at the old location could not be taken into consideration.

PURCHASING COMMISSION

Mr. SHAW:

1. Under what authority does the Purchasing Commission operate?
2. Is such authority, if any, legally sufficient and adequate?
3. If such authority is legally insufficient and inadequate what does the government propose to do?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Under authority of order in council P. C. 1077 of April 4, 1921.

2 and 3. The points raised in these questions are under consideration.

MOOSE JAW INCOME TAX OFFICE

Mr. HOPKINS:

1. Does the government intend to close the Moose Jaw Income Tax office?
2. If so, why and when?
3. If not, how much further is the present systematic reduction of the staff to be carried?
4. What status is it proposed to give the office, and what are the reasons for making the office junior to Regina and Prince Albert?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Staff will be increased or decreased as required to maintain an efficient service.

4. No change in the status as a sub-district office is anticipated. Economy and efficiency in administration.

CONDEMNATION INSURANCE

Mr. SPENCER:

1. Have any steps been taken or orders issued in the past by the Department of Agriculture looking towards the discontinuance of the system of condemnation insurance in Canada?
2. If so, upon whose request was this done?
3. Was it carried into effect?
4. If such an order was issued and not carried into effect, what was the reason for the failure to do so?
5. Upon whose request or demand was this failure brought about?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes.

2. Many requests had been received from different sources but action was taken specifically upon resolution from the Western Canada Live Stock Union.

3. No.

4. The order was first issued early in 1920 based upon a ruling by the Justice department pointing out that the charges referred to would appear to require legislative sanction unless justified by well-established usage. Subsequently, however, in the same year, it was agreed with the various live stock interests, producers and packers both being included, that it would be inadvisable to put the order of discontinuance into effect unless and until a constructive policy could be developed, providing comprehensively for the elimination of tuberculosis in commercial cattle. This agreement led to the organization of the Animal Contagious Diseases Eradication Board, for the purpose of working out such a policy. This board met on several occasions and agreed upon a progressive programme which was submitted to the government. This programme the government felt could not be financed by itself alone and that the producers would be expected to assist by taxing themselves in connection with the sale of commercial cattle. This question was referred to the Western Canada Live Stock Union in December, 1920, but in view of the fact that it was found impossible to reach an agreement as between the government and producers' interests respecting the financing of the policy, the programme which had been drafted was, by force of circumstances, allowed to drop. This being the case the order was not put into effect and the matter has not been since presented to the government.

5. Answered by No. 4.

RAISINS IMPORTED

Mr. PARENT:

1. What quantity of raisins were imported into Canada each year during the last five years?
2. What quantity of said raisins were imported into each province during each of the said years?
3. From what countries were the said raisins imported?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Total imports or raisins entered for consumption in Canada during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1919 to 1923:

—	Fiscal year, 1919	Fiscal year, 1920	Fiscal year, 1921	Fiscal year, 1922	Fiscal year, 1923
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Total	34,337,814	37,619,365	24,979,194	27,666,692	32,044,480

2. Imports of raisins entered for consumption in each province during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1919 to 1923:

Province	Fiscal year, 1919	Fiscal year, 1920	Fiscal year, 1921	Fiscal year, 1922	Fiscal year, 1923
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Nova Scotia	2,064,367	1,855,309	1,341,931	1,389,220	1,832,458
New Brunswick	1,563,508	1,485,512	681,067	893,843	1,492,149
Prince Edward Island	354,975	249,120	194,179	129,745	242,971
Quebec	4,166,425	5,523,063	4,145,056	4,393,656	4,703,529
Ontario	17,017,553	14,298,074	11,534,881	11,455,974	13,537,329
Manitoba	3,094,971	4,827,584	2,810,914	3,218,996	3,517,176
Saskatchewan	1,610,234	2,577,319	1,214,880	1,741,258	1,810,895
Alberta	1,695,931	3,239,408	1,381,305	2,041,674	2,191,335
British Columbia	2,760,432	3,558,060	1,662,259	2,401,330	2,706,089
Yukon	9,418	5,916	12,722	996	10,549
Totals	34,337,814	37,619,365	24,979,194	27,666,692	32,044,480

3. Countries from which raisins were imported during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1919 to 1923:

Country	Fiscal year, 1919	Fiscal year, 1920	Fiscal year, 1921	Fiscal year, 1922	Fiscal year, 1923
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
United Kingdom	.....	9,262	83,838	99,109	105,496
Australia	11,200	.....	154,000	.....	280
Bermuda	.....	.....	420	.....	2,050
British S. Africa	.....	.....	.....	98,750	36,700
Hong Kong	.....	18	7	.....	.....
Newfoundland	50	.....	475	.....	144
France	.....	.....	.....	7,787	.....
Greece	.....	12,757	338,381	474,661	127,956
Spain	115,723	383,836	2,417,724	1,178,678	930,598
Syria	.....	.....	.....	.....	150
Turkey	.....	348,551	1,594,161	1,629,784	194,191
United States	34,210,841	36,864,941	20,390,188	24,177,923	30,646,915
Totals	34,337,814	37,619,365	24,979,194	27,666,692	32,044,480

RUSH—BAGOT AGREEMENT

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. What progress, if any, has been made toward the negotiations of the new treaty which the government has proposed to effect with the United States to take the place of the present Rush-Bagot Treaty?

2. Does the government intend to continue these negotiations?

3. If so, what does the government expect to achieve thereby which will be of real advantage to Canada?

4. Is it the intention of the government that the present British Ambassador to the United States shall be permitted to sign such treaty along with the representative of Canada when same is complete?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Negotiations looking to the conclusion of a treaty to take the place of the Rush-Bagot agreement of the 29th April, 1817, are still in progress.

2. Yes.

3. The removal of possibility of friction in matters connected with naval armament on the Great Lakes between this country and the United States.

4. This matter will be determined at such time as final action is taken.

[Mr. Bureau.]

LAKE OF THE WOODS LEVELS

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. What is the present condition of the negotiations with the United States regarding the Lake of the Woods levels and the problems incident thereto?

2. Has any progress been made within the last year? If so, what?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Negotiations are proceeding between the governments concerned, and satisfactory progress is being made.

2. Answered by No. 1.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MARGAREE RIVER

Mr. HANSON:

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the Margaree river Salmon Fisheries Association during the year 1922 and the present year, including in particular, all papers, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the membership or ownership of such association, and the distribution of moneys payable by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the association or the members thereof.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—EQUIPMENT ORDERS

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a return showing all orders for equipment placed by the Canadian National Railways since October 4th, 1922, including orders for cars of different kinds, separately stated; for engines of different kinds, separately stated, with prices in each case or basis of prices, and comparison of such prices with last prices at which similar goods were ordered. The said return to contain also names of firms and location of factories, with whom such orders have been placed, and where same are to be filled. Also showing all correspondence and requisitions between officers of the companies and any member of the government referring to the necessity for such orders.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—NEW POSITIONS

Mr. RYCKMAN:

For return showing all new positions created and filled as offices of the Canadian National Railways since October 4th, 1922, together with salaries attaching to such positions and the name of the appointee to each. Showing also all salaries raised and all salaries, if any, diminished, of the officers of the Canadian National Railways or Canadian Mercantile Marine, since October 4th, 1922, with particulars as to previous and present salary in each case.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection to the motion on the understanding that it shall also include information in regard to positions abolished.

ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, have any objection to the third reading of the bill respecting the Italian Convention to-day?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the third reading of Bill No. 153, respecting a certain Trade Convention between his Majesty and the King of Italy.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time.

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

On motion of Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister) Bill No. 54 to provide for the investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers, was read the third time and passed.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Friday May 11th, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, when I rose on Friday it was for the pleasant purpose, in the first instance, of congratulating my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance. I rise now to discharge a duty that is not quite so pleasant; I have now to condone with the hon. gentleman. I must tell him how much I sympathize with him not only in regard to the extent of the work that he has had in hand but because of his inability, after four months of the session of parliament, to make any appreciable change in the situation, as well as his utter inability to disclose any message or policy for the Canadian people and the utter absence of any programme of any kind from his budget. I am quite sure my hon. friend has done his best with the material he has on hand, with the burdens which he is subject to, and limited and bound as he is by his mixed surroundings. The budget has a very notable omission this year. Usually budgets are begun with a review of world conditions and Canadian trade; and a review this year would have been very gratifying if it had taken into account the evidences of Canadian industry and production. The minister could have shown very good figures—figures due to the enormous harvest of last year having regard to our agricultural exports; he could have shown very good figures in connection with sales of our forest products—pulp, paper, newsprint, and the like—sales which have very materially advanced owing in large part to the tremendous expansion which our neighbours to the south are at present enjoying; he could also have shown that the late government were not very much wrong when they looked upon Canada as the legitimate manufacturing and export field for American industry owing to the preference which we are able to obtain in the British and other markets of the Empire. He could have shown, for example, that the factories which under our administration were built at Oshawa are now doing a very large share of the export business of the American automobile makers. He could have shown all that, but at the same time he could have claimed credit for nothing.

There was, however, one real reason why it was not done. My hon. friends have claimed credit for all kinds of prosperity in the past; they have claimed credit for our golden days, for our weather, and for our crops, with which of course they had nothing to do. But, I repeat, there was one reason why nothing of

the kind was done this year. To have said anything of that sort would immediately have invited a comparison between what we are doing here in Canada and what other people are doing. On the one hand, it would have invited comparison of how this country—which the government last year described as being left in a better position than any other country in the world—stood after eighteen months of their administration in relation to other countries which they thought, and justly so, it was so much ahead of. For example, we would immediately have had a comparison drawn between the deficit of former years of other countries and our deficit on this year's operations. This year's deficit is $57,000,000. It is not $49,000,000, because the deficit ought to be considered having regard to the results of the year's operations without taking into account the exchanges earned in previous years, and if we take away the $8,000,000 which is applied for the purpose of reducing the year's deficit, we find that we have a deficit growing out of this year's operations of $57,000,000. That would have been thrown into very glaring contrast with the redemption of debt that is going on to the south, it would have been thrown into very glaring contrast with the credit balance that the Mother Country reports this year, representing, if I remember rightly, in the neighbourhood of £100,000,000. But more than that it would have been thrown into very direct contrast with what countries are doing which have suffered tremendously from depreciated currency. The daily press tells us that the finance committee of the French Senate has adopted the report of Senator Bérenger on the budget for the current year, which balances the budget with an estimated surplus of nearly 400,000,000 francs. This is in contrast with a deficit of nearly 4,000,000,000 francs estimated by the French Chamber. So there was a very good reason why the usual thing was not done in this instance.

Well, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how we can describe this budget. What kind of a budget is it? What is its object? In what is it instructive? How does it help us in so far as governmental policy is concerned? How does it help us in so far as our own finances are concerned? How does it help us in connection with the tariff? I do not suppose that anyone will call it a low tariff budget when it contains increases in some instances and a general tariff of 37½ per cent on the new item of artificial silk. Neither can it be described as a tariff for revenue. We certainly need revenue this year, if we ever did. But this is a tariff that loses revenue, it is a tariff which is budgeting for a decrease in excise taxes, for example, of $5,600,000. It is a tariff which provides for a reduction in our sugar revenues of $2,500,000, that reduction, of course, being justified on the ground that there will be a decrease to the extent of half a cent a pound in favour of the consumer. Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister himself pointed out that we had cheap sugar with these very duties; sugar was high during the war, it was cheap afterwards. He pointed out, as the fact is, that the price of sugar is not at all related to the rate of duty at the present time, but that it is supposed to be a matter of speculation, something entirely removed from the question of duty; but nevertheless, at a time when we ought not to throw away one cent of revenue we are sacrificing $2,500,000 by reducing a tax under which in the past we had cheap sugar. No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a tariff for revenue.

I do not suppose anyone would call it a tariff for free trade. Hardly. We have heard a belated plea for business stability—a plea which had it only been made eighteen months ago, when hon. gentlemen opposite first came into power, and been acted upon, would have resulted relatively in just as much improvement and progress here in Canada as we see to-day in the United States. But we have that belated plea. No longer do my hon. friends opposite think it is a good thing to get rid of the dog's tail by cutting off an inch at a time and expect the dog to thrive. That idea is exploded. We cannot get free trade by slow degrees and continue to function. We have had the threat hanging over us, with the result that we have had a dead year when we ought to have had a good year.

But the tariff will not be described as a free trade tariff—not only in view of that plea but also in connection with the direct aid to new industries. Why, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how this budget ought to be labelled. It has not as many spots as a leopard, but it has infinitely more colours. It is a beautiful bit of camouflage. It is something which goes a small way in every direction, something which is going to throw a sop here and a sop there and a general kick all round when the final result is obtained. You cannot go north, south, east and west at the same time, but that is what this budget is trying to do. It is a political budget, a budget of expediency. I can sympathize with my hon. friend, because I am sure he has done the best he could with the material available, with the divergent views prevailing among those who surround

him, and with a policy which is such a vanishing, a lost thing, as that Liberal platform.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a few more changes in the tariff. —2½ per cent off here and there. I do not know whether 2½ per cent is popular down in Nova Scotia, but if the hon. minister went through Ontario he would hear a lot about two-and-a-half per cent there. In fact, two-and-a-half per cent Ontario beer may become famous. I wonder whether the minister thinks there is something in these particular figures, or whether 2½ per cent in tariff tinkering is the standard by which he thinks we ought to be governed? We had quite a lot of these little reductions last year, we have not so many of them in the present budget—perhaps just enough to carry into this year something of the paralysis that was to be found last year in so many quarters.

What evidence of principle can we find anywhere in the tariff. What evidence of principle is there in connection with any of the reductions made? Why are the reductions made that are made? As to the increases, there is an increase which is to help us negotiate a treaty with Australia; that is a perfectly proper, a perfectly logical and business-like procedure. The lesson has been learned only too late, had my hon. friends learned it before, the Minister of Finance would have been relieved of many of his difficulties in connection with the preparation of this budget. But apart from that item, what reason is there for any of these increases? I find none—looking back to past treatment. It is idle of course, to look to the Liberal platform as affording any reasons why anything should be done now. It is discarded; it is disgraced. The thing ought never to have been born; it never breathed; it represented a principle that the chief financial authority of the party says he was never bound by. Last year, while we were to discard the Liberal platform, he invited us to see what he said in the House in discussing these different tariff matters and suggested that we would then find out what the Liberal platform was, or, rather, what it ought to be.

Now, I will turn to something my friend said. I am going to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. gentleman's statement reported in Hansard of 1921, page 3153, as follows:

> If there are any people in Canada who are contemplating the establishing of new lines of business in which they feel that tariff protection is necessary, I do them a friendly service when I say: "Don't do it." because anybody who counts upon the continuance of a protective policy is bound to find that he is pursuing a delusion. If any outside capitalist purposes coming to Canada to start some industry which he believes can only be kept alive by protection, again, I advise him not to come. . . . Protection, like conscience, "makes cowards of us all." We lose faith in our country. Let us get away from that, let us find the things that we can produce, that God and nature intended us to produce.

That was the last deliverance made by my hon. friend upon the subject in opposition. I have tried to get his considered views down to the latest possible point, and this was his statement during the last session of the House before the present government came into power. Bearing that in mind, I wonder on what principle my hon. friend acts this year? On what principle does he deal with artificial silk? Now, the manufacture of artificial silk is an entirely new industry here. Let us see what he says about it, bearing in mind his remarks, to which I have referred, on the last occasion that he could very well deal with the subject in this House while in Opposition. I quote from his budget speech of this year:

> A new industry is promised us for the manufacture of artificial silk. It is represented to us that this industry will employ a large amount of labour and we have every reason to believe that if we can make encouraging terms a great industry will be established. We propose to make a classification in which it will be treated largely as silk and we have every reason to hope this will lead to a very important industry being established.

I may point out to my hon. friend that the classification hardly does that. As I read it, the classification is one which he has to draw for the purpose of avoiding the procedure by which silk duties and other duties on luxuries were reduced in connection with the French treaty. His items read that way all through—items referring to artificial silk, winding up with item 583d, "manufactures of artificial silk or artificial fibre silk," and so on, carrying a duty of 30 per cent preferential tariff, 35 per cent intermediate tariff and 37½ per cent general tariff. Now, what principle does my hon. friend go on? He is certainly not going on the principle that he himself laid down that nothing should be started in Canada that requires protection, whether from the inside or from the outside. We have here a direct protection. My hon. friend is in the position of saying the wrong thing and doing the right, but the trouble is we do not know how often he is going to do the right; in the absence of all principle we cannot tell. Then, there is the case of copper bars. Bearing in mind what he said in 1921, here is what my hon. friend says this year about copper bars:

> All these bars and rods are thus imported free. Neither of these copper products is produced in Canada for the reason that our producers are unable to compete with large manufacturing enterprises in the United States.

I wonder if that is a phrase which the government consider they have the right to use

only when sitting on the benches over there. I wonder if they have only caught it since they moved over there? It is a very familiar phrase that I have heard denounced and held up to ridicule. The minister continues:

> We sympathize very warmly with the desire to have a larger development of the copper industry in the Dominion.

Then there is the matter of hemp. My hon. friend says:

> There is another industry to which we are going to extend similar aid. We have been working together to encourage the cultivation of hemp, for which article we are assured the soil of parts of our country is particularly adapted. It is believed that with some encouragement a large manufacturing plant can be established in Manitoba, drawing its raw material from the crop to be raised in the immediate vicinity. Here again is a case where the helping hand may only have to be extended at the beginning.

And so on. No start without the helping hand, and the aid now given. But, Mr. Speaker, if artificial silk is to be helped, why should not natural silk be helped? It is a proper thing to help industries which can be made and ought to be made indigenous to Canada. We believe that, and my hon. friend is perfectly right when he takes that stand in connection with this article of artificial silk—perfectly right. It is a comparatively new thing, and I think it is going to be a very good thing. But although it is a pretty good thing it is a very small thing as compared with natural silk. Yet, if artificial silk is to be helped, why not natural silk? Why, Mr. Speaker, the other day I had occasion in connection with the Italian treaty to bring to my hon. friend's attention this fact, that while in the United States no silk whatever was grown—we all know where it comes from, and the same thing can be said of European countries, of France itself—nevertheless by a protective duty on natural silk they worked up an industry in the United States that during the year 1919 distributed in wages the tremendous sum of $108,000,000. Why not natural silk if artificial silk? Or is this altogether a sham idea and you want to get artificial things instead of real things? Or is it because the artificial is cheap and the natural expensive? Artificial silk to-day to a very large extent is the only kind of silk that the poorer people can buy. Real silk costs money, and a good deal of it. Is it to be understood that the reason we have artificial silk and not natural silk here is because the one is really a luxury and the other a comparatively cheap thing, and that in consonance with what was done in the French treaty and other treaties we are to have cheap taxes on the more expensive things and heavy taxes on the cheap things? Because that is what this government has been doing. Perhaps that is the reason; I cannot think of any other.

Then again, if copper bars, why not brass works? Why, if we are doing this for labour—and the real justification for protection always is the employment of labour at work which is properly indigenous to a country, and to the greater extent and greater amount that labour enters into the cost of a business the greater the claims it ought to have for protection—well, there is much more labour in turning out brass works than in turning out copper bars. So why not brass works?

Again, if we are to have copper bars, why not glass? First-rate factories now in Canada are practically doing nothing. Why not glass? If copper bars why not steel plates? And if hemp why not flax? The farmer in Canada is interested in the growth of flax. Why is flax to be dropped and hemp helped? Why?—unless it be that there is a total absence of principle in connection with the consideration of any rate, and the consideration that is given rests upon the insistency of the demand upon the one hand or political advantage on the other. So much for these tariff provisions.

My hon. friend makes a change in the sales tax. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that here again he has yielded to importunity.

4 p.m.

I can remember very well when one of the great complaints made by hon. gentlemen opposite against the customs revenue was that the customs revenue being collected at the source formed part of the costs of the jobber, formed part of the costs of the retailer, and as it formed part of the costs of both, their profits in both cases were calculated upon it. There is an easy way and there is a hard way of handling the sales tax; I quite admit it. We chose the difficult way because we wanted to keep down the cost of living. We wanted to see to the fullest extent possible that every single cent that the consumer had to pay in sales tax went in taxes and was not made the basis of further and increased profits. I admit it was hard, but we were getting along very well with it.

There is another consideration in connection with that very self-same tax. If you make the tax small and spread it out wide enough you can get it so that it merely becomes a part of the overhead and is not passed on. That is what we did in our sales tax of one-and-a-half and one-and-a-half. The

other day I ran across the owner of a large departmental store and he said we had been a great nuisance to them. I said "What is the trouble?" "Well," he said "you had that infernal sales tax on, and it was so small that we did not feel like changing catalogues and the like and passing the tax on. We absorbed it. But we are all right now," he went on "with the increase of fifty per cent the sales tax became so large that we are passing it on." The increase he spoke of was made in the sales tax of last year, and I think in a good many cases the sales tax was being passed on I think there is no doubt of this, Mr. Speaker, that the real reason why prices stopped falling down with my hon. friend's last budget, and took an upward curve, just simply lay in the fact that these sales taxes were being passed on. I am afraid that my hon. friend while he is considering himself, his department—and I admit it will be easier for them— while he is considering the retailer, and the retailers all want it, while he is considering the wholesaler, and the wholesalers all want it, is forgetting entirely the position of the rate payer And I venture this prophecy, that the result of this tax will be to increase further the cost of living. It is an absolutely inescapable conclusion as I see it.

I would just like to show how these taxes work out. I am going to take $100 worth of goods. Under our tax of 1½ per cent $100 worth of goods goes out from the manufacturer He has to pay a sales tax of $1.50. That amount of $101.50 goes to the jobber. I am going to assume for the purposes of this statement that the whole tax was passed on, even when it was small. I am going to assume that what that departmental store man told me was wrong and that everything was passed on; that is, put the case against our sales tax in the worst possible light, and do violence to the facts, for the sake of illustration. The jobber's cost then is $101.50. Now I will put the jobber's profit at—it does not matter what you put his profit at. His profit varies. It may be down as low as 5 per cent or up as high as 25 per cent. Suppose we say 15 per cent; the figure does not matter so long as you stick to the same percentage in all your illustrations. The jobber's profit of 15 per cent would amount to $15.22. That is what he sells at, assuming he passes everything on, and on that he has to pay his sales tax—again 1½ per cent. That is now increased to $1.75. That makes a total for which he sells of $118.47. Now, it does not make any difference what percentage we take for the retailer, as long as we stick to it. These gross profits vary tremendously. Take 35 per cent. Thirty-five per cent profit would be $41.46. That would make the cost to the consumer, assuming everything had been passed on under our tax, pressing it to the last possible extent, $159.93.

Let us take it under the proposed tax, which certainly has the great merit of simplicity, and direct action on the rate-payer, which has no merit. Take goods $100; sales tax $6, jobber's profit at 15 per cent, $15.90. Jobber's price, therefore, $121.90, retailers profit at 35 per cent $42.66, a total of $164.66, as against $159.93, a resultant increase in taxation to the ratepayer of 4·63 per cent. As I say, Mr. Speaker, the trade gets its way and makes more money. The ratepayers pay 4·63 per cent more. I notice that this is no secret, and I am going to read one of the many quotations which you can get as to who wanted this change. There is no secret about it. In this morning's paper I find the following:

Good budget for jobbers

Hamilton, Ont., May 12.—Jobbers are particularly pleased with the budget especially in its treatment of the sales tax.

"It's a good budget for the jobbers," stated St. Clair Balfour, of Balfour Smye Limited, wholesale grocer.

"It gives us just what we have been after for a long time. Hitherto with a one per cent tax we had to absorb the sales tax."

They did that under our tax. The quotation proceeds:

"We could not avoid it. Now, however, this tax will be placed on at the point of manufacture and we will be relieved of this trouble."

Asked if this would not result in pyramiding Mr. Balfour readily admitted that this would be the case.

"Oh, yes, certainly," he said, "if the article costs $100 and the manufacturer puts on the $6 sales tax we will collect our profit on the $106."

Why, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend says that he is not bringing in new forms of taxation. Well, I assume he is not bringing in many new forms of taxation, but he is multiplying the results of taxation on the ratepayers by the method in which he deals with that sales tax. I hope that the government are going to get good returns and that the revenues will be largely increased. My hon. friend needs these returns. But I would be very much more hopeful if I saw some way in which the increased profits in the case of this taxation, which is going to the jobber and retailer, could be diverted into the treasury. I am afraid it will never get there.

The receipt tax, he says, is to stand. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have receipt taxes, we have cheque taxes and other things. We have got the niggling taxes that bother us and bring in the main but comparatively small results,

while we have been entirely overlooking taxation on those that can best afford it—the taxation on the consumers of luxuries. This receipt tax, my hon. friend says they have it in England. He is right. He says that no chancellor of the exchequer in England would think of dropping it. Again he is right. But no chancellor of the exchequer in England would ever have thought of permitting taxes on cheques as has been done here—never in the world. Even in the worst days of the war the very highest they went was tuppence on a cheque. There was no ascending scale. There was a recognition that there was no service given, a recognition that it was a nuisance to business, and a difficult tax to administer; and I am going to have something to say about that when we go into committee, but at present I will not detain the House. Now, the position in England and the position here are entirely different. The receipt tax here, on top of those drastic cheque taxes, ought not to be thought of. We are getting far more out of our cheque taxes than we ever get from receipt taxes. There would not be nearly the objection to giving receipts to-day, if the hon. minister would accept the English method, and have a flat rate on cheques and a flat rate on receipts, but while we have not got it, the minister says it has to stand. It is just another of those small things that I do not believe my hon. friend is going to get revenue from. He has not enlightened us as to what revenue he is going to get to-day. What I do know now is that the chief effect of this receipt tax is that you do not get receipts. You sign your cheque to-day and send it, if you are fortunate enough to be able to send it, and the man who receives it says "Oh well, that cheque will be a receipt for that fellow, I will save two cents;" and the government is out two cents on the receipt and three cents on the return postage. That is how it has worked out. I know that to-day you have to ask for receipts if you want to get them. Then again we have the cheque tax still to stay with us. I suppose that my hon. friend feels that he is absolutely consistent in what he does with the cheque tax. This government will not tax luxuries. It is a very luxurious thing to be able to write cheques exceeding $2,500. You need not pay anything more for it. That is getting up into the class of luxury. You need not worry about that. Just as long as you keep the tax down to the cheques of the denominations that most of us are able to write, you pay your little percentage every time and there is no help. This assistance is put at the wrong end altogether. There ought to have been something done with this cheque tax, I admit, but the relief is given at the wrong end. The tax on cheques works in absolutely inverse ratio to the rate of taxation we pay in on incomes. The bigger income you have the more money you have to pay. It went up on an increasing scale, and went up heavily. You have super-charges going on all the time. But it works absolutely in the reverse way, so far as cheques are concerned. The remedy is at the wrong end. If the minister had said, "we are going to help small businesses, we are going to help people to-day that require help, and we will exempt all cheques under $500 from the operation of the tax, just leave it to the old rate of two cents, he would have done something. He would have given relief there where relief is far more required.

I think I have already dealt with the cigarette tax, but I wish to mention just one thing that was wrong in connection with it. My recollection was that my hon. friend counted upon an increased revenue of $5,000,000 in connection with his tobacco duties, and on looking the matter up in Hansard, I find that is correct. But instead of getting an increased revenue of $5,000,000, he has lost $1,200,000. He is not going to get that back to-day. You cannot bring down provisions and laws which directly affect business, which hurt business very materially, and say: "Oh, it does not matter; I will take the tax off this year and you will be just as well off as you were before." You cannot do that. Businesses that are disturbed and disrupted do not come back in that way, and it will be some time, I am afraid, before my hon. friend is able to make good the cost of his error and to get back anything like the old return which this country got from the sale of cigarettes. My hon. friend again is quite right when he said that cigarette consumption did not stop. It did not. He is again quite right when he said that smuggling took place, and that any quantity of American cigarettes, which paid us absolutely nothing, was being consumed in place of our own.

My hon. friend said that there was no revenue from the tax on beetroot sugar. That is quite right. Of course there was no revenue, but I do not think that statement leaves on the House the impression that he would desire to be left. The rate was first brought down at 48 cents. After protests from the opposition, the rate was reduced to 24 cents, and then a further protest was made by the manufacturing company, the sugar refinery. They said: "We have our contracts made for the whole year; we never counted upon this cost; it is unfair to impose this tax." Well, the tax for the whole year was sus-

pended, as my hon. friend explained, last year, and there has been no opportunity to collect the tax this year. Yet my hon. friend says there is no revenue from this tax. Of course there is no revenue because the tax was suspended. The real evil of that tax was not the reason that prompted its suspension last year. What prompted its suspension last year was the fact that manufacturers of beets into sugar would be out just that much money. That is not the real evil. The real evil, the real reason why the tax ought never to have been imposed, was that it was a tax upon a first product of the country, of which product we were not getting enough. My hon. friend is perfectly justified in discarding the tax altogether.

I am pleased to see that my hon. friend has taken that niggling tax off soft drinks. He could not have got much money under it, I am sure he did not; and if the cost of trying to collect it were taken into consideration, he would find his receipts were a vanishing quantity. There is just one suggestion I would make to my hon. friend in connection with that tax. He is taking it off now because he thinks it is wrong. If he thought it was right, he would not take it off. If it is wrong, it is just as wrong to-day as it will be on the 1st of next August. Nothing is going to occur between now and August to make that tax wrong on the 1st of August and perfectly right now. But he does not take it off until the 1st of August. If the tax is wrong—and it is wrong—it ought to be cancelled now. Further than that, in fairness to a trade that has been harassed a good deal by this tax, as they have to-day to prepare for their summer's trade and they cannot properly do that when they have this tax over their heads, if it be wrong, let us get the wrong righted at the earliest possible moment. I agree with my hon. friend that it is wrong and I see no reason why the repeal should not come into effect immediately just the same as our tariff resolutions have come into effect.

The next point that I want to say a few words upon is the resolution as to the United States. I do not know just what was operating in my hon. friend's mind. I am entirely disposed to believe, knowing him as I do, knowing his great ability, that he has absolutely no faith in his proposition; that he knows it is an idle gesture, and that it is meant merely for the purpose of pleasing my hon. friends to my left. No one believes at the present time that anything can be done with that resolution. Why, the Americans are men of business; they are much more concerned in trade and in furthering trade than they are in reading over piously indicated and beautifully worded resolutions in our statutes. They know where they are just as well as they will know after the present resolutions are made law. We learned something about their acumen when we heard about the French treaty. We found that everything we could get only at such great cost, they got for nothing, and it was suggested that we should employ an American to make the next treaty with France for us. They are business people, and there is only one way of trading with business people, that is, by having something to trade with; and this resolution constitutes absolutely nothing to trade with. In the last few days hon. gentlemen have learned the soundness of that doctrine: If you want to trade have something to trade with. In carrying out that doctrine, they imposed a duty on currants and raisins. The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), I think, has been helping them a little along the line of instructions. I do not know how he managed this; he certainly managed to get them to pick out the one item that would constitute the smallest reason in the world to move an American business man in the right direction. But, perhaps, the process of education will go on. He has got them to put a protective duty on potatoes when other countries maintain a duty against potatoes grown in Canada. I do not know why we should not eat Canadian potatoes. I always thought we should. I think Canadian potatoes are very good.

Mr. CALDWELL: Since the hon. member has coupled my name with this, I should like to dissociate myself with it entirely. We want free entry of our potatoes into other markets.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Wonderful! Is the attitude of this hon. gentleman not extraordinary? I am not going to debate the matter; but I am going to tell him one thing, that his attitude is just as helpful to the potato producers of New Brunswick as was his vote on the Crowsnest pass case. If he wants to make it impossible to do business, all right; but hon. gentlemen across the aisle were learning something, and they put this duty on potatoes. Let us suppose that this duty on potatoes was imposed for some good cause. If there be any good cause, the reason why potatoes should be picked out as a specific instance, must have regard to the American tariff. The one potato scale I know of that is worrying Canada to-day is the American potato scale. We get some potatoes from the United

States, and hon gentlemen think that reciprocity in tariff, which they regard as something good, should begin with this article. They evidently wanted to find something to trade with, but it seems to me that they are very bad traders when they begin with such a small item as potatoes. I have not the trade returns for 1923, but I find according to the returns for 1922 that in that year the Americans sold us potatoes to the value of $423,113. That is one of the very smallest items, one of the most unimportant, that my hon. friends could begin with. Certainly it is a fine point to start with if they are serious in the desire to tackle the question like men of business. Undoubtedly it is a fine trading point as compared with the millions, the hundreds of millions, of values that come from the United States into Canada; it is small, for example, as compared with the millions which we get from them in silks, textiles, iron and steel products, etc. It is simply small and contemptible. Surely the amount of agricultural products which the United States sends into this agricultural country is of infinitely more value and importance than potatoes. I do not know how it is in the rest of the provinces, but I do know that in Ontario the commodity that is of immediate concern to every thrifty farmer's wife is eggs; and in the year that we import $423,000 worth of potatoes we buy $3,162,143 worth of eggs from the United States.

Mr. FORKE: The Canadian hens went on strike that time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know anything about that; I cannot speak for Manitoba; but I certainly know that in Ontario this particular preserve of the farmer's wife is being very largely encroached upon, and I know that there is a real difference, in the Ontario farm at any rate, brought about by the conditions which these figures disclose. It may be that my hon. friend is interested only in wheat, but in Ontario, I would have him know, we are greatly interested in all of the activities of agriculture and certainly do not exclude that very important item, the domestic hen and her eggs. Now, there is one way of handling this question, and that is, not by indulging in any pious and empty gestures, but by being somewhat manly about the situation. Just let us have a little faith in our own country and in ourselves; let us have a little bit of courage; let us realize that this country is the second largest buyer of American goods. Let us realize also that the Americans are interested in this market; bearing in mind, of course, that they will do what is best for themselves and their people without any regard to us just so long as we have not enough pluck or courage or determination to do anything for ourselves. In that very year to which I have referred we made, of all our national purchases, 69 per cent from America, selling them only 39 per cent of our exports. If ever a country had arguments ready to hand to be moulded in a cause, we undoubtedly have them. Yet, with our trade blocked, American trade is allowed to come into the country untrammelled and absolutely unchecked. Do we suppose that we shall get anywhere by merely uttering pious phrases? Is there any reason why, in regard to the things that we do not get from the British Empire or produce ourselves, we should not at least show our good friends to the south that we are determined to take a leaf from their book and be good Americans in this Scotland of the north, and adopt the American tariff in connection with these goods, at least to the extent of agricultural products? There is a way of meeting the situation; but; as I have said, it is not by means of pious and empty gestures. Now, I have dealt with artificial silk, and I think that something can be done in this direction if proper steps are taken.

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. member calls Canada the Scotland of the North American continent. Is he aware that about two hundred years ago the Scotch people talked in the same way about trade coming from England after the union?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A whole lot of things have happened in that two hundred years.

Mr. McMASTER: Apparently not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: One thing that happened only two years ago was the Fordney tariff. I wonder whether there is another thought behind my hon. friend's interruption. Scotland is a part of England.

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Shame.

Mr. FORKE: I object to that statement; Scotland is not a part of England.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well then, I should have said a part of Great Britain. Scotland is a part of Great Britain; but does my hon. friend think that there is any parallel between Scotland, as a part of Great Britain, and Canada, not a part of the United States?

Mr. McMASTER: The parallelism is between the thought of the hon. gentleman now and the thought of the Scotch protectionists of that day, who of course soon saw the error of their ways.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have dealt with the silk industry, and I want to congratulate my hon. friend on what he is doing for copper, because we ought to be able to make some use of our mines and keep some of our money in the country that is got out of their exploitation. I only regret that the hon. gentleman has not gone further and seen to it that the languishing trades that use copper were looked after. Let me congratulate the minister also on bringing up the matter of hemp. Every now and then countries get national opportunities, generally, unfortunately, at the expense of other nations. To-day we have a great opportunity to go into the hemp industry by reason of the unfortunate position of Russia. We can grow hemp to advantage in the Northwest. Experiments have been carried on over a very wide field and I have no doubt whatever that hemp can be made a very highly productive crop to the western farmers. If there is anything that we ought to do to-day, I think we should above everything else help agriculture where we can, and this is one real practical way of helping it. We at any rate are of that opinion. My right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) had on the order paper a resolution dealing with this very matter. If there be any way of enlarging the profits of agriculture in Canada to-day it certainly ought to be taken. Not only will it help agriculture, but my hon. friend is right in saying that it will also help us materially. It will help the country as a whole materially, because I think it was last year that we imported some sixteen million dollars' worth of materials, and their place could be entirely taken by hemp grown in the prairie provinces. Therefore I congratulate my hon. friend.

But I do not congratulate him on the result, because I am convinced that this bounty will never be sufficient to get the hemp industry going. It is a five-year bounty, and then it stops. Just contrast the position as between copper bars on the one hand and hemp on the other. In the former case you have an industry already organized and functioning, with great works at the smelter. But in order to make the hemp industry a success the farmers in the districts where hemp can be grown must be instructed in the best methods of cultivation, which takes time—a long time. Copper is sure, it is not dependent upon drought, frost, vermin or anything else; it is there ready to be manufactured. On the other hand, the hemp industry must overcome the various troubles I have enumerated and an entirely new plant must be constructed. Therefore I hope my hon. friend will take into his serious consideration the advisability of greatly extending the length of time for payment of the bonus and the maximum amount. I think the farmers of the West absolutely require the utmost help we can give them, and if we can get hold of a crop which is really going to be a good paying crop—and it is said that this crop is worth from twenty-five to thirty dollars an acre net at the prices of hemp to-day—if we can render any help in this direction it is something which as many farmers as possible in the West ought to participate in. And there are great opportunities for such an industry. Not only our own domestic trade—which, as I have already pointed out, is large—but the possibilities in export trade are tremendous, and I sincerely hope my hon. friend will reconsider the terms of this bounty and make them more generous so that we may make sure of getting this primary industry well established for the benefit of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to turn for a few minutes to the position of the country and to my hon. friend's plight in connection with his budget. I want to be as fair to him as I possibly can. I do not know exactly which figure he really adopts. He showed increases in customs, post office, Dominion lands, and inland revenue, aggregating $13,315,000, with decreases in excise, investments and other taxes to a total $34,598,000, with a net decrease of $21,283,000. At one point he mentioned that his surplus over ordinary and capital expenditure would be $14,100,000, and that the railways would require $74,500,000. These figures would result in a deficit of $60,400,000. Of course, my hon. friend stated that he hopes something will occur in the meantime, that economies may be effected and that trade will revive, but on the figures given that would be the deficit. On the next page, however, there is another set of figures in which he gives the main estimates, exclusive of railways, at $353,011,255, advances to railways $73,000,000, advances to merchant marine $1,500,000, supplementary estimates $15,900,000, making a total of $443,411,255; with an estimated revenue of $372,517,000; leaving an estimated deficit therefore of $70,889,255. There is a third calculation which may be made and which would increase this deficit, but I do not desire to make it; either set of figures is sufficiently grave—extremely so.

It seems to me that if my hon. friend had delayed bringing down the French treaty until after his budget was out of the way, and he perforce had found how he stood, he never would have brought that treaty down. Why, Mr. Speaker, are the reductions being made which my hon. friend has enumerated? The French treaty. Why are luxuries to be more lightly taxed than the necessaries of life? The French treaty. Why is the tax on Canadian still wine reduced from thirty cents to seven-and-a-half cents at a time when we want every single nickel that we can get? The French treaty. Why is this tax on Canadian sparkling wine of three dollars reduced to one-and-a-half dollars? Again, the French treaty. Why is the reduction in the excise estimated at $5,600,000, unless it be the French treaty? I am confident that if my hon. friend had got out his figures first and had seen where he stood he would not have asked the House to proceed with the French treaty. In a year when we have a deficit of $57,000,000, five-and-a-half years after the war is over, when the government is deliberately budgeting for a deficit next year of $60,000,000 or $70,000,000, depending on how it is figured, but an enormous sum anyway, is it not indeed tragic to think that this is the time chosen to take off taxes on luxuries? But that is what is done. And why? Well, there was the treaty, there were many political considerations to be taken into account appealing to sentiment here and the like—in a word, party politics. And perhaps party politics after all may be expected to figure largely in a budget which has been dictated mainly by political necessity. Of course, it is unpopular to tax or economize but, if there is a tax that can be justified it is the tax on the luxuries brought into this country to the extent of millions and millions of dollars. But our friends had not learned their lesson; they went over with their tariffs as they were. I wish we could get this government imbued with the idea that the business of Canada and the necessities of Canada are greater than the necessity of staying in office or of getting jobs; if we could do that we would have a business budget, something not quite so political in its character. We used to hear statements about the independence of parliament, emanating from gentlemen opposite; how well do they themselves observe it? Let us see what has been taking place. Mr. McCoig goes to the Senate. Mr. Boyer goes to the Senate. Mr. Turgeon goes to the Senate. Mr. Demers becomes a judge. Mr. Stein becomes a judge. Mr. Trahan becomes a judge. Mr. McKenzie becomes a judge. And at this very minute there is an important judicial office held open, for the purpose, as it is generally supposed, of giving another hon. gentleman across the aisle a job. Besides that, Mr. Pacaud gets rewarded with a job in England—and all this in the short time since my hon. friends attained office. Then, we have had an Acting Minister for the Post Office. The government cannot make up its mind even as to a deputy for that department, so that there is no one really in charge. We have an Acting Minister of National Defence. We have no Auditor General; postmasters are holding office and being paid against the provisions of the law. We have no Solicitor General, no Chief Justice of the Exchequer Court. There has been activity in the appointment of commissions. We have Mr. Congdon's commission, which will enable him to have a very nice trip and to amuse himself —another ex-politician. We have the genial Mr. Pugsley, another very eminent Liberal ex-politician. We have that great and good man, Mr. Duncan Marshall, another commissioner. I will not go through all the rest of them—we have the grain inquiry started and we have also the Great Lakes shipping inquiry, the purpose of which is to do something which other governments did without wasting time and before the loss actually occurred.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. McMASTER: What?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Did my hon. friend say, "what?"

Mr. McMASTER: I did not catch my hon. friend's last remark.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will tell him what. In the year 1912 there was an advance in lake freight rates which the then government thought worked an injustice to the farmers, and they promptly repealed the coastal laws. That increase, though, was as nothing compared to what we had last year. The crop moved under those high rates; the coastal laws stood—but a commission is appointed; somebody will get some fees.

Then, we are to have another commission on exports of wood. My hon. friend admitted that there was a timber famine in Canada and that every possible effort should be made in the way of conservation. He pointed out in his speech the right of the private owner to dispose of the product of his lands. Here is a threatened famine of timber; the necessity of conservation and the like is admitted, and the difficulty is stated, namely, the right of the private owner to which I have referred. Well, that difficulty will remain exactly the

same no matter how many commissions pass on it or how much money is spent on it. You will have the question whether a man can denude his land to such an extent as to injure his neighbourhood, the question whether or not he stands in the same position as the farmer with his casual crop which is produced and harvested from year to year. If ever there was a case in which a private right, as was stated by the Prime Minister the other day, became a public wrong, it is in connection with the waste of timber, and if ever there was a right of interference, here it is. My hon. friend does not offer one word of argument in answer to the statements made by Mr. Barnjum—and what a fine thing it is, Mr. Speaker, to run across a patriotic individual who does not mind spending his own money and devoting his time and energies to the attainment of some great public object. That is what Mr. Barnjum has done. He demonstrates the famine to my hon. friend, and what is the answer? Oh, another commission. And we shall be just where we were before. I regret that there is no action in this connection which would be in the great interests of our country as a whole.

It is the usual custom, Mr. Speaker, for the official opposition to present an amendment to the budget. We have a good deal of sympathy with our friends to our left. They wanted to get in an amendment last year, but they did not have the opportunity, because under the rule—and we think it is a proper one—only one amendment can in such circumstances be moved. This year we want to give our friends an opportunity of moving any amendment they see fit to present. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, although this budget is so full of holes that the task of drawing an amendment would indeed be easy, we are going to leave that opportunity and that task to my hon. friends to my left.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, before addressing myself to the motion that is now before the House I wish to follow in the steps of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) and congratulate the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) on the bringing down of his seventeenth budget. Irrespective of the varying shades of political thought prevailing in the different parts of the House, hon. members look with respect upon a man who has occupied so honourable a position for such a considerable length of time in the life of our country. We all rejoice in the fact that the hon. Finance Minister came before us once again, and of him it may well be said that "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

I wish I were able to turn now to the budget which the hon. Finance Minister has brought down and refer to it in the same words of commendation and praise, but I am afraid I cannot do so. There are some things in the budget that we can accept gratefully; other things we are not so proud of. On the whole I feel satisfied that we have not very much to be thankful for in this budget.

We have listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Sir Henry Drayton). I do not think that we can draw very much comfort from the remarks he has made in connection with this budget. So it seems to me that we must fall back upon the members in this quarter of the House and rally to our own support, bringing forward the principles that we believe to be in the best interests of the whole people of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: You still have the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), you know.

Mr. FORKE: Possibly some time we may get the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). While there is life there is hope. I am afraid there will be disappointment in many parts of this country upon the reading of this budget. It has been looked forward to a good deal and much has been expected. It was expected that some relief would be brought to the people of Canada in the different items that were brought down by the Minister of Finance. I noticed a criticism in one of our papers in which it was stated that this was neither a very good nor a very bad budget. I do not know if that is a fairly accurate statement of the case. It is simply a matter of standing pat,—"as you were." There is not very much difference that I can see from the position we occupied last year.

I want to say a few words, in commencing, in regard to the financial position of the country, and in doing so I would repeat some of the figures that were given to the House the other day by the Minister of Finance. We were told that at the end of the fiscal year 1921-22 there was a surplus of $34,391,696.36 over ordinary expenditure, and that after taking care of capital account and a charge of $97,950,645 for the Canadian National Railways we had a deficit that year of $81,256,818. Coming to the year 1922-23 we again had a surplus over ordinary expenditure of $61,839,000, but capital account and a charge of $92, 190,000 against the railways and a deficit of $6,060,720 due to the Canadian government merchant marine left us with a deficit that year of $49,293,086. I think the Minister of Finance made the statement that in these figures we

could find some ray of hope because the deficits year by year were getting a little smaller. Well, let us take all the comfort we can out of that situation.

Let us remember, however, the great increase that has been taking place in the public debt during the last fourteen years. Since 1914 there has been an increase in the public debt of over two billion dollars, and we are still adding to it. The time is not yet in sight when we are likely to have our expenditure balance with our receipts. Now that cannot continue. It must come to a stop. In the ordinary business of life if year by year our expenditure is larger than our receipts some day bankruptcy will be the condition that will meet us. And the same is true of a country. I realize that the larger part of this debt was incurred during the war time, and although we think that some steps might have been taken at that time to pay some of the debt as it was incurred by some means that might have been adopted, it is no use going back and criticizing what was done at that time. The debt is here and we have to meet it, and the consideration before us is how are we going to pay this indebtedness.

We hear a good deal about economy, although I think perhaps we are beginning to forget it because I have not heard the word mentioned so much recently. It was very much on the lips of hon. mmebers when we came down here first, and I think
5 p.m. we ought still to keep in our minds the fact that it is necessary to practise economy if we are going to get out of the woods. I saw it stated not very long ago that in Dominion, provincial and municipal taxes the people of Canada pay year by year something like one billion dollars. Just think of it—a population of nine million people carrying a load of taxation of one billion dollars per year. Surely something ought to be done, something must be done, or taxation is going to reach the point where production will cease to some extent at least. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to read a short extract headed "Britain's Example to Canada:"

> In four years of peace the British government has reduced its income from taxation by one-third and has cut its ordinary expenditure by one-half.
>
> In four years of peace, Canada has increased its revenues from taxation by about one-tenth and has effected a minor increase in its expenditures.
>
> Great Britain has reduced its taxes. Canada has raised its taxes. Great Britain has reduced its expenditures. Canada has increased its expenditures. Great Britain has reduced its debt and thus its annual interest charges. Canada has increased its debt and also its annual interest charges. What Great Britain has done the United States has been able to do as well.

[Mr. Forke.]

Great Britain has adopted a policy of economy in every branch of manufacture. I know the railways can be blamed for the poor showing that we have been making during the last few years, but at the same time I do not think there has been much evidence of economy in the public business of our country during the last few years. The Minister of Finance may find a method of extracting money from the people, and I am willing to admit, Mr. Speaker, that he is most ingenious in his methods of extracting money from the pockets of the taxpayers. That is perhaps his business, but there ought to be some means of practising economy in order that so vast a sum will not be needed to be raised year by year. If the money is found, I think the government will find means of spending it. I do not know just how this economy is going to be brought into play. I have often thought that perhaps the only thing would be to have a stated sum of money apportioned to each minister and he would have to pare his estimates down to come within that sum. I think that is the only possible way, because when a minister sits down to draw up his estimates he will think he absolutely cannot do with anything less than he has asked for. I know that the provincial governments have been practising this sort of economy. They have simply had to make up their minds that there was only so much money to spend and they had to bring down their estimates to suit that amount. That is one method of practising economy in this young and, I hope, growing country. The limit of tax-paying power would be reached, and as I said before that will in time limit production.

I have a few figures here on the growing cost of government in this country which with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read. Take civil government—I shall mention only a few departments, and I do not do it in a spirit of criticism but simply to bring the facts before the House at this time. The Department of Agriculture in 1912 had 1,326 employees, and in 1922, 731 employees, but the salaries rose from $943,368 in 1912 to $2,392,309 in 1922. In the Department of the Interior in 1912 there were 720 employees, and in 1922, 1,342 employees. The salaries in 1912 were $862,023 and in 1922, $2,402,680. In the Post Office Department in 1912 the number of employees was 596, and in 1922, 788. The salaries in 1912 were $543,188 and in 1922, $1,348,218. I will not take up time reading reports from the other departments, but I will give the totals:

	Employees	Total salaries
1912	8,371	$ 7,805,373
1922	11,878	19,271,985

I know that the expenses of government have gone up enormously during those ten years, but the population of the country has not increased greatly in that time. We know that the expense of civil government has grown out of all proportion to the increase in our population. I do not know how we are going to remedy it. Speaking from this side of the House, I have realized how unable one who not on the inside is to criticize the different departments, the different estimates and the different expenditures as they come before the House. I believe that that could be done and done more economically if it were done from the government side of the House. But I want to make this prognostication: I believe the government that does it might as well make up its mind that it is going to be out of it for a few years at least. Nevertheless I would like to see governments that had the courage to undertake that house-cleaning that I think is very necessary at the present time.

Another question that I think is largely associated with the government and the expense of running the country is the question of distribution. I believe that our machinery of distribution is much too complicated and is not at all suited to our modern civilization. I think the cost of distribution is altogether out of proportion to the services rendered. We have a good many parasites between the producer and the consumer and when I say this I include manufacturers and all those who are doing good, useful and productive work, no matter what line of business they are in. I am very well aware that distribution is a very important part of the business of the country, but I think it could be shown conclusively, without fear of contradiction, that the increase in the cost between the producer and the consumer is altogether too large on any given article of commerce at the present time. It would not have been difficult for me to bring figures to show that the cost to the consumer is sometimes one hundred per cent and even two hundred per cent higher than the price paid to the producer. That same argument will apply to manufactures, just as it applies to agriculture and other industries of the country. A great deal of wastefulness characterizes the whole system and I believe our economic system lends itself to abuses of this kind, and that under different conditions a great many of the wrongs and injustices could be righted.

In regard to the budget itself, need I say that I am pleased with the few changes that have been made in it? I am not going to particularize the different items mentioned by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). Perhaps before the debate is closed all these matters will be discussed at very great length. Therefore, I will content myself with dealing with matters in a general way and leave others to particularize in regard to the different items. There is a maxim I would like to bring to the attention of the House at the present time, and that is if you do not buy you cannot sell. I think that is something that some of us ought to get into our heads, keep there and think over for a good while, because there seems to be an idea that you can sell yourself rich. That is not possible in the field of economics, and the only way you can be successful in business is by carrying on what you might call a successful trade. There is sometimes an idea that in an interchange of commodities one should get the better of, or have an advantage over the other. That is not the true spirit upon which commercial business should be carried on. The true idea would be an interchange of commodities that would benefit both parties concerned, so that we must make up our mind that if we are going to carry on business it will be to a certain extent by carrying on a certain trade.

I am very glad there has been a slight reduction in the British preference in the budget presented to us. Needless to say, anything connected with British trade with Canada interests me a great deal. While a good Canadian, I always look across the Atlantic ocean in my mind's eye, and still have a warm feeling for the Old Land with her many troubles, and any little connection we can have with the Mother Country is something that always brings pleasure to me indeed. I have an item in my hand which I wish to quote to the House. It reads:

> An increase in the flow of trade east and west between Great Britain and Canada would be reflected in an increased prosperity from Halifax to Vancouver. It would mean increased shipments through the ports, increased traffic for the railways, increased demand for Canadian produce abroad and increased purchasing power for the Canadian people as consumers at home.
>
> This stimulus to trade would help to meet the objections raised by protectionist members that a reduction of the tariff would mean a decline in the national revenue. Canada cannot prevent the United States from erecting tariff obstacles to the flow of trade north and south; but this Dominion can take a step towards stimulating trade east and west by substantially reducing the tariff on British imports.

I will read another short extract in connection with the British situation. I think we ought to have sympathy with Great Britain in her troubles and trials at the present time. This quotation reads:—

> Look at the British situation as it is. Forty-three millions of people can live in the narrow area of the

United Kingdom only as long as they can sell abroad their manufactures and their minerals and in return buy food, of which they can produce at home only a few weeks' supply annually. Their resources are increased by the accumulations of capital of other times and by the earnings of their shipping and foreign investments.

But if the foreign markets, go, if they cannot sell goods and buy food, reduction of population is inevitable and as it is postponed misery is inescapable.

That is one of the reasons why I am anxious to see every British preference that is possible for this country to give. Another feature in this connection is the fact that we produce in large quantities. Britain is our best market for agricultural products. We are shipping large quantities of goods, and we hope in the future to ship a great number of cattle. One of the difficulties has been the high freight rates which have been charged on the Atlantic ocean. If we could get a certain amount of return charge for those ships which are carrying our produce abroad, it would be possible for the shipping companies to give us reduced freight rates. Whatever is done, I do hope the government will take steps to see that proper and reasonable ocean freight rates are quoted for shippers who are trying to work up a business in the cattle trade. It will not do for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to make a reply to this request that he does not carry transportation in his pocket. We expect the government to pay attention to these things and to see that proper transportaton is afforded for carrying the produce of our country.

I have a few words to say regarding the protective tariff and combines. Protection is an evil in itself. I know my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) would not agree with that statement; but I repeat that I for one am unalterably opposed to the principles of protection. Not only is protection an evil in itself, but there are evils that follow in its train. Protection makes combines, trusts and mergers possible. Although we have a large country, we have a very small population, and it is not very difficult for people within the confines of Canada to form a trust, or merger, or combine for their advantage if they are assisted by a protective tariff. I do not want it to be thought that I am against combinations as such. I believe a combination can be formed for the interest of all concerned, for economy, efficiency in business, and that it can be to the advantage of both producer and consumer. But I maintain that human nature is human nature always, no matter whether it be amongst manufacturers or consumers, and if you place a combination in a position where it can take advantage of the public, it is only human nature that it is very likely to do so. A protective tariff lends itself to that system of things. The public to-day have plenty of evidence of combinations not to the advantage of the consuming public. Any one who has read the newspapers can testify to that fact, and those who have been following the work of the different committees of this House can, I am sure, bear ample evidence to the truth of that statement.

Canada is a land rich in natural resources. If you take into account our natural resources, Canada is, per capita, the richest country in the world. Then why should we as a people have trouble to make a living? I wonder why there should be so many poor people in Canada. Why should we not be the happiest and most prosperous people on the face of the earth at the present time? There must be some reason why this condition of affairs exists. We want a policy that will encourage our basic industries and make available the latent riches of the country. We have the riches; we do not need to create them; all we have to do is to make them available for the use and benefit of the people who dwell in our land.

I should like to recall a promise of last year's budget and to say just a few words in connection with the promises of 1919. I know that is becoming almost a hackneyed phrase in this House, and it should not be repeated too often; but it seems to me the time is opportune to call the attention of the government to some promises that have been made in past times. One of the most disappointing things in connection with the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance was when he began to use the words "finality and stability of tariff." Not very long ago there was a by-election in the constituency of Moose Jaw, and at the Liberal convention to nominate a candidate to support the present government, there was passed a resolution of which I will quote just these few words:

That this meeting re-affirms its endorsation of the tariff policy as laid down by the Liberal Association in Ottawa in August, 1919.

The election took place and, of course, hon. members know what the result was. Let me read this short extract from the Manitoba Free Press:

It now appears that the Progressive candidate in the Moose Jaw by-election will have a majority of well over 1,500 and careful observers both in the East and West interpret the result as containing an important lesson for the government, namely, that more attention must be paid to the needs of the West. The tariff was one of the main issues in the election and the

result represents the insistent voice of this part of the country for substantial relief from the burden which the tariff imposes on the Western farmer.

I will read these few words from the Lethbridge Herald, an independent Liberal journal:

Had the Liberals done something substantial to carry out their Ottawa platform, they might have made inroads upon the Progressive strength in the rural sections, but the Progressives were able to convince the electors that practically no attempt had been made to carry out the tariff planks of the Liberal platform, particularly. This was a handicap to the Liberal candidate, and accounts largely for his defeat. If Ottawa will only now interpret western sentiment, as represented by the Progressives, to be genuine, it may be able to do something substantial to meet it and recover some of the ground lost in the West by the Liberals in recent years. If the standpat sentiment, however, is permitted to prevail, there is little possibility of a change in sentiment on the prairies.

I might read a little more, but I think that is sufficient. I should like to say to the government that, as regards the West and, perhaps, over a large part of Canada, that is the handwriting on the wall.

Mr. CALDWELL: Make that East as well as West.

Mr. FORKE: It has just been suggested to me that I might say East as well as West. It is the handwriting on the wall. We have had promises and promises, and some other method must be taken to implement those promises than waiting upon the government to do so. I said there were changes for which we were thankful, and other speakers may deal with them as the debate proceeds. I will say once again that there is a feeling of disappointment, I know, particularly in the prairie provinces at this time. I have had ample evidences of that fact since the budget has been brought down. We hear of people leaving Canada to-day; we hear that our manufacturers are not able to compete. As one who wishes well for Canada, as a lover of Canada, I do not like to repeat those statements. There must be a reason why our people are leaving us to-day, and there must also be a reason why our manufacturers are not able to compete and to hold their own in the business world. Living as I do in my home very near the international line, I am going to state what I know to be facts. Perhaps they are not always pleasant to hear, but we might just as well know the truth. Everyone who is living by agricultural work on the northern side of the international boundary, knows very well that the farmers on the south side of the line are receiving higher prices for their produce than Canadian farmers are getting. That is a fact there is no disputing. I do not know whether I would grumble much about it, because I cannot help it. But there is another side of the matter when you consider that everything the Canadian farmer purchases, he has to pay just a little more for than the man living on the south side of the line. Perhaps our situation may explain that fact to some extent; but the fact that confronts us is that our agriculturists get less for their produce, pay more for what they have to buy and their overhead is larger than is the case on the other side of the line. It costs something to be a Canadian sometimes, in money, in dollars and cents. I do not want to be misunderstood, so I should like to make this statement. I said in commencing that I am British in sentiment. I am thoroughly Canadian from first to last and I will sink or swim with my country to the bitter end. But I do not think it is any part of patriotism to hide facts that are, perhaps, working to the detriment of the prosperity of our country as a whole. I have no pleasure in repeating these things; still I think they ought to be said, and the people of this country ought to know the facts of the case.

Why is Canada a dear country to live in? As I said before, it is a country of great natural resources, one that produces in great abundance all the common necessities of life; yet it is one of the most expensive countries on the face of the globe to-day in which anyone can live. Why is that? It is simply because we are living under artificial conditions and are not pursuing the true and the natural lines of business and economics. The mechanic, the labourer, the professional man, the business man, must have a high remuneration in their respective spheres if they are to make a living in this country; and I declare that we are going to have hard times and experience great difficulty in competing with other countries just so long as that high cost of living is maintained and just so long as Canada in consequence remains, as she undoubtedly is, one of the most expensive countries in the civilized world to-day. The manufacturers complain. Well, I have great sympathy for the manufacturers, notwithstanding that a good many people sometimes entertain the idea that because we talk low tariff we are opposed to manufacturing industries. I only wish that those industries were able to carry on successfully. But I believe, Sir, that some of their troubles are attributable to the very fact that I have been labouring, namely, the high cost of living, which we have to contend with. If a mechanic, an artisan, or a factory worker wants to build a house for himself he is met at the

very outset with a tremendous estimate of expenses; if he wants to buy a suit of clothes he is called upon to pay an exorbitant price. So that the worker must have high wages; and this process continuing, the vicious circle is completed and in the end the manufacturer finds himself confronted with a high wage list.

In the past it has been a very common thing whenever any industry has got into difficulties for those engaged in it to journey to Ottawa and secure a little more protection for that particular enterprise. No doubt this protection was well intended; the idea was to help the business along for the time being in the hope that in the not very distant future it would become successful and prosperous, when the assistance given in its time of trouble could be withdrawn. Looking back however, over fifty or sixty years we are perfectly convinced that this argument will no longer hold water; we know quite well that once assistance is given it is retained.

Now, Sir, that cannot continue; we have reached the limit. I repeat that the cost of living must come down and production must be made cheaper, although I know very well that the statement is often made that this cannot be done. But some people believe that with efficient methods of conducting business, with up-to-date machinery, with conditions all as they should be, and given the skill, the energy, and the business abilities of the Canadian people, the cost of production can unquestionably be reduced and the cost of living consequently lowered to the benefit of the consumer and of the whole population as well. There are many people who hold this view and I am one of them. I do not like to make the statement, Mr. Speaker, but I fear that if the cost of production cannot be decreased, then some of the industrial plants in this country will have to go out of business. I should be sorry to see this done; I want to see them rather increased. But we must face the facts; if they cannot carry on under existing conditions they will have to cease operations.

The taxing of commodities increases prices and lessens consumption, so that you have fewer contracts, less work done, and consequently unemployment. If you can buy two suits of clothes at $50 each instead of one suit for $100 the manufacturer employs twice the number of persons who can make clothes; and that argument is easily demonstrable. The higher the price of material and the greater the inability of people to purchase, the greater the unemployment. I believe that the cause of unemployment in a great many instances in this country is due to the fact that people are not able to purchase goods that are already manufactured. The business man complains, and surely he realizes that when business is slow he must necessarily suffer. Surely by this time the business man of Canada must begin to realize that he is in the same boat and sinks or swims with the great industries throughout the Dominion. I have here a small clipping from the Montreal Witness, which with the permission of the House I will read.

Is it not a little cold-blooded, is it not a little insolent—

This is the Witness's language—

—for comfortable people in other walks of life to snarl at the producers upon whom they are living and tell them to stop croaking? If this supercilious and, let us frankly add, dangerous, attitude means anything, it means that the farmers have no ground for their demand to be released from the burdens which make their life that of slaves to the ruling part of the community. These people find themselves bound to the soil—to hard unpaid-for work for the men and harder work for the women—while every one who is free moves away, either to skim the cream off a fresh acreage or to some other employment, often some other country, where to be a Canadian is a commendation to employment.

Whatever may be said about question of employment or unemployment, the manufacturer and the farmer are in the same boat; if times are dull they cannot make business pay. It is not easy for them to pull up stakes and leave the country, or enter into some other occupation at home. I should like very much indeed, Mr. Speaker, to see a closer bond of sympathy between the agricultural community and the manufacturers of the country, and no spirit of hostility ever induces me to speak in the strain in which I sometimes do speak. Last year a great stream of wealth poured down from the western prairies through eastern Canada to the Old Country. I want to tell the House that this is what kept the wheels of industry moving at that time. It was not protection; it was no system of economics; it was because a certain amount of wealth had been created from the soil and went to grease the wheels of industry in Canada. But we are met face to face with this condition: If it should be found that the remuneration of those who produce that wealth is not sufficient to procure them a decent livelihood, is it not probable that the stream may cease to flow at no distant date? I want to point out to the House, therefore, that it is in the interests not only of the West but of all Canada as well that the agricultural industry should be placed upon a footing where it will be advantageous to the people engaged in it. I say this with no sectional feeling. No hon. member in this House who

hears statements made by gentlemen representing every part of the Dominion can fail to realize that there are difficulties in all walks of life, and that every part of the Dominion has its own peculiar troubles. I do believe, however, that there is not a proper estimate of the great wealth that is yet to come from the western prairies if the right conditions are brought to bear upon that great land.

I am very proud of this Canada of ours; but all the same I cannot but believe that a great many eastern Canadians do not understand the potentialities that lie in the development of that vast land, an empire in itself. No one can fully estimate these potentialities, which may be realized in actual wealth in the not distant future, if the proper conditions are brought about in the interests of those who are trying to develop that part of our Dominion.

I do not know whether all my hon. friends agree with me on the question of immigration. However, whatever may be said on the subject, I think it will be agreed that if we can so get conditions in Canada that people will believe that this is a good country to live in, and will come in great numbers, our great difficulties in taxation and our railway troubles will to a very large extent disappear. I realize the perplexing problems which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has to cope with to-day; I realize the tremendous amount of money that must be raised, year by year; and it is in no spirit of opposition. in no spirit of criticism that I offer the remarks I make to-day. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I would much rather have stood up in my place and endorsed the budget. Nothing but a sense of duty and a sincere belief that the welfare of our country makes it absolutely essential that a different course should be taken has induced me to take this stand.

The hon. member for West York referred to ideals and sentiments. Well, there is undoubtedly a good deal of sentiment in human life, and, after all, hard as business may be and matter of fact, we cannot ignore sentiment in everyday life. It is perhaps a bold assertion for me to make, but it does seem to me that the civilized nations of the world have an altogether wrong ideal. I do not know what we are heading for but commercial rivalry and industrial war. This does seem a hard thing to say, but such must be the inevitable result of present-day conditions. I believe that the building up of high tariff walls engenders hatred, jealousy, and distrust among the nations of the world. In all solemnity I express my belief that the last great catastrophe that overtook the world had its source in commercial rivalry, in the idea that Germany wanted a place in the sun, a full share of all privileges from the commercial standpoint. This has not anything particularly to do with my argument; I merely interject it by the way.

We have heard from time to time in this House considerable criticism of the speeches delivered from this quarter of the chamber descriptive of western conditions. I do not think that these conditions were in any way overstated in relation to certain parts of western Canada. While some isolated statements might be taken exception to as perhaps not giving an exact impression of prevailing conditions, yet upon the whole what was said was well within the facts. We talk a good deal of what our immigration policy is to be, and thousands of dollars are to be spent on advertising to attract immigrants. But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we realize sufficiently the great volume of correspondence that flows between Canada and Great Britain day by day and year by year, those who have come out here telling their friends at home just how things are going with them in Canada? I can assure you, sir, that if the letters sent to the Mother Land were full of news of prosperity and good times we would have a tremendous volume of immigration, and no advertisements would be needed to induce people to make their homes in the Dominion.

I hope that I have not said anything that will in any way hurt the feelings of those who I have no doubt have the interests of Canada just as much at heart as I have. What I have said has been uttered in all sincerity and in the full belief that it is in the best interests of Canada that I should be frank in expressing my opinions. Let me repeat that I have the greatest love for this my adopted country, and that I have no thought at any time but what is for the advancement of my fellow citizens.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston):

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor:

Whereas the tariff policy of the government, as indicated by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, and particularly his pronouncement in favor of tariff stability at existing rates, and the consequent intimation that the government contemplates no further appreciable tariff reduction, constitutes a repudiation of the tariff planks in the Liberal platform of 1919 and is inconsistent with the Finance Minister's statement last session that the changes then made were a step in the right direction;

And whereas the fiscal policy of the government as now brought down is based on the principle of protection, and in this respect is indistinguishable from that of their predecessors in office;

And whereas the condition of the primary industries and the position of consumers in general is such as to demand immediate relief;

Therefore, be it resolved: That while recognizing that changes in the fiscal policy should be made in such a way as to give industries affected a reasonable opportunity for readjustment, this House is of the opinion that the principle of protection as a basis for fiscal policy in Canada is unsound, and that every claim for protection should be heard publicly before a special committee of parliament.

And, further, that the best interests of Canada will be served by:—

(a) An immediate and substantial reduction in the tariff, particularly on the necessaries of life and the implements of production.

(b) An immediate increase in the British preference to 50 per cent of the general tariff.

(c) Reciprocity in trade with the United States as outlined in the proposed Reciprocity Agreement of 1911.

And, further that the loss of revenue, if any, which might result from a reduction in customs duties should be made good by:

(a) The readjustment and extension of the income tax to bear more heavily on unearned incomes.

(b) The increase and extension of excise and other taxes on luxuries.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my agreement with a great deal of what has been said by the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) and also to concur in the general lines of the amendment which has been presented. I would, however, like to point out that in the opinion of the group which I represent, the mere bringing about of a larger measure of free trade does not really touch the root of the trouble to-day. The leader of the Progressives has stressed the need for greater economy. We believe that we should have economy in our different government departments; we believe that there should be elimination of all duplication, elimination of all effort that is not really productive in character. At the same time we do not believe that, essentially, economy will solve our problems to-day. Rather we would point out that the necessity is to touch the real sources of wealth; not merely to cut down our expenses, but to recognize that if we adequately administer our natural resources, with the equipment we now have there will be sufficient to carry on all the administrative machinery of this country and at the same time provide for the needs of individuals and their families. We believe we ought to get down deeper than the question of free trade or the question of economy and ask ourselves whether the time has not come in our industrial and political history when there ought to be some radical social adjustments in our whole economic system.

The budget has been said to be a disappointment. I do not know that some of us had expected it would be very different from what it is. I am not so sure but that it is a good thing that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has come out frankly and stated that he would like to see the policies incorporated in the budget made more or less a permanent policy for Canada. We understand now more clearly, and I think the country understands more clearly, that the present Liberal government is committed to very much the same kind of policy as that of the government that it superseded. In fact, it is very interesting to some of us to find the members of the Conservative group congratulating the Minister of Finance on having learned the principles which they have advocated so long. Essentially the budget reveals an intention to perpetuate the old policies. There is nothing to indicate any radical changes in the policy of this country; we are still going on what has been known for a great many years in Canada as the National Policy. There is not even any indication of a gradual alteration; rather, as I have said, the Minister of Finance has thrown out the suggestion that the manufacturers and others ought to be assured that there will be no great changes. The people generally are looking for light at this time, they are wondering in what direction the light will break. I think we may say it is clear that the light is not breaking from the quarter occupied by the Liberal party. In the Liberal manifesto issued in October, 1921, publication number 11, we read that the tariff policy—

—advocated placing implements of production and food on the free list, thus benefiting labour both as producers and consumers.

That promise seems to have been entirely forgotten; indeed, in some instances at least the duty on the necessities of life has been greatly increased.

An hon. MEMBER: What about raisins?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes—raisins. I have the following telegram from the Women's Labour League:

Sugar resolution protest forwarded yesterday. Latest advice on budget housewives note proposed increased duty on raisins will increase final cost at least four cents per pound. Raisins and currants are household necessity and we feel present duty of two-thirds cents per pound high enough and government should find ways and means of raising necessary taxes without penalizing the housewife.

I should like to quote an oft quoted passage from an address by one who stands very

high in the opinion of a great many men across the floor of the House, and, I think, in the opinion of the country at large—Wilfrid Laurier. In a convention speech before he came into power he said:

> If every cent collected through the operation of the protective policy went into the treasury it could be borne, but for every dollar that goes into the public coffers two or three dollars go into the pockets of the protected manufacturers. . . . We will relieve the people of protection, which is a fraud, a delusion and a robbery. For it is a robbery to take money from one man and give it to another.

It seems very strange that the Progressives after all these years have to advance this plank of free trade and urge that protection is essentially evil in itself.

With regard to the general attitude of the government toward our larger public questions, I should like to read also a note that was sent to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a few weeks ago. This comes from the Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association:

> We note that almost half of the budget will be applied in payment for past wars and in preparations for future wars and it would appear to us that something could have been expected from the government for the preservation of life and the building up of a higher grade of citizens. While the government, evidently, has no regard for the welfare of the workers of this country, we note their great interest in cattle and farm stock. To such an extent are they interested in the latter, that nearly three millions of dollars is voted to wipe out disease and in improving the type of stock. We cannot be blamed if we come to the conclusion that we as human beings in the working class are considered of less value than cows, horses and pigs. We do not say that the grant should not have been given; on the contrary we believe that it is a good investment, but at the same time we feel that the unemployed workers are entitled to some consideration.

The Minister of Finance seems to be very much concerned—chiefly concerned, shall I say?—over the question, how shall we raise the necessary money, and how can we so raise it as to give occasion for the least protest? It would appear as if there were some larger and more primary questions that should be asked at this time. We are running a vast machine and it seems as if it takes all the steam that we can generate to keep it going—there is no power left to pull the load. We must admit that with our small population we have altogether too extensive governmental machinery. I think of this large House here, with the Senate across the way; I think of all the departments that we have at Ottawa, of our provincial governments, in some cases with two Houses in a province, of the many departments connected with them; of the county machinery in some of the provinces, the municipal machinery, all on an elaborate scale. The fact is that our comparatively small population cannot begin to carry such a load as this, and the people are beginning to get out from under it. It has been said by one of the members on the government side that you cannot blame ambitious young men for going over to the United States, that you cannot blame people for seeking the higher wages over there. I am not sure just what their position ought to be from the patriotic standpoint, but I take it that we who are here charged with public responsibility are attempting to do the most patriotic duty possible when we try to get at the real evils underlying the present condition of affairs.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was trying to point out that the time had come in the history of this country when we should be concerned not merely with the questions of how to raise a certain amount of money, and how to raise it with the least protest, but that rather we must face some of the more fundamental questions which are before us. A great many of the citizens to-day are looking for the government to take stock, as it were, of the actual situation, in which we find our country, and to introduce those measures, however radical, that are really necessary to meet the present situation. I ventured to point out in passing that we could hardly look at the legislative and administrative machinery of government of this country without recognizing that we are organized on altogther too elaborate a scale, involving an expense heavier than our population really warrants. Our federal, provincial and municipal organization is very elaborate and very costly, and in some way we must cut this down. Just where reforms are to begin is a question. In this House, the highest legislative body in the land, we might well set ourselves to the task of reorganizing our governmental machinery. But further than that, much deeper than that, is the question of the organization of the whole economic resources of the country and their proper administration. I have tried to secure from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics some estimate as to the wealth of Canada. The officials gave me a rough approximation of the value of our developed resources. It is almost impossible to form any estimate as to the value of the undeveloped resources, the value of the water

powers and so on, but the statement furnished by the bureau was as follows—

Farm values in 1921	$3,196,876,000
Buildings	1,035,712,000
Implements	391,660,000
Live stock	766,720,000
Poultry	38,007,000
Animals on fur farms	5,824,000
Mines and forests	1,200,000,000
Fisheries	50,405,000
Steam and electric railways	2,687,000,000
Canals	137,000,000
Shipping	200,000,000
Telegraph and telephones	191,000,000
Urban real property	4,115,050,000
Manufacturing machinery	666,835,335
Stocks of raw material to manufacture goods	789,513,000
Stored products of farms, fisheries and mines	500,000,000
Household furnishings, clothing, carriages, motors, etc.	800,000,000
Specie	193,603,304
Imported merchandise in store	250,000,000
Total for Canada	$17,215,205,639

Surely, when we talk about the poverty of Canada, we cannot be thinking of our vast natural resources and the equipment to work those resources. I would call your attention in this statement to the one item, specie, which amounts to only about 1 per cent. We are making a great deal of fuss these days about whether or not we have gold. According to the statement of the Bureau of Statistics, the gold that we have in this country amounts to only about 1 per cent of the entire national wealth. It is really a negligible quantity, and when bankers are trying to impress upon us the necessity of a return to the gold standard, whatever that means, we may very well bear in mind that the actual amount of specie we have in Canada does not matter very much one way or another.

Next, having given a statement of our physical assets, as it were, I should like to turn and ask: What about our annual production? Again these figures are supplied by the Bureau of Statistics:

Estimated gross annual agricultural revenue, 1921	$1,396,233,000
Fur industry, 1920-21	10,152,000
Forestry, 1920	306,661,000
Fisheries, 1920	49,241,000
Minerals, 1921	172,431,000
Manufactures, 1920	1,830,145,000

That is the net value added in manufactures.

Transportation and communication, 1920	$ 603,134,000
Professional (very rough estimate)	200,000,000
Wholesale and retail trade (very rough estimate)	600,000,000
Total production	$5,167,997,000

Let me note that with a capital of $17,000,000,000 as given by the Bureau of Statistics, we produced, according to the estimate of the bureau, about $5,000,000,000, or about 30 per cent. The value of production per capita is $585, or, taking a family of five, $2,925. That is, keeping in mind the immense amount of unemployment and under-employment, the very small percentage of efficiency in our productive and distributional processes, the over-lapping, the lack of proper organization on the one hand and over-organization on the other, the general anarchy that prevails in our industrial, commercial and financial world—taking all this into consideration, the fact is that we yet produce for an average family something like $3,000 a year.

I want to come a little closer in our study of one particular industry where the figures are more readily available than in some others. That is the manufacturing industry. The figures in connection with the manufacturing industry of Canada in 1920 are as follows:

Value of products	$4,019,371,869
Cost of materials	2,189,227,028
Net value of products	$1,830,144,841
Total wages and salaries	814,412,677
Leaving a balance of	$1,015,732,164

I should just like to ask the question: For what and for whom is that immense balance? I note that, according to these figures, the average salary is $1,773, and the average wage is $1,102.

Let me give another note supplied by the Bureau of Statistics. The fixed capital invested amounted to, say, $3,500,000,000, and the value of the products to, say, $4,000,000,000, representing a net production of $1,800,000,000. The par value of securities of joint stock companies engaged in manufactures amounts to $2,743,520,823, of which $1,591,076,596, were held in Canada and the rest outside of Canada, so that dividends, bond interest, etc., were paid in these proportions. Altogether Canada's indebtedness outside of Canada has been estimated at about $400,000,000,000. According to those figures, in the manufactures of Canada in 1920, salaries and wages accounted for 44·5 per cent of the value added by the process of manufacture; fuel and miscellaneous expenses, 26·9 per cent; interest on capital investment at 6 per cent, 11·3 per cent; leaving a balance of 17.3 per cent for profits, discount charges, depreciation and other unprovided-for expenditures.

I should like to turn for a moment to the other side of the ledger and ask concerning our national debt. These figures also are furnished by the Bureau of Statistics for the

year ended March 31, 1922. The net public debt amounted to $2,422,135,801, or, per capita, $275.60. I turn to the provincial governments. There we have both direct liabilities and indirect liabilities. Of the direct liabilities, the per capita figures are as follows:

Prince Edward Island	$ 17 10
Nova Scotia	42 96
New Brunswick	77 69
Quebec	24 71
Ontario	69 86
Manitoba	119 74
Saskatchewan	60 63
Alberta	108 12
British Columbia	115 52

Further than that, our municipal debenture or bond interest by provinces is as follows—I again give merely the per capita figures:

Prince Edward Island	$12 28
Nova Scotia	36 64
New Brunswick	27 95
Quebec	80 55
Ontario	91 94
Manitoba	94 77
Saskatchewan	52 26
Alberta	97 21
British Columbia	183 21

I am going to take Manitoba, my own province, as an example of particular interest to myself. The national net public debt per capita is $275.60; provincial direct liabilities $119.74; municipal debentures and bonded debts $94.77; a total of $490.11, or roughly speaking $500. A newspaper editorial, commenting upon a similar set of figures, says:

> It is common knowledge that the net national debt has been increased approximately eight times during the last decade with very little increase in the population. President Gooderham, of the Bank of Toronto, in his statement at the annual meeting of that institution, said that the total debts of the federal and provincial governments and municipalities amounted to $4,000,000,000, or about $500 per head. This is a staggering statement when it is borne in mind that the greater part of this indebtedness is now bearing more than five per cent interest, which means that the average family is bearing an annual interest charge of at least $100 a year for public expenditure alone.

Then we find this situation: Illimitable natural resources in Canada. No one doubts it. It is not necessary to go into an enumeration of what they are. Further, we are well equipped with an elaborate system of production and distribution; we are, on the whole, an industrious and resourceful people. And yet for some mysterious reason we have unemployment on the part of a considerable section, anxiety on the part of a still larger group, and general dissatisfaction. What do we find the government offering us in view of all these circumstances? Well, they are taking a tax off candies and putting a little higher duty on raisins. Is that a proper solution for the immense problems that we face at the present time?

I should like to-night, as well as I may, to present this question from the viewpoint of labour. We have had the problem outlined this afternoon from the viewpoint of the farmer. Labour, as yet, in this country is poorly organized politically. We are very few in number in this House, and yet it is clearly manifest to all that labour is by no means negligible numerically across the country, and one day its voice will be heard more effectively than it is to-day. The viewpoint presented to us by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) this afternoon was very largely that of free trade. Now, I would suggest that free trade came into existence as an economic gospel at a time when there was real competition among the trading classes of Great Britain. At that time undoubtedly it was in the interests of the manufacturers, the traders, and perhaps the public at large in England that there should be a very large measure of free trade. But there have taken place most remarkable developments in the economic field since that time. All our large industries have been built up, our great combinations and trusts have been organized, and our governments themselves have been induced to take a larger part in the economic affairs of the country. So that it is very doubtful indeed whether, except in a very limited degree, free trade will solve our problems. I, for one, am heartily in agreement with it, the underlying principle, but I doubt whether it can be carried out under existing conditions. Even if it were, as it has been in free trade England, there are still unemployment and social difficulties. I doubt, therefore, whether it is a real solution of our problems. So far as labour is concerned, socialism is the economic gospel of the labour movement, as free trade is, or was, the economic gospel of the trading classes of Great Britain at the time when political Liberalism came to its best development. In Great Britain, however, we have had in recent years new political ideals and alignments. A good many in this House like to stress the part that Great Britain has played, and to point out to us the example that Great Britain affords us. Well, I am content to follow their lead, and to-night I should like to indicate the policies that are being advocated these days by the opposition party in the British House of Commons.

The great British National Labour party starts out on this programme:

> To secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the

basis of the common ownership of the means of production and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service.

It has been said in the past that socialism, whether of a co-operative variety, or the Fabian type, or state socialism, was altogether an academic question. Someone stated on the floor of the House the other day that it would never find any place in any Anglo-Saxon country. We cannot be quite so sure of that when it has become a matter of practical politics in Great Britain. A few weeks ago the following resolution was introduced into the British House of Commons as an amendment, I believe, to the budget:

That in view of the failure of the capitalist system to adequately utilize and organize natural resources and productive power, or to provide the necessary standard of life for vast numbers of the populations, and believing that the cause of this failure lies in the private ownership and control of the means of production and distribution, this House declares that legislative effort should be directed to the gradual supersession of the capitalist system by an industrial and social order based on the public ownership and democratic control of the instruments of production and distribution.

This resolution was introduced by Mr. Philip Snowden. Now, whether or not the members of this House can agree with such a resolution as that, it does seem to me highly desirable that we in the various dominions should know what is taking place in the Motherland, and that we in the opposition in some of the Houses in the dominions should try to bring before the public of this country what some of the leading people in Great Britain believe will be the solution of our social problems. You will notice that this is a very moderate resolution indeed. In some countries the labouring classes in desperation have rushed in, have overturned the present system, and are attempting to set up another. The British Labour party does not propose to do that. It offers at least an alternative solution. Whether or not the country is in a position to adopt the alternative remains to be seen, but at least it is put forward as a possible solution. The far reaching character of this resolution was clearly set forth by Mr. Lloyd George in an article which was published in our papers of April 21. I should like to quote a paragraph or two from that article because Mr. Lloyd George is a critic of these labour proposals, and so, perhaps, his estimate of the seriousness of this resolution may be regarded as being moderate. Speaking of the socialist vote, Mr. Lloyd George said:

At the last election the aggregate socialist poll reached the imposing figure of 4,251,011 votes. The party that secured a majority of members in the House of Commons polled only 5,467,871 votes. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald states categorically that he knows that independent Liberal members—exclusive of their leaders—favour nationalization and a capital levy. If that be an accurate statement of the views of the majority of these gentlemen and of those who elect them, nearly one half of the British electorate are already prepared to assent to Socialism in easy stages—which is the purport of Mr. Philip Snowden's motion.

On that assumption we are on the eve of greater and more fundamental changes affecting the lives of every class and condition of men and women than has yet been seen in this country. Hence the new sense of struggle with which the political atmosphere is palpitating. Capitalism is to be arraigned before the supreme court of the nation, condemned, sentenced and executed by instalments—Chinese fashion. The composition of that court is not to-day favourable to the prosecution. But who will be the judges after the next general election?

Again:

The men and women who have no property for the state to seize constitute an overwhelming majority of the electors of the country.

And again in suggesting how to avoid trouble:

The second and more important is the rooting out of social evils which furnish the revolutionary with striking and indisputable object lessons of the failure of the capitalistic system as an agent of human happiness.

I take it that we are in this position—either we have to advance to some radical programme of this kind, or we have to say there must take place such fundamental changes as will do away with the gross injustices which now exist.

Mr. H. G. Wells says:

The great war has struck a blow at the very foundation of our civilization. It has shattered the monetary system which is the medium of all our economic life. A rotting down of civilization is spreading now very rapidly and nothing is being done to arrest it.

And this fate is not threatening civilization; it is happening to civilization before our eyes. The ship of civilization is not going to sink in five years' time or in fifty years' time. It is sinking now.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that certain hon. members are prejudiced against some of those who hold what they regard as radical views. Perhaps few of us realize how radical are many of the critics of the social system, how clearly they recognize that if Socialism, as they have pictured it, is not to come into existence, then almost equally radical changes must take place in society. I believe a great many members of this House are loyal adherents of the great Catholic church. Might I then quote a statement written for the Halifax Evening Mail by Dr. J. J. Tompkins, Vice-President of the St. Francis Xavier University? He says:

The average Conservative citizen who does not feel the pinch of want, as so many of the exploited poor do, or who is not actively engaged in "industry" has not begun to realize the grave import of these facts—indeed, the facts themselves have scarcely dawned upon his consciousness. Such a man would probably

be startled to read in a recent cable despatch the proceedings of a meeting of Catholic bishops and priests presided over by Cardinal Logue. Describing the conditions that menaced society, one of the speakers said that by degrees workingmen had been delivered helpless and isolated to the hardheartedness of employees and the greed of unchecked competition; that the mischief had been increased by the rapacious usury of financiers; and that to these evils was added the custom of doing work by large contracts which concentrated many branches of business in the hands of a few individuals.

It followed as a dreadful consequence, therefore, that "a small number of very rich men had been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than slavery itself". The remedies are proposed in language equally frank and outspoken: "We should not shrink from the application of Catholic social principles however startling or revolutionary they may appear to persons long adjusted to prevailing circumstances. We must make up our minds that the wage system has to go. The wage system is degenerating into industrial anarchy before our very eyes. It is doing more than Socialism to restrict ownership. The worker must be made a partner so that he may get a proper share of the income earned by his work."

Many ecclesiastical authorities as well as those representing various types of social work and economic thought, have united in bringing before our attention the indisputable fact that to-day we are face to face with a serious crisis. I have spoken of this world situation because I believe that we in Canada are simply part of a larger world, and that our troubles are simply systematic of the troubles that exist in the whole body politic. For that reason I crave the indulgence of the House while I explain how we of the labour movement believe that we have arrived at the present stage of development in our economic and political life.

Going back to the England of one hundred and fifty years ago we come to a great change, which is known to historians as the industrial revolution. Before that time the great majority of workers produced by means of a few simple tools all that was necessary for themselves and their immediate neighbours. Then came the introduction of machinery and the application of mechanical power. That changed entirely the course of the history of Great Britain and of the world at large. It ushered in a completely new era, so different from the past that students of economic history have called it a revolution. The use of machinery meant greatly increased production. Commodities were turned out sufficient not merely for the local markets, not merely for the immediate county, not merely for England herself, but for the whole world. England became the workshop of the world. Not only that, but processes of standardization were introduced, which meant that the people generally began to consume much more nearly the same class of things, and therefore the market could be supplied much more readily. Things went well so long as England was the only workshop in the world; but gradually other nations began to introduce the modern type of production—France, Italy, later Germany, later the United States, and last of all the Orient, so that to-day we have the same kind of system prevailing throughout the greater part of the world.

Now, I submit that while this system may have been fairly tolerable and, indeed, beneficial in Great Britain while she was the only country that manufactured in this way, this same system may prove anything but desirable when a large number of countries have adopted it. However, I want to give the system its full due. Undoubtedly it has led to the development of what we regard as our modern industrial civilization. Here in Canada until a few years ago the large majority of us lived in the country or in small rural towns where we had very much the same type of production that prevailed in England one hundred and fifty years ago. It is within the memory of most of us that these changes have taken place in Canada. The trouble is that a good many of us are still thinking in terms of individualistic production. Our ideals are still those of the individual producer, as our institutions are largely those that prevailed before this great world change took place. The industrial revolution has affected most profoundly farm life as well as city life. it is only making itself manifest to-day. To a considerable extent the farmer is still an individual producer, and yet the farmer would be helpless to-day without his machinery. Our western farmers would be in a sad plight without the railways that bring his supplies and take away his goods. In fact, as soon as the farmer steps off his own farm he becomes a cog in this vast machinery of production and distribution However, he is still to a limited extent the owner of the tools of production and so perhaps he has not quite so clearly realized the character of the machine as has his industrial neighbour in the city.

The machine was applied to transportation, and we have our transcontinental railroads and our transoceanic steamship lines. These have really brought all the different parts of the earth into one great community. Still, we sometimes talk as if we lived a narrow national life. The fact is that industry and commerce and finance have spread away beyond the confines of narrow national boundaries. Whether we like it or not we

are to-day living in an international community. That is the point we must remember. One of the difficulties is that we are still thinking in terms of the parish, in terms of the little country, in terms of one continent, instead of in world terms.

Not only was production fundamentally altered in its character, but the industrial revolution wrought a very decided change in the economic status of the worker. As long as a man, with his own hands and a few tools, could provide for his own needs, he might have been said to be a free man. If he did not produce, it was his own fault; if he did not make his living, it was his own fault. But when the big factory was set up and in order to carry on his work of weaving he had to leave his hand loom and to go to the factory then he ceased to have that freedom which once he possessed; he became simply a wage worker. He had no control over his tools of production; he had no voice in the management; he had nothing to say with regard to the disposal of his product. The owner of the factory claimed to own the product because he owned the machinery, and thus the hitherto free workman of Great Britain was reduced to being simply a hired man, a wage earner, or as he himself sometimes bitterly puts it, a wage slave. There is a good deal of truth in that expression; for whoever controls a man's livelihood really controls his life. I could make this position of the industrial worker understandable by our farmer friends if I could picture a great syndicate coming into the West and buying up several thousand square miles of territory and proceeding to organize it under scientific management. The individual farmer would become simply a tenant, a hired man. Possibly he would be compelled to give up the little home in which he had been brought up and to go and live at some central point from which the farm operations would be carried on. He would have nothing to say as to the disposal of his product; from then on, he would be reduced to the position of being forever a hired man and his children forever hired men. That is the position of the industrial worker. In this connection I should like to submit that perhaps the farmer is not so very far from reaching that position. Statistics from the southwestern states so long ago as Roosevelt's commission, on agricultural conditions showed that in increasing numbers the farmers were becoming merely tenants. Out in the West a year or two ago a farmer, who had the impression that we wanted to nationalize the private farms—which was not our idea at all—said, "After all, I would be quite willing that the state should own the farms; I would rather have government ownership than bank ownership."

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Undoubtedly this new form of production, with its concentration of capital, has led to some very important and valuable results. It has been largely responsible for what we term modern civilization. Whether this is capable of being perpetuated remains to be seen. Mr. John Maynard Keynes, in that epoch-making book of his, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace", points out some of the advantages of the concentration of capital in a few hands. He says:

> The immense accumulations of fixed capital which, to the great benefit of mankind, were built up during the half century before the war, could never have come about in a society where wealth was divided equitably. The railways of the world, which that age built as a monument to posterity, were, not less than the pyramids of Egypt, the work of labour which was not free to consume in immediate enjoyment the full equivalent of its efforts. Thus this remarkable system depended for its growth on a double bluff or deception. On the one hand the labouring classes accepted from ignorance or powerlessness, or were compelled, persuaded or cajoled by custom, convention, authority, and the well-established order of society into accepting, a situation in which they could call their own very little of the cake that they and nature and the capitalists were co-operating to produce. And on the other hand the capitalist classes were allowed to call the best part of the cake theirs and were theoretically free to consume it, on the tacit underlying condition that they consumed very little of it in practice. The duty of "saving" became nine-tenths of virtue and the growth of the cake the object of true religion. There grew round the non-consumption of the cake all those instincts of puritanism which in other ages has withdrawn itself from the world and has neglected the arts of production as well as those of enjoyment. And so the cake increased; but to what end was not clearly contemplated.

Mr. Keynes says there is coming a fundamental change—and that is what I should like this House to recognize; we cannot reckon on the old system going on as before the war. He says:

> The war has disclosed the possibility of consumption to all and the vanity of abstinence to many. Thus the bluff is discovered; the labouring classes may be no longer willing to forego so largely, and the capitalist classes, no longer confident of the future, may seek to enjoy more fully their liberties of consumption so long as they last, and thus precipitate the hour of their confiscation.

I have said that so long as England very largely held a monopoly of this new method of production, so long as she was able to invest and reinvest her capital abroad, the situation was not so bad; but after a while when the colonies began to set up this self-same system, and when even the Orient did the same, the conditions became fundamentally altered. They needed larger markets in England and hence said: If we can only get free trade, that is all that is required. But to-day

where are we to find new markets? The United States is after larger markets. All the countries of Europe are after larger markets. Japan and China are after larger markets. Where then are these larger markets to come from? Before, as Mr. Keynes points out, the man who owned the tools was able to control a large part of the product. He gave in wages to his workmen a very small part of what they produced, and as long as he could keep the balance for himself and invest it in some other country he was all right, but when he had nowhere else to invest it then came the difficulty. His factories became idle and his men unemployed.

Why? Fundamentally, because the workers had not the buying power. That is the real trouble to-day. Men who are not socialists, leading economists like Mr. J. A. Hobson, have told us for the past twenty years that what the world requires is to distribute a larger measure of buying power. That is what some of the economists have been trying to tell us in the Banking committee in the last few weeks. We need buying power. Unfortunately the whole financial system has been built up so long on the older basis that we have become hypnotized by the older ideas and do not seem to be able to perceive the newer ideas clearly. Ever since the war the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has been telling us we ought to produce more; then when our warehouses are full they are at a loss to know where to find the markets. A good many of my farmer friends are beginning to realize that when they produce more as they are advised they too will be faced with the same problem. When the Argentine produces more largely, when Russia and the other countries of Europe begin again to produce wheat more freely, where are our markets coming from? Thus we come to the strange anomaly as we have it to-day in all parts of the world, a plethora of produced articles and yet at the same time a vast mass of impoverished, unemployed workers. Surely something is fundamentally wrong, and unless we can seriously tackle this problem here in our own country as they are attempting to do in some other countries, I do not know that we can hope to make very permanent progress.

This vast capitalistic system set up rival groups of manufacturers, traders and capitalists—that increased in power until the successful competitors became organized on a national and even an international scale. I am not going into the perplexed question of the causes of the late war. Undoubtedly as a great many thinkers have recognized, it was fundamentally a struggle for world markets.

If we had any doubt about that
9 p.m. question before or during the war, surely the Peace Treaty and the events since the signing of that treaty must have revealed to us that the great nations are dominated by great competing industrial and financial concerns striving to get possession of world markets, concessions and mandates and all this kind of thing, in order that they may control the situation for themselves.

We have had in the building up of these competing groups, of course, the great problem of combination. As I have said if we could have free trade it would be a good thing, but as I tried to show on the floor of this House the other day, the fact is that in our great combinations we recognize a development which is bound to go ever forward. Someone has said in Great Britain, either the trusts will control the nation or the nation must control the trusts. If we can control the trusts and let them go on with their work, I suppose it is all very well, but the trusts have become too firmly established, too monopolistic in character, to permit them to remain under private control.

Perhaps more serious than the monopoly which has taken place in the industrial field and the vast extension of large scale commercial operations throughout the world has been the more recent control of finance. There is to-day a monopoly of credit. I do not intend to anticipate the debate on the control of credit which must come in connection with our banking system, but I would say that the evidence which has come before the Banking committee has revealed to us that in this country as in other countries a comparatively small group of people control the whole of our financial machinery. In Canada some seventeen financial groups can say practically where and what shall be produced. Further than that, they can say at what price things shall be produced. I am not going to elaborate those statements. I think they can be proved when there is opportunity so to do.

This great system which has grown up, industrial, commercial and financial, which, for want of a better term, we commonly call the capitalist system, has had not only its great economic results, but also its social consequences. One of these is that those who own so largely the resources of the world exercise a predominating influence over all our educational agencies—our schools, our universities, our churches, our press and so on. I repeat that those who own come inevitably to exercise a very great influence in all these various educational agencies. I hope every member

of this House has been reading the books of Upton Sinclair on conditions on the other side of the line. With regard to the control of the press even in Great Britain, I should like to read this statement from Viscount Northcliffe:

> Behind every single London daily newspaper, with the possible exception of some sporting journals and a labour publication, of which I know nothing, there is a multi-millionaire or a very wealthy colleague, a shipping king, a cotton-waste king, coal kings, an oil king and the rest of them.

That is the situation that we find all over the world to-day and which makes it so difficult for us to carry on an effective propaganda. Not only that, but these vast industries and financial concerns have secured a tremendous hold on the governments of our country. I am not going to speak of conditions here in Canada for a moment but I will go to Great Britain, the Mother of Parliaments. There is a vast organization over there known as the Federation of British Industries with which I believe the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is in affiliation. In its bulletin of February 3, 1920, the F. B. I. states:

> The federation is now a very powerful body representing through its direct and indirect members some 18,000 manufacturing firms with a united capital estimated at £4,000,000,000 . . . . . When the general voice of industry on any particular question of national importance is expressed by the Federation of British Industries it is received with due weight by the government and the press. . . . During and after the war it has secured representation on most of the government committees appointed to inquire into matters concerning industrial, economic and financial policy. The value of its watchful activities regarding legislation affecting industry can hardly be overrated.

The pamphlet from which I am reading, the publication of the Labour Research Department, goes on to say:

> After the election of 1918, when about seventy directors of firms belonging to the F. B. I. were returned to the House of Commons, a parliamentary committee was set up, and a special "Liaison department" was established for the purpose of keeping in direct touch with government departments. From this time on the "watchful activities" of the federation ranged from influencing the form of the peace treaties to the determining of the post-war programme of the government.

Let me add one more paragraph of this same pamphlet which gives the viewpoint of labour in the Old Country,—a viewpoint which is to a large extent shared by labour in this country.

> But although the representatives of big business have captured both the Commons and the Lords, their power does not reside there or depend upon this capture. This generation, which has seen a newspaper make and unmake a government, has no illusions on that score. Just as the king, a sacramental man of the Middle Ages, lost all his personal power and became the mere facade of the structure of government, so the whole of parliament has become a facade behind which go on the operations of finance capital and the real government of the country. Were the workers' representatives to gain a majority in the House of Commons and abolish the House of Lords, they would only have captured the outworks. The real struggle would still lie before them.

Now in this indictment of capitalism, which has been made by British labour on the floor of the House of Commons at Westminster and which is being made all over this country to-day in every labour union hall, as well as in every workers mass meeting, we have had splendid reinforcements from those known in Great Britain as the intellectuals. On the floor of this House the other day, the Conservative member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), referred to the last book of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "The Decay of Capital and Civilization". I venture to quote a paragraph from that book in which the authors sum up the arguments which may be used against the existing system. They say:

> The socialist indictment of the capitalist system of industry and the society based upon it has four main counts. History proves that, whilst national poverty may have other causes, wherever and whenever the greatest part of the population are divorced from the ownership of the instruments of production, even where the aggregate production is relatively enormous, the bulk of the people live in penury and large numbers of them are perpetually threatened by starvation.

We have our millions upon millions of unemployed in Great Britain. We have our millions upon the very verge of starvation in Great Britain, but I submit that in all countries more or less the same condition exists. Even in Canada, with any abundant natural resources, we have had a very large share of unemployment, and those who have worked in our large cities among the industrial population know that large numbers are on the ragged edge of poverty. Let me read further:

> In the second place this penury and its accompanying insecurity are rendered more hideous and humiliating by the relative comfort and luxury of the proprietary class and by the shameless idleness of some of its members.

Let me pause for a moment to suggest that whilst we in Canada have not had, in the past, the vast differences between the very wealthy and the very poor, there has undoubtedly been created, especially since the war, an ever widening gap, between those who live by owning and those who work for their living. I know that we are still in the first generation of those who have earned large fortunes. I know perfectly well that a good many of those who are wealthy to-day have worked as hard as anyone, perhaps harder, and yet the fact remains that their wealth has come to them, not merely by hard work, but because they have been enabled, with some start they have had, to secure ex-

ceptional privileges or to secure monopolies of various kinds which have more or less placed other people within their control, In our largest cities to-day we are beginning to develop the social diseases associated with wealth. Reading on:

> The worst circumstance of capitalism is, however, neither the poverty of the wage-earner nor the luxury of the property owner, but, thirdly, the glaring inequality in personal freedom between the propertyless man and the member of the class that "lives by owning." Hour by hour, day by day, year in and year out, the two-thirds of the nation who depend for their daily or weekly house-keeping on gaining access to the instruments of production find themselves working under the orders of the relatively restricted class of those who own these instruments. The sanction for the orders is not legal punishment, but, ultimately, a starvation which is supposed to be optional.

That is what is meant by the wage earners when they complain of wage slavery? It was not until I went into the industrial ranks myself, that I began to realize what the Webbs mean here when they speak of those who have so little freedom, freedom of self expression, or control over their daily lives. It is all very well for men who use the old Liberal phrases, to talk about us having political liberty, but if a man has not liberty to go out and earn his daily bread, if a man has not any real liberty in finding a job, political liberty becomes an absolutely vain thing. I would say again to my farmer friends to whom I appeal, because I believe their condition is fundamentally the same as that of the industrial workers of the cities, that they should realize that this political liberty would be absolutely useless if they had not that liberty which comes through the power to earn a decent livelihood for themselves and their families. One other point which is made is this:

> Fourthly, the socialist believes that the very basis of the capitalist system is scientifically unsound, as a means of organizing the production and distribution of commodities and services, and fundamentally inconsistent with the spiritual advancement of the race.

We come now to the practical difficulty. If this system is functioning, I have comparatively little to say with regard to it, but when we see, in almost every nation that has adopted it, that it is failing to supply large numbers of men and women and children with the actual necessities of life, when we find that it is setting one group against another, and one nation against other nations, we may well ask ourselves, whether there is not something in it that is fundamentally unsound. We have in Canada such a bad situation that by tens of thousands the labouring people are leaving to go to the South. We have farming conditions of the worst kind portrayed to us in season and out of season in the House. We have high prices that are felt by the consumers from one end of the country to the other. We have a large number of business men in nearly all our cities to-day who are feeling the pinch very severely. They are more or less whistling to keep up their courage. They are saying that they must not give a black eye to the country, but if we inquire in any of our cities we find that there are back rentals and large accounts owing to the bank, and all other indications of a most serious economic condition.

What do we propose? I am not going to spend any great length of time to-night on our proposals, simply because I realize perfectly well that we are not in a position effectively to propose anything. We are in this house too few in numbers. I would suggest merely the lines along which we hope to advance. I would put forward the principles that, in our opinion, ought to underlie sound legislation and administration. We say that there ought to be democracy, not only in politics but in industry. I am not pleading for any particular form of economic or political life. Many people think we cannot speak of socialism without referring to state socialism. It may very well be that some of our concerns may come under federal control, for instance the railways. And in passing let me say that I cannot see that we are going to effectively operate a Canadian National railway in opposition to a privately-owned Canadian Pacific railway. Sooner or later we must bring our great railways under one control. Some things may be owned by the federal government; others may be owned by our provincial governments. I can see very well how great natural resources like our coal mines might be brought under provincial control. I think my farmer friends have already gone as far as recognizing that it might be well that we should have some sort of definite government control over our mines. We can hardly think of these great coal measures in Nova Scotia and Alberta, and the way in which they are being maladministered at the present time and the fact that the people are not being able to get the fuel that they should, without recognizing that it is a responsibility of the government effectively to operate or control an industry which is so vital to the life of the nation.

Sometimes we socialists use another phrase to indicate what we should like to see brought about, and that is "production for use instead of for profit." I am giving a phrase; it may be no more than a phrase; but after all we must try to formulate in some way our ideals. Our thought is that we have gone on producing for profit, competing firms producing for profit, until we have lost the real meaning

of production. Why do farmers produce wheat? Fundamentally not to sell; they produce wheat to be made into flour to feed hungry men, women and children. Why do we produce coal? Fundamentally, not for profit, not to sell, but in order that we may use it to warm our homes and to run our factories. Why do we produce furniture, clothing and all the other manufactured articles? Fundamentally, not to sell, but in order that we may use them in our every day life. Our contention is that we have gone on and on and on in this system, each man producing simply to sell, producing as much as he can, producing irrespective of the real needs of the people, until we have forgotten the primary reason of production. We say that we have to get back to fundamentals so to organize our productive and distributional processes that we shall produce in order that the people may use.

We have come very near to a place when either we must face a collapse in our financial system or we must bring about radical readjustments which will in themselves amount to a practical reconstruction of the system—one thing or the other. Take for example our financial system to-day. If we go on and on piling up debts as we are doing, it is absolutely impossible that we shall ever pay them. One cannot observe the way the debts have been pyramided—to use a word that has been common in the Banking committee—during the past few years, and hope that this can be a stable system. There must be either a collapse or such radical change in the system itself as will be really revolutionary in its character. The old parties have their policies. Labour offers an alternative policy. I should like to suggest the practical lines along which labour in Canada proposes to proceed even at the present time in order to keep things going. The party which I have the honour to represent suggest the following fiscal planks in their platform:

6. Regaining for the use of the people of the natural resources of this country which have been so recklessly alienated by incompetent or venal administrations.

7. Public ownership and democratic operation of public utilities, and, as soon as possible, of essential large-scale industries.

8. The nationalization of the banking system.

9. Abolition of fiscal legislation that leads to class privilege: (b) Removal of taxes on the necessaries of life; (c) Taxation of land values; (d) After exemption of small incomes, a steeply graded income and inheritance tax.

10. A capital levy for the abolition of the war debt.

I am not going to argue these points to-night. That can be done at some later time when our numbers will enable us to do so more effectively. But I should like to call attention to the fact that our taxation, as it has been in the past and as it is proposed by the budget before us, rests most heavily upon the ordinary people of the country. As far as I can read that budget, if there are modifications, the modifications are made in the interest of the moneyed people, in the interest of luxury, and not in the interest of the necessities of life which are most used by the large majority of the people of Canada. Taxation is the taking of wealth for the purposes of carrying on the government; it is taken from one or the other group. We claim that the government is taking a very large amount from one particular class to-day. Why should we not have some such arrangement as a capital levy for the abolition of our war debt, a levy on the actual property that is owned to-day by a limited group. At the beginning of my speech, I cited the large natural resources that we have in this country. Some people say that these lands and natural resources ought to be held inviolable; that they belong to one particular group, and that the rights of this group can never be challenged. Any one who has read such a book as the History of Canadian Wealth, any one who knows anything of the way in which the large resources of this country have been alienated, must recognize that the present owners have by no means given an equivalent for what they claim at the present time. From the standpoint of law itself, private property has never been recognized as being inviolable. I wonder if I may quote just a sentence or two on this point from legal authorities of Great Britain. Blackstone says:

It being received and now undeniable principle in law that all lands in England are holden mediately or immediately of the King.

Again Williams on Real Property, says:

The first thing the student has to do is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership. Such an idea is quite unknown in English law. No man is in law absolute owner of his land. He only owns an estate in them.

Again Cope says:

All lands or tenements in England in the hands of subjects are holden mediately, or immediately, of the King. For in the law of England we have not any subjects' land which is not so holden.

David Lloyd-George says:

I remember as a law student that the first thing I had to learn was that there was no such thing as private property in land.

With reference to the great estates that exist in England, the proposal of the British Labour party is to boldly recognize that these are fundamentally public property and should be administered as such. In this country our land is, to a considerable extent, held and

worked by small owners, and we need not worry over that. But we have other resources that are held by big syndicates, the great mining properties, the great water powers, all the machinery by which nearly all the goods of this country are produced. These resources are held by certain groups who claim an absolute private ownership in them. We assert there is no reason why the government should not tax these—tax them as heavily as it pleases, tax them even to the extent of partial or full expropriation. May I point out that during the war thousands of our men went overseas. Some of them went under a measure of conscription; they were told that their lives were owned by the state. I would say here, as I said a year ago, that if it is right to conscript men it is right to conscript wealth. There is no difference between the principles involved. I should not say that—there is an immense difference between the two. Surely men are worth infinitely more than natural resources, than mere wealth. Undoubtedly they are, and yet we have reversed the valuation. We have claimed that it is right to require men's lives but we hesitate to say it is right to require a portion of men's wealth. Our whole policy is built upon the idea that we must leave the dividends to the big companies, that we must leave the interest and dividends to the banks, that we must leave the big profits to the great trusts. These things are inviolable according to our present way of looking at matters. But we tax the ordinary necessities of life and make it so that many families in this country hardly know how to make both ends meet. We labour men claim that the whole policy must be reversed, we assert that when it comes to a conflict between the welfare of a majority of a people and what are called property rights, that the welfare of the people must have first place.

I am not going to prolong this argument. Perhaps there are some in the House who think that I should not have presented this case to-night, or at any such length as I have done. I have done so, because I believe that there is a growing body of public opinion throughout the country that is seeking a way out of our difficulties, and that that body of public opinion has not hitherto been able to give voice to its ideals in the house of parliament. I can recognize how easy it is for these men, who perhaps, come from the better classes of the business and professional men to see almost everything from one particular angle. They are themselves fairly well fed, fairly well housed, fairly well-to-do, and so they look at the situation from the standpoint of their particular class. But there are other groups in this country who because they have had altogether different experiences are thinking along altogether different lines. It is not because I want to "knock" our institutions that I make this serious indictment of the existing situation. It is because that it is well that parliament should know what all sections of the community are thinking about these matters. I have ventured to go into the subject more thoroughly because if a good many of the leading economists in this and other countries are right we are facing, not a situation which can be rapidly passed over, and from which we can hope there will be a return to normalcy, but rather a new epoch in our history. We are producing in a collective way and yet our institutions, economic and political, are lagging behind our method of production. The result is not satisfactory. We cannot claim that justice prevails between man and man. We cannot claim that we have evolved a civilization in which under the existing system there is any prospect of a permanent peace.

Before I close I should like to quote one or two sentences from one of the great writers of the Far East, Rabindranath Tagore. He says:

> We have seen that in spite of its (civilization's) boasted love of freedom, it has produced worse forms of slavery than ever were current in earlier societies—slavery whose chains are unbreakable, either because they are unseen, or because they assume the names and appearance of freedom.

And again:

> And this nation may grow on to an unimaginable corpulence, not of a living body, but of steel and steam and office buildings, till its deformity can contain no longer its ugly voluminousness—till it begins to crack and gape, breathe gas and fire in gasps, and its death-rattle sound in cannon roars.
>
> I ask you to have the strength of faith and clarity of mind to know for certain that the lumbering structure of modern progress, rivetted by the iron bolts of efficiency, which runs upon the wheels of ambition, cannot hold together for long.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we are facing to-day the necessity for radical changes. Members of this House again and again have pleaded that on the ground of patriotism we should do this, that and the other thing. I think we may claim that the vast majority of the people of this and other countries are earnestly desirous of doing the right thing. I am not seeking to impugn the motives of anyone, I am not seeking to suggest that anyone is particularly responsible for the condition of affairs that prevails to-day, but I would urge that every thoughtful man who realizes these conditions must set himself definitely to their

solution. Although some of us may be beneficiaries of the system, the thing for us to do is to recognise that either we must make changes or within a very short time we, as other nations have done, may pass through a period of great suffering if not of chaos. I would therefore plead that even at this session of parliament we frankly face the situation, and attempt the necessary changes however radical they may appear.

Mr. JOHN PRITCHARD (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I remember one hon. gentleman charging the Progressives, a few weeks ago, with being academic in their speeches. I assure you that it is my purpose to-night to be exceedingly practical. I have been sitting here for some months listening with a good deal of patience to the speeches made from day to day. I heard one remark during the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne offered by a member of the government. It was intended, I think, as a compliment to the seconder of the Address, and I noted it. It was that this is a good school. On that occasion he also expressed the opinion that members of parliament were up to and even above the average in morals. I believe he was stating the facts. Notwithstanding all that may have been said, disparaging and otherwise about the speeches that had been delivered in this House, I have come to the conclusion after carefully listening to our debates that no man even of average intelligence can be long a member and not receive a good deal of information.

I do not feel inclined to upbraid any particular group, for I feel that as members we are all here with one common object in view, no matter where we sit. But I believe there is a wide difference of opinion in regard to the policy that is best suited to promote our national interests, and before I sit down I hope to state some of the facts that I think have a bearing on this point.

One of the difficulties that we in this corner of the chamber have had in debate has been to establish the fact of the actual condition of agriculture in the Dominion, and I have noticed that some hon. members who are not farmers have not been inclined to accept the statements made by a number of my colleagues. Perhaps we may show a similar disinclination in regard to matters which may be brought forward by hon. members in other quarters of the House. I was convinced before I became a member of parliament of the wonderful ability possessed by many of our public men, of their remarkable grasp of the actual conditions of our country, and that when I came here and listened to them I would find I did not know very much. I will admit that this has been borne out by my experience here. But since I have sat in this chamber I have been struck by the fact that some of our most prominent members have made statements on the floor that I have good reason to believe were not altogether correct. While many of us may not have had the advantages of a university training, we have had the inestimable advantage of a good training in the school of practical experience. Theory is all very well, but I have noticed that when a man speaks on a subject on which he has practical knowledge it is pretty hard to beat him in debate.

Now, the question of policy bulks largely in this debate on the budget. For forty years we have been following a certain fiscal policy, and if we look at the result we can come to but one conclusion—that there is something radically wrong with its policy. As I stated last session, we have a vast country with only a sparse population. And yet in the estimates for the current year there is a million and three quarters set aside for unemployment—a condition of affairs which naturally was emphasized during the debate on immigration, when many hon. members in this quarter of the House objected to the initiation of any policy which would bring in more immigrants to swell the ranks of the unemployed. I have considerable patience with those who took that stand, and I agree with them that conditions here should be improved before we ask more people to come in. On the other hand, we admit that we want more population, we want immigration. The question then arises: How are we to make conditions better so that we will be justified in adopting a vigorous immigration policy? We are all anxious to improve economic conditions. the only trouble is how to go about it in the right way.

We find to-day, as the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has just shown us, that our labouring men with their well-organized unions have advanced the price of the labour, but conditions continue unsatisfactory, for we find unemployment, want, and actual poverty among our working people And we do not find our manufacturers altogether satisfied although they are able to control the price of their output. Labour has demanded of the manufacturer higher wages. In turn, the manufacturer has demanded the higher price for his products, until we hear in this House—in fact it was stated only this afternoon—that this is the dearest country in the civilized world to live in. I believe this is true. Now, you may put wages and com-

modity prices up twice as high if you like, but will you be any better off?

Then what about the agricultural class? We as farmers claim that the fiscal policy of this country for the last forty years has not been in the best interests of agriculture. That has been proven on this side of the House beyond the shadow of a doubt. It is being shown from day to day in the special committee on Agriculture what the farmer is making to-day. If the working man in the city is not getting wages enough, what about the working man—the farmer—on the land? I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have paid on an average to every man, woman and boy in their employ five dollars a day for the past year. Suppose we take half a section of wheat land in western Canada, yielding 23 bushels to the acre. It takes five people—his wife, a boy, and three men—to harvest and handle that crop. Supposing he pays the same wages as the men receive from the Canadian Pacific Railway, he finds that it takes every bushel of wheat to pay his wage bill alone. How are we going to employ men to work on our farms in competition with the railway companies under such circumstances? How are we going to compete with the manufacturer who being able to control the price of his output can pay his men five and six dollars a day? How can we go on the labour market and expect to hire men to go on our farms and stay there in the face of such competition?

I had a striking illustration of this last session. One of the finest types of immigrants one could wish to bring to this country struck this city a few weeks before I returned home. I do not care if you bring out ten thousand immigrants, you could not bring a finer specimen—a young man twenty-one years of age, of good character and fine physique. He came and worked on my farm, which was situated on the edge of a town with railway employees across the street. That young man was satisfied with his condition, he appreciated everything we did for him, but he was studying conditions and he saw it was quite impossible for a farmer to keep a man on the land when these protected industries were able to pay twice as much in wages as the farmer could afford. These are the conditions. Now, the farmer has no control over the price of his output. He has to sell his output in the markets of the world. Some hon. gentlemen try to tell us that we should build up a home market and that in that way we could get a better price for our products. But those of us who have been growing farm produce know that after all we depend largely on the markets of Europe; we would very soon glut the market if we attempted to sell all our produce in a country of 8,000,000 people. So that the home market really does not cut any figure at all.

I have heard a good many arguments to the effect that the man living near the city could get better prices for his products, but that statement is hardly correct. Those of us who have been farming know that a man who is some distance from the city can produce stuff and put it on the city market just as cheap or a little cheaper than the fellow who lives close to the city. Take the case of milk; right in our own locality, one hundred miles from Toronto, considering the cheapness of our land, the low freight rate to the city and the amount of stuff we can produce compared with what the man near the city can turn out, we can undersell the man on the more expensive land adjoining the city of Toronto, which is our chief market.

We have reason to believe that conditions can be improved. It is asserted that we should have better tariff arrangements. If there were not so many burdens on the men on the farms, and if they had some of the advantages that men in other callings are getting, we in Canada could hold our own with any country in the world. We have a country of wonderful resources; we have a people who are resourceful and energetic. It is true that we have a national debt, but after all it amounts to only 30 per cent of our total assets. It has to be admitted that our debt is large, but there is a cause for that debt which we do not care to enlarge upon at this time. The war was very far-reaching in its effects; we are still suffering from the reaction, and it behooves us as Canadian people to take a lesson from our men who went to the front. Surely we are possessed of some of the courage that those men possessed. If we get busy and endeavour by every means in our power to produce, to create wealth, we can pay off our debt. We often speak about our resources, and undoubtedly they are very great indeed; but we have no greater source of income than our farming lands. Our forests, which have been a great source of wealth, are becoming depleted; our fisheries may fail; our mines may fail. But after we have used our farms for hundreds of years, they will still be there, a national asset. I believe that we have to-day no other source of revenue equal to the farm lands of this Dominion. If we would develop our agricultural industries we would have no trouble about our cities, but the policy of

this country has been to build up the cities first and thereby build up our country. My policy would be this: Look after the agricultural industries of an agricultural country, and then we will develop the towns and cities. We have been demanding too much off the agriculturists. Time would hardly permit me to enumerate all the different burdens that are placed upon them, but if I mention one or two it may make some hon. members realize that I am on safe ground. I was thinking of our educational institutions. We boast of having the best educational institutions in the world, and we are proud of them. I do not wish to suggest anything that would impair the usefulness of those institutions, but I wish to point out—and I am thinking now of the burden that is placed on the farmers—that if a man wants to enter a profession and undertakes to get a university training, we, the people of Canada, pay practically half the cost of that man's training in the university. Now, we are producing a lot of splendid men in our universities every year. But to me the sad part of it is not so much the expense these men are to us on account of their training as the fact that hundreds of them, after they have finished their courses, go across to the other side of the line to be an asset to the United States. To my mind that is a tremendous national loss. We are expected to carry untold burdens for all classes of our people that we have no right to bear. If something was done to eliminate some of these the farmer would have more encouragement and there would be more men going to the land. With our immigration policy the trouble is to get men to go to the land; if we would make conditions more favourable on the land we would have no trouble getting our immigrants to go there. I submit that it should be our policy to do that. If we can get six or eight million people on the land we shall solve all our national problems. If we can make conditions right so that people will be induced to go on the land, we shall have that many more people, as has been said time and again in this House, to shoulder the national debt, that many more people to produce on areas that are now practically lying idle.

We talk about helping our immigrants, and there is great lament about those who come here with nothing. I sometimes think of the men who came into this Ontario when it was all bush, without a dollar, without experience, without anything. Who helped them to make this country what it is? Our Ontario boys growing up during the last thirty years, who in many cases started without anything, have complained that when the immigrant comes here, the alien, we begin to pay him money out of the public treasury, so that the man who has had to make good for himself has not only to hoe his own row but is asked to help the other fellow. We do not think that is fair to the man who is struggling on and trying to make his way in this country. The returned men are much in the same position—these men of whom we speak in admiration and on whom we shower praise for their wonderful sacrifices. These men are asked to assume their share of the responsibility of the debt of this country; they have to help to pay it. I mentioned this before, but I will mention it again lest the minister might forget it: I refer to the case of a returned man, one of our own Ontario boys, who went West and settled on the land there, and he was positively refused the same chance that was offered to the alien coming to this country. I am pleading at this time, in this city, for help for that man out in Alberta, and I am going to continue the fight; if I do not get anything I will keep at it just the same. When a returned man has the courage to go on land in the western provinces surely he ought to get treatment equal to that handed out to the aliens who come to our country. I could deal with this question at some length but it is not my intention to take up the time of the House.

I am not a pessimist. I do not feel for one moment that we are up against the inevitable or the impossible. We are here in this House to do a man's job. I think I heard one hon. member of this House say some time ago that the farmer should have stayed at home and looked after his organizations and after his market conditions, and leave parliamentary affairs alone. We would have been satisfied to stay at home and do that work. We did stay at home and worked hard and we talked and pleaded, but the members of this parliament would not listen. We kept on pleading until we got tired, and that is why we are here now representing the farmers of Canada in this parliament, and if the different parties in this House will not listen to the words of warning that have come from the rural sections of this country there will be a still larger deputation sent here, for the voice of the people must be heard. We have a problem before us, and we feel that the farmers are fit to deal with that problem. We have done hard things. We would not be worthy of the name Canadian, we would not be worthy to be called brothers of the men who went to the front, if we were not able now to grapple with the financial

situation of this country after what our boys have done in the Great War in France. We are able to do it gentlemen, and we are not going to stop the fight in this parliament until we have brought about a better economic condition in this country that will help pay off our national debt and put the country's finances on a better basis. It is up to us to do it. As I said before, it is a man's job, and I have confidence that the members of this parliament will be equal to the occasion. We are not going to stop the fight until the body economic of this country is in a very much healthier condition.

As we have sat here listening to speeches for some time, we have been impressed very much with one idea which I must mention. There seem to be two forces at work in this parliament. There is a strong financial force somewhere at work, and another force at work in this parliament in the interest of the common people of Canada. I am satisfied that the former force has had too much influence in this parliament in the years that are past, and that influence I am satisfied is just as active to-day as it ever was. This is not a new condition in the British Empire. I have a book here that was written not long ago and if you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I will make a short excerpt from a speech made at the Brotherhood Congress in London, England, by the Right Hon. Arthur Henderson:

> Class rule in politics, notwithstanding the existence of a broadly democratic franchise, is still a reality. What are called the possessing classes, through their social influence, the power of money, their practical monopoly of all the higher branches of education, and their control of the press, contrive repeatedly to defeat the popular will on every first-class political issue in which the rights and liberties of the common people are involved.

If that is true of conditions in England, I believe it is also a factor which has actuated too much many of our public men. I imagine that the fight is on, and the fight is between the men of that class and the men who represent the common people of this country, I was going to say; but I do not like that term, so I will say the great masses of our people at home.

I have faith that by the exercise of thrift and economy we will overcome these difficulties. I believe that in our public life as in our private life there is room for the exercise of economy. I believe that we are all guilty of extravagance, extravagance in our public business and in our private business, and I am satisfied just as much as I am standing here that if we would cut out the unessentials our national debt could be reduced to a minimum. If we will attend to that with the earnestness and the zeal with which the men who first came to this country made this Ontario of ours the country it is, we shall soon solve the fiscal and financial problems of this country.

10 p.m.

Mr. ALFRED STORK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, in rising to offer a few observations on the budget I wish at the very commencement to compliment the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon this his seventeenth budget. I believe, Sir, that Canada is fortunate in the possession of the experience of the Minister of Finance. He has served Canada long and well and his integrity is a national asset. We hope that he may long be spared to grace his position in the councils of the parliament of Canada.

Coming to the budget, I notice with satisfaction that it reaffirms the principle of reciprocity. It was last Friday when this announcement was made in the House, and we are now beginning to receive evidences of how these proposals have been received throughout the Dominion of Canada and also the republic to the south of us. So far as Canada is concerned I believe the Canadian people will welcome this attempt at a fiscal arrangement with the people to the south of us. The American papers are now coming to hand and many of them are expressing satisfaction that ways and means are being opened up to have this problem negotiated. I wish very briefly to quote from one of the prominent American newspapers, the Chicago Tribune which commenting on the reciprocity proposals says:

> Now, after 12 years, a new start is made. This time probably we shall face bitter opposition by some American farmers who fear Canadian competition, but the wiser of those opponents will see that their products compete with Canada's not in the United States but in world markets. It is the surplus production of any country which meets competition with other countries.
>
> So long as the United States is a producer of surplus agricultural products it cannot avoid such competition, no matter how high our tariff barriers. That has been proved to thinking persons by the utter failure of the emergency or the permanent tariff on farm products to raise the price of such products in the United States.
>
> On the other hand, reciprocity in trade would work to the mutual advantage of both countries. We hope the friendly advances made by Mr. Fielding will find a cordial welcome in Washington.

I notice also that the budget in its reciprocity proposals specially mentions cattle, wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, turnips, onions, hay and fish. It was also gratifying to note that timely attention is being given to the sugar situation.

The high price of sugar in the United States has caused the people in many parts of that country to embark upon a boycott of sugar. I am not in accord with the principle of the boycott, because in a country like Canada, if that principle were adopted by the users of sugar in order to force down the price, it would of necessity inflict a tremendous hardship on those who find the use of sugar a very great necessity. We should be able to find other ways of dealing with the soaring price of sugar rather than to force our people to boycott the use of it, and the timely attention which the minister has given to the rising price of this commodity will commend itself to the people of Canada. I would commend the Minister of Finance for the alteration which he has made in the manner of collecting the sales tax. I think the improvement he has made will commend itself very generally to the people of the country.

I shall deal with some matters of particular concern to the province of British Columbia from which I come. The first matter is the bounty on copper and the manufacture of bars and copper wires. British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, as you are no doubt aware, is a great copper producing province. This bounty on the manufacture of copper will give an added impetus to the mining industry and will call into operation a very large concern which has been established in West Kootenay for this particular purpose. It will bring into operation many copper mines in British Columbia which heretofore have had to remain idle.

Another matter which I am very pleased with is the admission into Canada free of duty of machinery used in the manufacture of fish offal for fertilizing purposes. We have several propositions on the coast for the manufacture of fertilizers. The machinery to be used in connection with those plants is of very vital importance. This concession will also encourage the destruction of pests such as dog fish. We have a great variety of fish which play upon the commercial fish, and this will assist in a very great degree in the extermination of the dog fish and other pests.

I notice also that the principle of the British preference is being extended with the object of developing Canadian ports. The minister, in naming the principal ports of Canada, was good enough to include such ports on the Pacific coast as Vancouver, Victoria and Prince Rupert. This government has a very large holding in Prince Rupert. It has the terminus of the Canadian National Railways there. It is a port which has not been used up to the present time, but I notice in the papers to hand to-day that the first shipment of lumber to Japan is starting from the port of Prince Rupert the middle of next month. There is no reason why the freight to the Orient should not go through that northern port, because we are 500 miles nearer the Orient than any other port on the continent. I find that from the 1st September, 1921 to April 23rd, 1923, there were 3,842,177 bushels of wheat shipped to Japan through the port of Vancouver. This undoubtedly should have gone via Prince Rupert. This would all be Canadian National business. I find from September 1st, 1921, to April 1st, 1923, 14,679 cars of wheat arrived at Vancouver. The Canadian National Railway hauled 5,693 of those cars, and the Canadian Pacific Railway 8,986. By developing the port of Prince Rupert, any traffic that comes into that port will naturally come in over our own railway. I am advised by competent authority that a grain elevator located there would effect a saving of 25 cents a ton in loading and port charges. With a 7,500-ton ship, with a full cargo, a saving of 25 cents a ton in loading and port charges would equal $1,875. That is equal to three days' operation and profit for a ship of that type. This saving offsets any handicap that the northern port might suffer in competing with the Panama canal route on traffic destined for ports in Europe.

So far as facilities are concerned, this government has already in the port of Prince Rupert a splendid new freight warehouse capable of taking care of ocean going business. That is available at the present moment for the shipping and handling of sacked wheat with a very small additional expense in connection with loading facilities.

I am glad to see also that reciprocity is reaffirmed in this budget. It is true this question was before the country in 1911, but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the contest as carried on in 1911, was not fought out on the merits of the case. The people of Canada have had twelve years in which to reflect, and at that time the slogan was "No truck or trade with the Yankees." To-day I think the boot is entirely on the other foot. The Fordney tariff says "No truck or trade with the Canadians." The United States for years admitted fish free into their country. Canada insisted upon maintaining a duty of 1 cent a pound on fish coming into Canada from the United States. The Fordney tariff apparently says. "Well if you like it, and if you believe in the principle of 1 cent a pound on fish, we will meet you on that issue, and we will impose a duty of 2 cents a pound on your fish coming into American territory." The Americans are ap-

parently trying to demonstrate to their own satisfaction that they can get along very well without Canadian fish. I do not know how long it will take them to find out to their own satisfaction whether they can do so. It may require a long or short period. However, I am persuaded of one thing, and that is that while they are trying this experiment in the United States they are certainly demonstrating to the Canadian fisherman that they cannot get along without the American market. We need the American market. The 2 cents a pound duty on halibut going into that country is slowly exterminating the Canadian fisherman. The situation in British Columbia is most acute, more especially in regard to the matter of fish. We have in that northern part which has handled all the fish trade, the spectacle of American fisherman marketing their fish in British Columbia, and as a rule receiving 16 cents a pound. The Canadian fisherman is immediately docked the amount of the American duty, and he receives 14 cents a pound. An American selling fish in a Canadian port receives 16 cents a pound and a Canadian selling fish in the same port receives only 14 cents a pound. Moreover, when we remember that the port is absolutely free and open to the Americans, we can see the immediate effect unless we are able in some way to bring about a better situation as regards the marketing of fish. Last year there were sent east over the Canadian National Railways 1,500 refrigerator cars loaded with fish for the American market. Each one of those cars paid to the railway on an average of $1,000 for traffic charges. The trade is growing by leaps and bounds, and this year the record will be even greater than that of last year.

I am persuaded that this acute situation, as developed there, is due largely to American misunderstanding. The American fishermen who are using Canadian ports do not want this duty. It does them no particular good. The American people themselves do not want this duty, and the Canadian fishermen certainly do not want it. This situation is due very largely to the action and attitude of townsite boomers in the neighbouring territory of Alaska. They have made representations to Washington, and the authorities at Washington have had no evidence to the contrary. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway runs to the fishing grounds. At the present time the advantage of that railroad is largely with the Americans, and Canada has to keep up and foot the bills incidental to carrying it on. The American fisherman uses our ports free; but if he should buy in a Canadian port for his boat any supplies such as ice, or bait, or gear, or even if he should paint his boat in a Canadian port, the moment he lands back in American territory, he pays 50 per cent duty on everything he has bought on the Canadian side, even though he had free access to the Canadian port.

The present situation is a most unequal one. At the present moment the Commissioner of Customs is on the Pacific coast, and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) has requested him to proceed to the north and to investigate thoroughly the whole situation. I trust when his report is received by the government, they will be advised of all the facts and details in connection with this matter, and that they will give this their immediate attention and endeavour to expedite action.

Everything possible that can be done should be done to negotiate a settlement of this question. Canada has been generous in her treatment of her American cousins. During the progress of the war Canadian ports were free to American vessels, and American ports were free to Canadian vessels. Not long ago the Americans rescinded that agreement as regards themselves and withdrew the use of their ports from the Canadian fleet, but we in Canada have still continued the courtesy and our ports remain open. Very often Canadian generosity is misunderstood.

We are not small or quibbling in our dealings with our neighbours. In fact, in the northern part of my constituency up at the end of the Inlet, where are located the Canadian town of Stewart and the neighbouring town of Hyder, the Salmon river flows into the Inlet and brings down gravel, sand and silt in such large quantities that it has more or less filled up the American end of the Inlet. In their search for deep water and harbourage, they have, according to the best advice I have received on the question, come over into Canadian territory, and we have now an American wharf built on Canadian soil. We do not object to that particularly; we have plenty of foreshore and deep water, and if our American cousins want to use a little of it, we have no special objection, provided of course, that they will accept our generosity in this respect without misinterpreting it. In view of all the courtesies Americans receive in Canadian ports, when these matters are laid before the American authorities, there should be little difficulty in arriving at an amicable settlement.

I would suggest that we should have at Washington a trade representative. If we had stationed there a man who was thoroughly conversant with trade conditions in Canada,

many of these misunderstandings would not occur. A man stationed at Washington would be able to lend his assistance and to furnish information from time to time that would keep us out of many of these misunderstandings. Our prosperity depends entirely upon our export trade. I see no danger whatever in trading with the Americans; in our trading with them, our nationality is not in danger. I believe it is preferable to keep our young men here at home, to build up Canada, to develop the natural resources of Canada, and by trading and dealing with the United States, we shall be able to keep our young men at home rather than see them proceed across the border to seek a livelihood, and there to take on the duties of citizenship, by doing which they are lost to us and to Canada forever.

Mr. L. P. BANCROFT (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I will base my remarks to-night on the assumption that the policy of the government and particularly the policy as outlined in the annual budget, should have a direct and vital relationship to the platform on which the party went to the country. Indeed, it might be said, without fear of contradiction, that no government has a mandate other than the mandate secured from a free and untrammelled electorate. To argue otherwise is to repudiate the first principles of democratic citizenship. Under our system of government it is at once the duty and privilege of the opposition, to slowly, deliberately and intentionally evolve a policy the aim of which is to influence and ultimately to capture a majority vote of the people, and thus enable them to pass from the opposition to the government benches. If we review the history of the Liberal party in opposition from the time of their defeat in 1911 until the date of their victory on December 6, 1921, we are justified in drawing no other inference, or in arriving at no other conclusion than that the party by every legitimate and conceivable means, not only created a low tariff sentiment in this country, but became known as a party that stood for a revenue rather than a protective tariff. I want in this connection to quote two amendments submitted by the Liberal party while in opposition, amendments that speak more eloquently of the attitude of that party towards tariff reform than anything I could possibly say. During the budget debate in 1919, the following amendment was moved, which is to be found in the 1919 Debates at page 326:

> The proposals of the Finance Minister are unsatisfactory. They offer no curb against extravagance. They utterly fail to take any adequate steps to relieve the present high cost of living. They give no definite promise of tariff revision downwards.
>
> That to relieve the present situation, the tariff should be so framed as to free the food of the people and the machinery used in the development of the natural resources of Canada, together with the raw material entering into the manufacture thereof.
>
> To take off or substantially reduce, as speedily as may be expedient and just to all interested, the duties upon all other necessaries of life;
>
> Also, the reciprocal offer of trade with the United States should be accepted, and a general downward revision of the tariff undertaken forthwith in conformity with the principle herein enunciated.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Whose words were those?

Mr. BANCROFT: I could not tell the hon. member who framed them but this is an amendment which was moved in the House by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Then in the following year, 1920, another amendment was moved which is to be found on page 2510 of Hansard and which reads in part as follows:

> That in view of the continued increase in the high cost of living, of the greatly increased burden of taxation, of the hardships which many of the people suffer from these causes, and the unrest naturally arising therefrom; and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to increase production and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of parliament, the House is of opinion that, pending a wider revision of the tariff, substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance—first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Who moved that resolution?

Mr. BANCROFT: The present Finance Minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, it might be well to pause here and ask what were the motives which actuated the Liberal party in supporting these proposals? Were they actuated by sincerity, or were these mere attempts to deceive the electors and thus obtain power under false pretences? It is not my intention to answer this question, I simply leave it to the members of the House and to the disillusioned electorate. The tariff plank of the Liberal platform in 1919, which formed the basis of that party's appeal to the country, was simply a concrete and condensed statement of the attitude of the whole party, without a single exception, towards tariff taxation during the years when they occupied the opposition benches. That this plank was a chief issue in the last campaign few will dispute. The

then Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) nailed the protectionist flag to the mast, and the low tariff forces of this country quickly and eagerly accepted the challenge. In western Canada tariff reform had been, although somewhat unwillingly, left in abeyance during the war period. Actuated by a sense of patriotism the agriculturists were willing to labour under almost any handicap in order that the nation as a whole might not be retarded in its efforts to win the war. Coupled with this there was a tacit understanding that tariff revision would immediately follow the signing of the armistice, and the fact that this revision was not undertaken, in spite of the report of the Tariff Commission appointed by the late government accounts in no small measure for the failure of the Conservative party to elect a single member in the three prairie provinces. An anaylsis of the vote cast in the last general election is both interesting and illuminating. It is doubtful if there has even been in the history of Canada since confederation a parliament representing such a considerable body of low tariff sentiment as the present one. It is well to remember that the tariff planks of the Liberal and Progressive platforms are almost identical. I have them here, Mr. Speaker. The Progressive platform recommends:

(a) By immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.

(b) By reducing the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will ensure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

(c) That the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911, which still remains on the United States statute books, be accepted by the parliament of Canada.

This platform was drawn up in the year 1916 but we have not forgotten it yet.

(d) That all foodstuff not included in the Reciprocity Agreement be placed on the free list.

(e) That agricultural implements, farm machinery, vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement, illuminating fuel and lubricating oils be placed on the free list, and that all raw materials and machinery used in their manufacture also be placed on the free list.

(f) That all tariff concessions granted to other countries be immediately extended to Great Britain.

(g) That all corporations engaged in the manufacture of products protected by the customs tariff be obliged to publish annually comprehensive and accurate statements of their earnings.

(h) That every claim for tariff protection by any industry should be heard publicly before a special committee of parliament.

Now, the Liberal platform reads in part as follows:

That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat the principal articles of food; farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments; cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.

And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

These two platforms are almost identical and when we remember that the united votes cast in favour of Liberal and Progressive candidates at the general election totalled 2,150,342 as against 971,502 registered for the Conservative party, the truth of my contention is readily realized and the mandate of the elected representatives appears clear and unmistakable. Never did the people express themselves more completely on this matter, never did they seek more earnestly to escape the injustices for which, in their opinion, the protective system is responsible. It is my opinion that the policy of the Liberal party in opposition, culminating in the platform of 1919, was a policy evolved at a time when the needs of the Canadian people were the primary interests of the Liberal leaders and when retention of office and mere political opportunism had not, as yet exercised a baneful and paralyzing influence on the minds of those leaders. In a word, we appeared to have in Canada at that time a Liberal party with a Liberal programme, a party since transformed into a party of Tory reactionaries clothed in the mere garb of official Liberalism.

It might be pertinent to ask, Mr. Speaker: Has public opinion undergone any appreciable change on the tariff question, and if so, is such a change at all in evidence? Is it sufficiently widespread to justify the present administration in following the tariff policy of their predecessors in office? If not, what is their justification? I submit without fear of contradiction that low tariff sentiment has in no sense diminished rather it has increased since the present government took office. There is a feeling, indeed one might call it a deep-seated conviction, that the protective system is directly responsible, first of all, for the alarming emigration from this country; for the high cost of living in so far as the high cost of manufactured goods is concerned; for the restricted purchasing power of the Canadian dollar, which must of necessity militate against industrial development

and expansion; for the unrest and dissatisfaction so acute in rural Canada at this time; and for rural depopulation, the seriousness of which becomes evident when we realize that we can only meet our crushing financial obligations by the export of our surplus farm products, sold in open competition in the markets of the world.

It might be stated in reply that it is illogical to contend that the protective system is responsible for the high cost of living and for the outflow of settlers owing to the fact that these settlers migrate to a country which has a tariff higher than ours. But we must remember that they have in the United States, speaking commercially, the largest free trade area in the world—110,000,000 people, the wealthiest in the world, trading freely with one another. And while their tariff is high, the amount of customs duty collected is comparatively negligible when compared with ours.

I have the figures of customs duties for the two countries for the calendar year 1922. I took the calendar year because the fiscal years of the two governments do not correspond, ours closing on March 31st, and theirs on June 30th. In the United States for the calendar year 1922 they collected in customs duties $458,359,415, or $4.17 per head of population. In Canada in the same period we collected $132,167,544, or $14.68 per head of population. Taking the family unit as five, this puts an annual burden on the supporter of each family in the United States of $20.85, while the head of a Canadian family of the same size has to shoulder a burden of $73.40.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the acid test to which our tariff legislation must be submitted is the results that accrue from it and as these results affect the great masses of the people in their efforts to secure the necessities of life and the tools of production. Therefore in this connection I want to submit a few figures, briefly comparing the prevailing prices in the United States to-day with those in Canada. The figures are the most up-to-date that can be procured, and the commodities chosen are those in which the people as a whole have a direct interest. In February of this year I got a copy of their mail order catalogue from the T. Eaton Company at Toronto and from Winnipeg. These catalogues I think are always admitted to be a fair criterion of prices of general commodities in Canada. In the same month I sent across to the States and got a copy of the mail order catalogue of the Sears-Roebuck Company of Chicago. Some hon. members might think that this perhaps is not a fair comparison, that the Sears-Roebuck Company may be a cheap concern handling an inferior line of goods. I want to assure them that such is not the case. I have lived among American farmers in western Canada for some years and I know positively that the Sears-Roebuck Company occupy the same position among the rural communities in the western United States that the T. Eaton Company do in Canada; they have practically a monopoly of the mail order business so far as rural sections of the western states are concerned, and they hold that monopoly by giving good value. In fact, many farmers in western Canada living near the border send to Sears-Roebuck Company for their goods. The company does not ship to Canada but to the nearest point on the American side, and our farmers go across for the goods and pay duty as they bring them into Canada. Of course, if the customs officer did not happen to be there when any of these farmers came across with their goods they would always wait until he came!

In going through these catalogues, while there is a great difference in the prices, there are a great many lines of goods which I could not use for purposes of comparison; that is, I could not take two suits of clothes and say they were exactly the same. However, I have picked out certain items which I could be sure of from the description in both catalogues. The first I have here is overalls and smocks. This is the description in each catalogue:

Blue and white stripe, heavy weight denim.

I think a great many members are familiar with these articles. Before I go into this comparison any further I want to say that wherever possible I used Eaton's Toronto catalogue for comparison with the Chicago catalogue of the Sears-Roebuck Company because I thought it was fairer to do so; but a great many articles used in western Canada do not appear in the Toronto catalogue, and in such cases I have had to use the Winnipeg catalogue of the T. Eaton Co. These overalls and smocks are quoted in Eaton's Toronto catalogue at $1.80 per garment; in Sears-Roebuck at $1.48 per garment. That is, they are 22 per cent higher in Toronto. The tariff on denims is 32½ per cent. Another item is men's work shirts, heavy weight drill, black and white stripes. I chose this shirt because it is very popular among working men in this country—I wear one myself when I am at home. Eaton's price is $1.45; Sears-Roebuck's 95 cents, or 53 per cent higher in Toronto. The tariff is 35 per cent. The next article is

women's gingham house dresses. In this line I could not pick out two dresses and say they were the same, so I took the highest and lowest in price—there is a page of them in each catalogue. In Eaton's Toronto catalogue they run from $2.65 to $3.75; in Sears-Roebuck's from $1.69 to $2.98. The difference between the two best ones was 26 per cent higher in Toronto, and in the case of the two cheapest ones 56 per cent higher in Toronto. The tariff is 32½ per cent.

Another item is sewing machines. These are also taken from the Toronto catalogue of the Eaton Company. I could not pick out two of these and say they were just the same, so I took the highest and the lowest as with the preceding article. In Eaton's they ran from $29 to $52.50; in Sears-Roebuck's from $24.85 to $39.75. The difference between the best machines shows 32½ per cent higher in Toronto, and the cheapest machines were 17 per cent higher in Toronto. The tariff on sewing machines is 30 per cent. Warm air furnaces, complete except for pipes and registers. These are both described as having a 20-inch firepot and 12,000 cubic feet heating capacity, the only difference being that the Sears-Roebuck furnace was something like 80 pounds heavier in shipping weight; Eaton's, Winnipeg, $84.50; Sears-Roebuck, $57.45, or 47 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff, 25 per cent.

I find in both these catalogues specials in paints. Those to which I shall refer are paints for inside and outside use, the kind we usually buy for ordinary work in this country. Eaton's, Toronto, $3.15 per gallon; Sears-Roebuck, $2.35 per gallon; 34 per cent higher in Toronto; the tariff is 30 per cent. Twelve-inch gang-plow, stubble bottom, high lift; Eaton's, Winnipeg, $88; Sears-Roebuck—and this, Mr. Speaker, is at Fargo, North Dakota; they have a warehouse there for some of their heavy implements, and while the price is higher there than at any other point where they stock it, I took that price because I thought it was fairer when compared with Winnipeg, Fargo being only a few hundred miles straight south of Winnipeg; Sears-Roebuck, Fargo, $75.45; that is 17 per cent higher in Winnipeg. The tariff is 15 per cent. 16-16 disc harrow—and most hon. gentlemen in this corner will know that that means 16 discs 16 inches in diameter—complete with tongue truck and weight pans; Sears-Roebuck, Fargo, $45.24; Eaton's, Winnipeg, $54.50; 20 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff 12½ per cent. Three-quarter wagon or general purpose truck—a very popular wagon in this country, the wheels being three-quarters the height of the standard wagon. Skeins 3½ inches by 10 inches; front wheels, 36 inches high; rear wheels, 40 inches; 3-inch tires; Eaton's, Winnipeg, $59.50; Chicago, $49.95; 24 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff, 17½ per cent. Standard two-deck wagon-box. Now, there are different styles of wagon-boxes, involving different costs of construction, but there was a cut in both these cases and the styles were the same. Both boxes are described as being 26 inches high, 10 feet 6 inches long and 36 inches wide. Sears-Roebuck, $22.50; Eaton's, Winnipeg, $33.75; 50 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff, 30 per cent. Self-dumping hay rake, 10-foot size. This is from the Toronto catalogue; Eaton's, $42.50; Sears-Roebuck, $33.66; 26 per cent higher in Toronto; tariff, 15 per cent.

The next item I have here is that of hay forks. Both catalogues indicated that only one hay fork was stocked, so that there can be no difference in quality. Three-tined, bent handle hay fork, 5-foot hardwood handle, Eaton's, Winnipeg, $1.25; Sears-Roebuck, $1; 25 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff 22½ per cent. Four-tined barley fork with guard—this is the kind of fork we use for pitching straw. Eaton's, Winnipeg, $2.25; Sears-Roebuck, $1.65; 36 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff, 22½ per cent. Five-foot mower, vertical lift, complete; Eaton's, Winnipeg, $79.50; Sears-Roebuck, Fargo, $59.90; 32 per cent in Winnipeg; tariff, 10 per cent.

Thresherman's tank pumps, 5-inch cylinder, 5-inch stroke: Eaton's, Winnipeg, $15.75; Sears-Roebuck, $10.65. Open top lift pump, —this is the type of pump used for shallow wells— with 3-inch by 10-inch iron cylinder: Eaton's, Winnipeg, complete with 8 feet of 1¼ inch pipe, $8.45; Sears-Roebuck, complete with 4 feet of 1¼ inch pipe, $5.60. Then, there are wooden pumps, also very popular for shallow wells. I figured this out for a well with a depth of 24 feet: Eaton's, Winnipeg, $20.25; Sears-Roebuck, $13.88; tariff on pumps, 30 per cent.

I found a great difference in harness, but it was impossible to pick out two sets of harness and say they were exactly the same. However, on some parts of harness we could get a good comparison. For instance, on heavy team lines complete, 1¼-inch by 22 feet, the prices were: Eaton's, Winnipeg, $7.85; Sears-Roebuck, $6.37; 23 per cent higher in Winnipeg. Also team traces, 6 feet 4 inches long, with heel chain 2 inches wide, 2-ply: Eaton's, Winnipeg, set of 4, $14.75; Sears-Roebuck, $12.65; 17 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff 30 per cent.

We have heard something in the House this session about a building boom in the United States; perhaps the figures I am about to give are an indication of one of the reasons. Standard wire nails, 2½ inches—that is the length—per 100 pound keg: Eaton's, Winnipeg, $4.90; Sears-Roebuck, $3.50; 40 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff 60 cents per 100 pounds.

I looked up woven wire fencing but I was unable to find two that were of the same pattern—that is, no two that had the same number of line wires and the same number of stays per rod, therefore I could not get a fair comparison. But in poultry netting I was able to make a comparison. Diamond poultry netting, 2-inch mesh, constructed of No. 19 wire throughout, galvanized, 36 inches wide, 50 yard roll: Eaton's, Toronto, $4.65; Sears-Roebuck, $2.95; 57 per cent higher in Toronto; tariff, 30 per cent. Standard barbed wire, 4 points, 80 rod spools: Eaton's, Winnipeg, $4.25; Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, $4; 6¼ per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff, free.

Rotary washing machines operating on the Dolly principle, Eaton's, Winnipeg, $16.60; Sears-Roebuck, $12.25; 35 per cent higher in Winnipeg, tariff, 27½ per cent. Gasoline engines—I took the small type, 1½ horsepower, a very popular engine throughout the country, used for driving washing machines and churns, pumping water, operating fanning mills and doing many little chores like that about the farm. These are both described as 1½ horsepower, both equipped with Webster magneto: Eaton's, Winnipeg, weight 250 pounds, $67.50; Sears-Roebuck, weight 278 pounds, $52; 37 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff, 27½ per cent.

Cream separators, similar style and quality, both described as having 600 pounds skimming capacity: Eaton's, Winnipeg, $57.50; Sears-Roebuck, $62.50; $5 higher in Chicago; tariff free.

Cream cans, five-gallon size, heavily constructed, railway shipping cans, weight twelve pounds—Eaton's (Winnipeg) $5.10, Sears-Roebuck, $3.40; fifty per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff, 25 per cent.

Agricultural monkey wrenches, 10-inch size: Eaton's (Toronto), 70 cents; Sears-Roebuck, 45 cents; fifty-five per cent higher in Toronto; tariff, 30 per cent.

Crescent wrench, with adjustable jaws, 6-inch size. This is a very popular wrench nowadays where there is any mechanical work to do. The price at Eaton's Toronto, is 65 cents, Sears-Roebuck, 45 cents; 44 per cent higher in Toronto; tariff, 30 per cent.

Men's gum rubber boots, knee length: Eaton's, $5.25, Sears-Roebuck, $3.98; 31 per cent higher at Eaton's; tariff, 25 per cent.

*See page 2696.

[Mr. Bancroft.]

Next comes an item that will not interest the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales). Gillette safety razor, new model, silver plated: Eaton's (Winnipeg) $5, Sears-Roebuck, $3.75; 25 per cent higher in Winnipeg.

Auto Strop safety razor, silver plated, twelve blades and strop; Eaton's Winnipeg, $5, Sears-Roebuck, $3.75; 25 per cent higher in Winnipeg; tariff 30 per cent. There was about the same difference in the hollow ground razors but I could not pick out two of them and say they were the same quality.

I could go on almost indefinitely making comparisons between these two catalogues, but I think that is enough to give the House some idea of the range of prices on ordinary purchases and of the excess that we have to pay as compared with the farmers in the United States. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no permanent prosperity in this country while our production costs are greater than those of the countries with which we have to compete. I believe it is our duty to remove all artificial barriers in order that we may develop our natural industries to the greatest possible extent, and not until we do this can Canada take her place among the great producing nations of the world.

On motion of Mr. Raymond the debate was adjourned.

Mr. TOLMIE: Will this debate be continued to-morrow?

Mr. ROBB: We shall continue this interesting and illuminating debate.

On motion of Mr. Robb the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Tuesday, May 15, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 167 (from the Senate), for the relief of Christina Julia Hamilton.—Mr. Simpson.

Bill No. 168 (from the Senate), for the relief of Smith Kain—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 169 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Malcolm Mushett.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 170 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Francis Rafferty.—Mr. Irvine.

*WHEAT BOARD LEGISLATION

On the Orders of the Day.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think I owe my right

hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) and the House an apology for having given an incorrect answer to a question that was asked me yesterday. My right hon. friend asked me if the government had extended by order in council the operation of the Wheat Board Act, and I replied, "not yet." I had in mind another matter. The answer should have been, that the extension was granted by order in council on the 7th day of April.

CROWSNEST PASS AGREEMENT

On the Orders of the Day.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the government yet taken action with respect to the Crowsnest pass or so-called Crowsnest pass agreement extension? It will be remembered that there was power to order an extension of the temporary arrangement, or so-called temporary arrangement, for one year. Has action been taken to do so?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): That is the matter I had in mind when I replied, "Not yet," to my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When is it the intention of the government to take that step, or does the government intend to do so? It is clear that it had better be done now if it is going to be done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The matter is under consideration. I will give my right hon. friend a reply later.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Monday, May 14, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto, of Mr. Robert Forke.

Mr. W. G. RAYMOND (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, so far as the debate on the budget has proceeded, I should like to associate myself with the cheerful sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork). It came quite refreshingly after what we had been treated to for some hours before; it came like a refreshing western breeze, full of hope and inspiration. It was as though one had been reading in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and had turned from that to the glad songs of Isaiah, the prince-poet of Israel. I should also like to associate myself in the complimentary remarks that he made to the Minister of Finance. I am sure that not only hon. members on this side of the House, but every hon. member of this House, and, in fact, the country at large must thoroughly appreciate the great service that the Minister of Finance has rendered to Canada. A record of forty-one years of life devoted unselfishly, honestly, faithfully and patriotically to the service of his country is a record that is very seldom equalled in any civilized country in the world. Not only has his native province every reason to be proud of him, but the great Dominion from ocean to ocean has reason to be proud of and grateful for his services.

I am one of those who believe that in this particular budget that he has brought down now, he has rendered his country a great and signal service. I was pleased with it. Although it has been criticized by some hon. members opposite, it possesses many features that must commend themselves to the country generally. In the first place, there is no great disturbance of business; there is no attempt to do something spectacular. His position has been termed "standing pat", and some hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with the expression that the hon. gentleman used of "tariff stability". In my opinion, the very thing that we wanted in this country was tariff stability, and I am bold to believe hon. gentlemen misunderstood the way in which the word "stability" is applied. Stability as applied to a ship does not mean that it will not progress; that it will not change its position; but it means that it is not easily upset. Every time before a Dominion general election, there has been a feeling of anxiety throughout the business world of Canada, and to a somewhat less extent there has been a feeling of anxiety every time a budget has been brought down in this House by the Minister of Finance. But on this occasion a general feeling of confidence was established throughout the country. The people found in the budget speech many things for their general advantage, some things that were to the particular advantage of the farmers and people generally engaged in agriculture, and others particularly advantageous, perhaps, to the commercial and manufacturing industries of our country.

I do not intend to take up the items of this budget in detail, but speaking in general of it, I think we may say that it is one that has given satisfaction in many regards, partly in the increase in the British preference which I thought was what

was wanted by our hon. friends opposite, and the removal of certain taxes whose removal must be beneficial to those engaged in that industry, such as the sales tax on wool, the sales tax on drain tiles, the sales tax on furs, besides the removal of the excise tax on beet-sugar and the reduction of the excise tax on wines. While these items may not appeal to hon. gentlemen who live on the prairies, surely those who have to sell wool, those who have to purchase drain tiles, those farmers who have furs to sell, those persons who raise grapes for the purpose of making wine, or, as in the case of western Ontario where the industry is carried on to quite an extent, those who grow a great deal of beet-root for sugar making, should all certainly feel that something has been done in the way of helping along their respective industries. I regret therefore that there was no word of appreciation, not so much as a syllable, from hon. gentlemen opposite. I had hoped that they would feel some appreciation and would at least recognize that this much had been done, and if there was anything else that they wanted they might have mentioned it. Alas, however, not one word of appreciation comes from them for what has been done for them in these instances.

Had I not been so well pleased with the budget on hearing its presentation by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I think that the criticism of it that was made by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) would have given me some confidence in it. We all know that hon. gentleman's power and his knowledge of budget questions; we know that he has had an intimate association with the labours of a finance minister, having filled that important position himself. We know him also to be a man of great acumen and penetration. So, when we consider these qualities and reflect on the little objection which the hon. gentleman could find to the budget, we must come to the conclusion, I think, that the minister's statement was a pretty perfect production. The hon. gentleman's criticism rather tended towards the French treaty; in the latter part of his address he seemed to make a very strong point of the treaty and to repeat the arguments that were made at the time the treaty was before the House, to the effect that it reduced the taxes on luxuries and goods used by the wealthier class. That I took to be his argument when the treaty was under discussion, and it was repeated. But as I stated before in this Chamber when the treaty was being considered, the satin, the silks, the cords, the braids, the twists, and all these articles that come in cheaper under the French treaty are the raw material of the dressmaker, the milliner, the tailor and the costume-maker, of all who make garments in our country for our people, whether they are rich or poor. Consequently, I pointed out, it was a relief to lighten the tax on the raw material of the garment makers, because the reduction helped those industries and helped to cheapen the clothes of everyone. Again, the hon. gentleman stated that brandy and champagne were luxuries. In the part of the country I come from, I beg to say that brandy and champagne are not luxuries; nor, Sir, is sparkling Burgundy a luxury. On the contrary, these things are classed with blue pills, calomel, salts, and various kinds of similar matters that must be prescribed as medicine by doctors. So that they are not only necessaries, but necessaries for the sick, and if these goods are lightened in any way by the French treaty the reduction is beneficial to those who suffer the afflictions of sickness under the hand of Providence. Now, I should not like it to be thought, when I say that these things are not luxuries, that they are articles of common, daily consumption, in Ontario at least. But certainly Mr. Speaker, when one who can analyze this budget as thoroughly as did the member for West York finds so little in it to criticize, the effect must be to inspire greater confidence in all the friends of the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman's criticisms seemed like some heavy 12-inch howitzer, but the emplacement did not seem to be exactly accurate, the elevation was not precise, nor was the training direct. So that the little soixante-quinze seemed to get away.

In the remarks of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft) I was much interested, particularly in the lengthy price list that was produced of Eaton's goods, as well as the comparison that was made—which was very instructive—with the goods of Sears-Roebuck, of Chicago. But, Sir, would it not be considered by Wanamaker, by Montgomery-Ward, by Seigel, Cooper, and by other large stores on the other side, a matter of partiality that only Sears-Roebuck should have the advantage of the great advertisement which was given that firm in the placing upon Hansard and the dissemination all over the country, of their price list? I feel sure there was a great deal in the hon. gentleman's argument; but without having the actual goods before me, and just taking the statement in one catalogue that a shirt is worth so much and

another statement in another catalogue that a shirt is worth something else, I would want to be quite assured that it was identically the same kind of shirt before I began to compare prices. This is another exemplification of the old adage that the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

We have heard recently of a number of young men who went over to the United States, induced to go there by the high wages on account of the boom. Those young men are now coming back because of the high cost of living on the other side. The member for Selkirk endeavoured to show that the cost of living was lower in the United States than it is here and that it was cheaper to live across the line than in Canada. Well, the Mayor of Brantford recently made the statement that many of the young men who had left that city and gone to Detroit and other American cities were coming back because the cost of living was so much greater in the United States than in Canada. There was another part of the hon. gentleman's speech that I could not help noting.

He stated that because the right hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) had nailed his protection colours to the mast, the two parties that were opposed to him at the last election received 2,120,000 votes whereas the right hon. gentleman got only some 900,000. I believe that was his statement. I could not help wondering, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member made the remark, what the hon. member for Grenville was thinking; and it seemed to me, by a kind of telepathy, I suppose, that I could hear with my mind's eye, if I may use that Hibernianism, the reflections that were going on in the right hon. gentleman's mind. He was saying: Did I not try to cultivate you with 5 per cent of a reduction off the duty on cultivators? Did I not try to reap the harvest of your affection by throwing 5 per cent off binders? Did I not try to draw you to my way of thinking by making tractors absolutely free? Did I not try to bind you to my affection by leaving binder twine free on the list? And what was the answer? I am sure that the right hon. gentleman's reply to his own soliloquy must have been that ingratitude was "more strong than traitors' arms." There was no response from these gentlemen—no response whatever. And now when the question is brought up again we are reminded that duties were thrown off at that time to please the Progressive party. Duties have been relaxed now to please them. But nothing seems to please them, they do not appear to be delighted with anything. But is it a matter really to be sorry for? Because, knowing them personally and individually, I can say they are mostly cheerful, healthy, happy men; but as a party, I should like to see them appreciate those things that are done for them.

Last night we had a very long address that, as far as I could make out, was on the subject of capital and—I won't say labour, but on the subject of capital and no capital. Now, capital is one of the most important considerations of this country and is something that needs to be understood by those that talk about it. When a man rises in this House and tells us what the wealth of this country consists of, and goes over our farms, farm buildings and live stock, our mines and forests, he must not lose sight of this fact, that so far as these represent the wealth of the country, they also represent the hard work and the savings of our people. If you follow that out you will find that the capital in our banks and our insurance companies represents the thrift and the savings and the self-denial of somebody or it would not be there. Therefore I say that when a gentleman rises in this House and suggests that we should make a levy upon capital to pay the national debt, I think he either does not understand what capital means or he does not understand the genius of the Canadian people; because it is contrary to our institutions, it is contrary to the whole spirit of our people to make a levy upon capital to pay the national debt. Why, think of it! These seventeen banks that seem to irk him so much and to grieve him because of their existence—indeed, he looks upon them as some big monopoly apparently—actually represent in many cases the property of widows and orphans.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RAYMOND: I do not understand whether the objection is to the banks or to the widows and orphans. What I mean to say is this, that if they will examine the stocks of these banks and the stocks and bonds of our insurance companies they will find that they represent, as I say, the savings and the thrift of somebody. For instance, if a man dies and leaves an amount of money, what is done with it? It is put into some sound investment for his family, and that investment constitutes the capital upon which the member (Mr. Woodsworth) who was speaking last night said he would like to make a levy to pay our national debt.

I do not understand a great deal that is said and written nowadays about capital and labour, how can we get money for nothing, and how the purchasing power of people can be increased without the people working and

saving. It may be my stupidity, Mr. Speaker, it may be the old-fashioned way in which I was brought up, but I think what a man does not earn by his hands and save, that he cannot have by enactment of parliament. There is no sense in spending money and calling it purchasing power and then throwing it back on to the general aggregation of the wealth of the country. Why, what are the mines and the forests that he spoke of?—and I doubt his figures in regard to these when he said they were only worth $1,200,000,000, because the forests of Quebec alone, according to a report of the government of that province, are worth $600,000,000; I believe our forests and mines are worth many times what he said they are worth. But what good are they? How can you coin them, how can you issue paper against them? They are worth nothing until they are developed—they are worth nothing until the gold, silver, copper and iron are brought to the surface, until the trees are cut down and sawn up into lumber or converted into pulp and paper. And what does develop these natural resources? The capital of the country. And this capital, I repeat, represents the thrift and savings of the people. If you can point to so many billion dollars' worth of farms and farm buildings, to several hundred million dollars' worth of live stock, it is because the farmers have worked and earned and saved money; it represents their capital; and if you have mining corporations or milling corporations functioning, it is because somebody has saved the money for their purposes, and that money constitutes capital.

The idea of having any hard feeling against capital or against capitalists, or making laws against capital or capitalists! Such legislation would be the wreck and ruin of any country. We have seen it done in Russia. We have seen war made upon capital in that country by gentlemen who hold something of the same kind of views that the Socialists profess. I must here admit that I cannot distinguish very clearly between a Communist, a Socialist, an Anarchist, and an out-and-out Bolshevist; there may be a difference, but I fail to see it. I think that anyone who understands this country realizes that it is necessary to have capital if we want to develop our resources, that while those natural resources are there under the ground they are of no value, and that it is only by capital that we can hope to develop them.

Now, the logical consequence of that is that we must have laws that make property safe, we must have laws that respect the rights of the people. We must not countenance anyone who should change the basic principle of our jurisprudence, because if we do we shall have trouble. While we have, as I say, the gross example in front of us of Russia at the present time, we should proceed with due caution. We know what they did in Russia. They first destroyed their ruler, then they destroyed their parliament, then they destroyed their banks and merchant citizens and murdered them for their money, and finally they destroyed the farmers and took their wheat away from them.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RAYMOND: These are facts. They may be uncomfortable to certain hon. gentlemen, but the farmers of this country should be mighty glad that we have—I won't say no Bolshevists, but so few.

Passing for a moment to the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, I think we should realize that one of the greatest difficulties he has is to produce the money necessary to run the country. There are many things doubtless that we all would like to see done that he has not been able to do. But I do not think we should for a moment suppose that he has not seen them, I do not think we should imagine they have not come under his consideration and received the due exercise of his careful judgment. However, when such a general benefit to the country is offered as a reduction of the duty on sugar I should have thought it would have helped to sweeten the public generally—I won't say particularly hon. gentlemen opposite, but I should hope they would appreciate it because it is something that affects us all. For myself, I would have thought that had it been possible the Finance Minister would have abolished another tax that I feel sure has been brought to his attention, and being one of an important nature he will, I am sure, exercise his due judgment upon it. I refer to the removal of the war tax stamp from letters. It is something, I think, we should all be very glad to see removed. It is something, I feel sure, the hon. minister will remove as soon as it is possible to do so. It is something that, no doubt, can be removed by order in council, and I hope that later in the year it will be possible to remove this tax, because at the present time we are sending letters to Great Britain and to our sister nations within the commonwealth on which we are obliged to pay twice the postage that the citizens of the the United States have to pay on their letters. Where their postage has been two cents on letters forwarded to those places ours has been

four. I hope the time will come when ours will be reduced to a figure at least as low as that which prevails in the United States; and I feel sure that this would have been done had it not been for the unfortunate and regrettable illness of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy). But we ought to remember that if the United States at the present time is leading us in the matter of low postage rates there was a time, in 1897, when Canada led the world by establishing penny Imperial postage. I say I hope the time will come, Mr. Speaker, when it will be possible again to send letters all over the British dominions at the rate of two cents.

There is a suggestion I would make to my friends the Progressives—and I would emphasize the word "friends," for nobody thinks more of them than I do; and I know they will take my suggestion as I mean it. They seem to concentrate their whole attention on that poor item of our national programme, the tariff. On every question that comes up in the House, whether the French treaty or immigration or anything else, my hon. friends always manage to work around to the tariff, obsessed as they are with the idea of free trade. I would say this to them: that there are other questions well worth their consideration; other questions ten times more important to them than the tariff question. If they will consider the question of transportation and what it means to them coming and going, taking supplies to them and bringing their products away, why, the tariff, as a matter of supreme importance, will disappear; it will become a relatively small thing in their minds. The farmers of the West produced last year something like 400 million bushels of wheat and something like 1,000 million bushels of other grains. If they could only save 10 per cent on that by improving the transportation system, the whole amount involved in the tariff system would be equalized by the amount thus saved on the transportation of their goods. I say the matter is well worth their consideration. The tariff is not the only thing. But it is true that in developing these railways, in developing a transportation system and making it a success, it is necessary to have a tariff system; tariff system and transportation system and immigration policy must go hand in hand in the development of this country. It is not necessary to reiterate this; it has been referred to several times in the House. But I would respectfully urge my hon. friends to look at some other questions besides merely the matter of tariff.

Now, what do my hon. friends propose instead of the tariff? What do they suggest as a means of raising the revenue that would be lost? They propose an additional revenue by way of income tax, a tax upon unearned income. But if they will examine the figures in the Income Tax department they will see how heavily the income tax already presses upon that part of our population which is included within our towns and cities—it does not press so heavily upon those in the country. I think my hon. friends would see that it would be impossible by any system of increasing the income tax—a tax which is imposed by the Dominion government, in Ontario by the municipalities, and in Manitoba, I believe, by the province—to attain their object. Then, they suggest an increase of certain duties on luxuries. Why, the people who would be buying the luxuries are the very people whose incomes they would reduce by increasing the income tax. The plan they propose, therefore, to make up the money that the tariff now provides would not be at all adequate; a fair consideration of it shows that.

But I would ask my hon. friends, how do they like the other substitute, the one proposed by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). Among the suggestions he made, one, I think, was a levy upon real estate, upon the land. The whole tariff could very easily be made up by a levy upon real estate, a tax upon the land, but the reason it is not done is that such a tax is thought to be not quite fair to the farmers. Yet that is proposed by a gentleman who associates himself with my hon. friends and who finds that he is able generally to vote with them on their tariff policies and their resolutions. The tariff question is not, I think, rightly understood by some of those who undertake to discuss it.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RAYMOND: Let me give hon. members my point of view, and they will see whether that applies to my discussion of it. The tariff is very often discussed merely as a question of political economy, discussed by people who take a theoretical view of things. Most of us are aware that on the basis of mere theory free trade can be argued very successfully, especially upon the presumption that every other country is a free trade country. But as a theory, simply as a theory, it is a dead, cold thing; it is the stillborn child of parents who suffered from academic anaemia. As a theory, free trade is something that never could take its place in the comity of nations to do its part for Canada. When we speak of the free interchange of natural products between Canada and the

United States, then we are dealing with something which, if consummated, would somewhat change the aspect of affairs. But we are situated beside a great country, a country of many times our population, with large well organized and well established factories; a country with a high protective tariff against us. What, then, can we hope to do with free trade? We have heard hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the United States is a free trade country, but when they say that it is evident they have not tried to sell any wheat there; if they had, they would have found a duty of 35 cents a bushel staring them in the face; they have evidently not tried to sell any cattle there. They have not tried to sell woollen garments there, because they would find on woollen goods an absolutely prohibitory duty. And the same applies to cutlery and many other articles. Situated as we are, therefore, we cannot hope to succeed if we have free trade while the United States maintains its present tariff policy.

I do not look upon the tariff purely as a question of political economy that can be argued on a theoretical basis. I regard it from another point of view entirely. It may be a wrong point of view, but I can look back over the history of Canada and I can see that my contention of what the tariff question really involves is amply borne out. As long ago as 1805, 118 years ago, there was a similar discussion going on in Montreal and throughout Canada, which was a small country then. It was considered that the town interests were separated in some way from the country interests, and the question of duties came up. One of the sentiments expressed on the occasion of a great banquet in that time was: "Here is to our agricultural and commercial interests; may they work harmoniously together and both realize their advantages and responsibilities." I think the same sentiment is necessary to-day. But from that time down to the present the tariff question has always been raised in Canada. Some people think it is a new thing, but there have been tariffs practically ever since Canada has been a country. If to cease to have this tariff means—as it does mean—to surrender our market, to give up our commercial weapon of negotiation; if it means to lay our country commercially helpless at the foot of a rival, I say it is contrary, Mr. Speaker, to the spirit and nature of the Canadian people. That is my argument; the tariff is not a question of theory, and it never can be made a question of theory. It is a study in natural psychology. And I would ask you to look at these Canadian people and see what they are, see where they came from and the spirit of independence that they brought with them. You can go from one end of the country to the other. You can begin with those sturdy men who came from Scotland because they stood by the cause of the Jacobites and would never surrender, and who came over to Nova Scotia and that part of eastern Canada. You can take those people to whom I am, I suppose, by race more nearly related, so I will not say anything about them except that it is said that the totem of their tribe is the bull dog on the flag and their motto "What we have we'll hold." No surrender has always been their motto. Or you can take those people who inhabit the western part of the country, and you have there a people of a strong, free, independent disposition, whose motto never could be surrender. If you take the people of the old historic province of Quebec why, Sir, the first military governor described them as the best and bravest people in the world—a man of an alien race, a man who belonged to the army that had been successful at the seige, Murray. That was his description of them, and there is nothing in their history from that day to this but carries out his words of that people—the best and bravest people in the world. Now, do you tell me that a people who have that blood of freedom flowing in their veins are going to surrender their market, throw down their boundaries and barriers and lay themselves helpless at the feet of a wealthy rival to the south of us? It is not to be thought of. It puts me in mind of the battle of St. Julien. If you want to see the concentrated essence of the Canadian people I would remind you of the post that was held by a Brantford boy. He got word during the hear and struggle of that battle when men were falling thickly around him, "Hold the position at any cost"; and he sent back this answer, "We will hold the position till Hell freezes over." I quote that now because it is typical of the spirit of the Canadian people, and come before them in any way you like, bring down your tariff propositions in any way you please, with the duty off this or the duty off that, but when it is a proposition to throw our markets at the feet of any commercial rival, I tell you what, gentlemen, you will never find it meet the approval of the Canadian people.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I join with very great pleasure in the good wishes and congratulations which have been showered upon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). It

is certainly the viewpoint of every man in this House that we wish him long life, prosperity and happiness, with many years of good health and all the good things that can be wished for a man who has so many years of public life to his credit.

I have some general remarks to make, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not deal with the budget except in dealing with these general remarks a little later on in my address. In regard to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) who has just taken his seat, I do not intend to touch his speech, because with a great deal of it I think all of us can agree, and his speech was so humourous and entertaining and showed such culture and good feeling that many of us could profit by emulating many of his qualities. My own remarks for a few moments will be of a general character.

In the first place I should like to point out that, if we look back over the different addresses given in this House since the opening of this session, we are forced to the conclusion that this country of ours is in a very serious condition. That is mainly due to the fact that we have had very little immigration into this country while at the same time we have had tens of thousands migrating from this country, not only from the prairie provinces which are mentioned by my hon. friends to my left, but from the different industrial cities of this country and from the eastern provinces of Canada as well.

What are the causes in brief for that exodus? Well, in the first place, there is the fact mentioned by the hon. member for Brantford, that we have an area which for over three thousand miles is contiguous to the greatest industrially developed country in the world, and one of the richest nations in the world which will always be an attraction for the young men of our country who look for wider fields to capture than they can obtain at home. In the second place, there is the fact that the climate of this country is more severe than the climate of the United States, and because of our cold climate the people have to spend more for their food, more for their clothing, more for their houses and the heating of those houses, than they have in the nation to the south of us. Then there is the fact of high taxation. We have been suffering in this country recently from very high taxation. I regret to say there is very little sign in the budget that has just been brought down of cutting down any of that taxation. It is true that much of it is due to war expenditure, but in addition to the ordinary taxation we have the railway taxation in Canada, because after all railway charges are a direct tax upon the people of a nation. We have unfortunately built three transcontinental railways where two would have been amply sufficient, and until we can build up the population of Canada to a point equal to supplying both passenger and freight traffic sufficient for these railways we are going to have very heavy railway taxation.

Finally, there is the fact that we have a very small population spread over a very large area. We have about three people to the square mile, whereas in the United States they have about twelve and in Europe thirty or forty people to the square mile. In addition to that the population is congregated into sections which makes the country a very difficult one to govern and a very expensive one to live in. We have the Maritime provinces in the east, where there is a large congregation of people with interests different and industries and problems different from those in other sections of the country. Then come the industrial sections of Ontario and Quebec, which are the manufacturing sections of the nation. Then comes my section, a thousand miles of more or less undeveloped hinterland in northern Ontario with a very sparse population indeed. Then we have the wheat-growing provinces with different interests again, and finally across the Rocky Mountains the province of British Columbia, with its own interests of fruit growing, lumbering and fishing, which are different from the interests of other sections of this country.

Unfortunately each section has a tendency to blame its own problems for the condition of the nation as a whole. For example, my hon. friends to my left in many speeches this year have blamed different causes for the conditions in the western provinces. They have blamed the tariff on some occasions, the unfair exactions of the grain trade, the banks, the fact that the Hudson Bay railway has not been completed, and the high transportation costs. Any or all of these are contributory causes to the conditions in the West, just as over-speculation is a contributory cause, or a desire to live too luxuriously probably is a cause. The absence of mixed farming, as mentioned by the hon. member for Brandon, the leader of the Agrarian party himself (Mr. Forke), is another contributory cause. But none of these are the whole cause, except in individual, isolated cases.

There are two main causes for the depression in Canada to-day in addition to the high taxation and some of the other things I have

mentioned. The two main reasons for our depressed condition that appeal to me are these: One is the high prices of manufactured goods in comparison with the prices of agricultural products from the farming sections of the country. The other, the chaotic conditions in Europe because of which world markets have vanished to a great extent. In regard to the high price of manufactured goods there has been too high a cost not only for labour but for raw material. There has been a tendency on the part not only perhaps of the manufacturers themselves, though I do not know that is a fact, but it would appear so, but on the part of their employees as well to charge all that the traffic will bear. I submit that the high cost of manufacturing and distributing goods in this country is standing in the way of a return to prosperity to a very real extent.

In regard to world conditions, France occupies the Ruhr and the Saar basin, the coal and iron mines of Germany. She has the heart of Germany in her hands. I am not criticizing France for that; in fact, I entirely sympathize with France in her attitude, but the fact remains that Germany is out of business and France herself is in a very serious condition. Austria and Italy are also in a very serious condition. Russia is in the hands of the Communists, and we all know what the conditions in Russia are. So far as Great Britain is concerned, she, unfortunately, has lost many of her continental customers. Her trade is disorganized; there are a million and a half unemployed in that country; she has a debt of forty billions of dollars; and her political condition is very unsettled. So that the European and world conditions are all upset. With respect to the United States, that country has placed an increased tariff against imports from Canada. Therefore the world conditions have had a very grave effect on conditions in this country. A recent authority on the world's grain production has stated that the last world crop was short one and a half billion bushels of the world's need, and yet, notwithstanding that fact, there remain in Canada to-day something like one hundred or one hundred and fifty million bushels of grain unsold. That is due to the fact that these world conditions have destroyed the purchasing power of other nations.

Now, let me give just a few figures to illustrate the loss of the market to the farmers of the Canadian West. In 1922 we sold more grain to Great Britain it is true, than we sold in 1921; but, Sir, to other countries we sold less. Here are the figures:

[Mr. Manion.]

Canada's Sales of Grain in 1922 as compared with 1921 were

	Bushels less
To the United States	26,000,000
To France	4,000,000
To Italy	11,000,000
To Germany	500,000
To Belgium	10,000,000
To Holland	4,500,000

These are figures given by the Bureau of Statistics of Canada, and no doubt are absolutely correct. So that the loss of the world's trade, due to the chaotic conditions that exist, has cost Canada a great deal.

What are the remedies for these conditions? It is true that some of them are uncontrollable by us. So far as we are concerned we cannot control world conditions or the decrease in the purchasing power in Europe, nor can we control the United States tariff despite the gesture towards reciprocity made by the Minister of Finance in his budget. But, Sir, there are five main things I believe we can do to help to build up our country. One of these is to hold, so far as we can, the home market. The Fordney tariff in the United States is an attempt on the part of that country to hold the United States market for her producers; and all the other countries of the world have put up tariffs with the same object in view. It is true that there should be an effort made by the manufacturers and by the workers in the factories of this country to lower the price of manufactured goods so that the farmers of the west and the other sections of Canada can have a better opportunity of buying to a greater extent than they have had in the past. I am not even sure, Sir, that an educational campaign along this line might not have some effect in pointing out the seriousness of that condition, not only to the manufacturers themselves but to the employees in the factories.

Second, Sir, we should increase, so far as we can, interprovincial trade because that not only helps our country generally but does away to a great extent with misunderstandings and brings about a unity which cannot be effected in any other way.

Third, we should, so far as we can, increase the population of this country. There, Sir, is where I believe the government has failed in not having a proper immigration policy, a policy which will build up the population of this country. Because if we can do that we will solve practically all the problems we have, particularly that of high taxation and the railway problem. I will step aside for a moment to deal with immigration upon which question I wish to say a few words. There are to-day tens of millions of

European people who are anxious to come to this country, anxious to get away from the serfdom under which they have lived not only for generations but for centuries, anxious to come to a country where they can establish themselves and their families in a free land. I well remember, Sir, a story which illustrates my point, the story of one of Napoleon's marshals who had gone to Vienna, where he was taunted by one of the nobility of Vienna with being a parvenu, an upstart. He replied "Yes, that may be so, but I am an ancestor, and you are only a descendant." That is the spirit, the desire to be ancestors, which animates the breasts of tens of millions of central Europeans, of tens of millions of agriculturists, who have lived as serfs in those countries and who are only too anxious to come to Canada if they are given the proper encouragement to do so. But in order to aid them to carry out this ambition we must also strive to make our country a good one to live in, and—

Mr. PUTNAM: Would the hon. gentleman indicate what his conception is of the "proper encouragement" to be given?

Mr. MANION: That, Mr. Speaker, is not my business. I am not the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Immigration in the government. I would think that one way at least would be to have a plan of some kind, but such a plan does not exist at the present time so far as I have been able to see.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going on to say that this is a moment which would appear to afford a supreme opportunity for Canada. I have a very great respect, and I say this in all sincerity for those foreigners whom we have in this country and those foreigners whom I am speaking of bringing to this country. I live in a city which is very cosmopolitan. There are people of all nationalities in that city. I have worked among them in my earlier days to a great extent in the course of professional practice, and I say that this is a fact: According to my observation the Canadian-born children of these people become good Canadian citizens. I well remember meeting little Slovaks, little Polanders, little Italians, little Greeks, in my city and of observing how quickly these Canadian-born children became good Canadian citizens. I have seen them in their school rooms and I remember on one occasion hearing 200 little Slovak
4 p.m children sing "God Save the King" with as much gusto and heartiness as any of our Canadian children could do it. So I believe, Sir, this is the time when we have these millions of acres of ours to develop when we may look into the immigration problem before us and do everything we can to get these people.

The fourth method by which we can improve conditions in this country is by cutting down taxation. We have Dominion taxation, provincial taxation, and municipal taxation in this country and these taxes bear very heavily on the people of Canada. Sir, in that respect I consider that our budget was very disappointing. In England when the budget was brought down about a month ago they cut off from their national debt forty million pounds, about $200,000,000, and since the war they have reduced the national debt by about £600,000,000, about $3,000,000,000, a sum greater than the whole national debt of this country. In addition to that they have lowered taxes. Despite the great difficulties under which they are suffering they have lowered taxes. In this last budget they lowered taxation to the extent of £34,000,000, or $170,000,000, which works out at $4 per head for every man, woman and child in the British Isles. In our budget which has just been brought before the House we have cut taxation to the extent of about $2,500,000 on sugar, which works out at the rate of about 30 cents per capita, less than one-tenth of the cut in the British Isles. In addition to that, Sir, we have not only added to the debt in the past year, and in all past years since the war, but we are going to add to that debt in the future. I believe, Sir, that the people of Canada are looking forward to a cutting down of the national debt in the very near future, and not an addition to it. Our budget should, so far as we are able to do it, be balanced. I do not know that it is altogether possible but a greater attempt should be made to balance the budget than has so far been made by this government. I fear that the promises of economy on their part, like the Liberal platform of 1919, have gone into the limbo of forgotten things.

There are two items in the budget upon which I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance. They are details but, I believe very important details in their consequences to the people concerned. One is the lowering of duties on stumping machines. In northern Ontario, northern Quebec, British Columbia, and in some parts of the Maritime provinces, stumping machines are very important to the pioneers who are cutting their way out of the forest. They certainly are of great import-

ance in my section of New Ontario, and I advocated this step to the minister.

Then, Sir, in regard to boots for cripples. It is a small duty it is true, but it is something that will be greatly appreciated by those who are affected. In this connection I have never been able to see why we should not take off the duties on all appliances for cripples in this country. I do not know why those cripples, who are handicapped before the world to begin with, should not have, at least, the benefit of any remission of taxation which may possibly be given to them. I say this very feelingly, because in the past summer a carpenter in my city, who has a little boy paralyzed from the waist down, found it necessary to buy a wheel chair to send that little lad to school. He told me that he had to pay a duty of $30 on the chair. I took the matter up with the Deputy Minister of Customs and asked if there was not some way by which this could be remedied, but he told me that according to the law, it could not be remedied. It is time, at least as regards cripples, that we should do everything we can to lessen their difficulties in life. That is one of the ways in which it can be done, and the Minister of Finance should extend this legislation as regards cripples' appliances and should carry it out completely.

There is another matter which I wish to lay before the Minister of Finance; unfortunately he is not in the House at present, but I hope the matter will be drawn to his attention. According to my understanding of the budget —and I hope I am wrong—after August 1, the sales tax will not be permitted to be passed on by large dealers. I say I hope I am wrong, in certain connections at least, and the following is one of them. The other day I had a letter from a large lumber dealer in Ontario, in which letter he pointed out that he had made large contracts amounting to millions of dollars, under the law as it was before the present budget was brought in. He claims that under this new legislation, if he is not permitted to pass on the six per cent sales tax, he will not be able to continue, that this will put him out of business. It would be at least fair to have the Minister of Finance bring in a resolution to protect men of that kind who have made contracts in good faith under the law as it was.

The fifth point to which I wish to refer and which is, I believe, necessary to build up this country, is that we should have a little less pessimism in Canada than we have had in the past. It is true that conditions in Canada have not been good. It is true that all of us, not only the farmers on the land, but citizens in the cities, have been up against a very difficult proposition. But I do not think it is necessary for a man in trouble to stand on the housetops and tell his troubles to the whole world. It is true that a foolish optimism is sometimes worse than pessimism, but we have reason for being fairly optimistic in this Canada of ours, and I am going to take the liberty of dealing for five minutes, not with the dreams but with the actual accomplishments of this country.

1. As a wheat growing country, Canada stands third amongst the nations of the world. In wheat export, she stands first. Our total field crops amount to $1,000,000,000.

2. As regards our gold output, Canada stood second amongst the nations last year, with one-fifth of the world's production, Ontario surpassing even California.

3. Canada has the second-largest coal deposits in the world, and it is only a matter of time until our transportation difficulties are removed so that, at least, we may supply all our own fuel.

4. Canada stands third in production of silver in the world. Last year we produced 21,000,000 ounces, being surpassed by only the United States and Mexico.

5. Canada produces over 90 per cent of the cobalt produced in the world, 80 per cent of the nickel, and 80 per cent of the asbestos.

6. Canada possesses 18,000,000 horse-power of potential riches in waterfalls, and only one-sixth of that has been developed.

7. In pulp, paper and forest products, our exports last year amounted to $200,000,000 worth, or nearly as much as our exports of wheat.

8. Finally, we have millions of acres of fertile land, fisheries on all sides, iron ore to the extent of hundreds of millions of tons, because of which there is no doubt the day will come, in the not very distant future, when Canada will be one of the largest iron-producing countries of the world; and we have a vigorous, virile people.

These are only a few brief facts showing why this country may feel optimistic, and it might be well for us to forget, to a certain extent, some of the pessimism that we have been displaying too freely in Canada.

In addition to that, the other day I read a statement by Doctor O. E. Baker, an agricultural economist of the United States Department of Agriculture, in which he said that there is practically no more potentially agricultural land left unutilized in the United States, that does not involve unprofitable

expense for reclamation and clearing. He pointed out that in the United States there is a movement to limit production. According to a foreign agricultural economist, in the great grain belt of southeastern Europe, the peasant proprietor is lessening production. Therefore grain growers of Canada and Canadians generally may look to the future with a little more optimism. It is true that conditions in the West are not good, but the rest of the country has also been hard hit. There has been a great deal of hardship, not only on the prairie farms of the West, but in the cities and towns. A short time ago we had a discussion in this House as regards mortgages on the farms of Canada. To have a mortgage, one must at least possess something to mortgage, and a large proportion of the people in the cities and towns have nothing that they can mortgage. Even as regards those of them who have homes, seventy-five per cent have mortgages on them. It is true that we must do all we can to aid the West, and it is the desire of every one in this country to do so. Some arrangements must be made for longer credit. Apparently, from the evidence given before the Banking and Commerce committee, longer credits than the banks can give and at interest rates better than the farmers can get at the present time, are necessary on the western prairies. Transportation must be looked into, and as far as we can we must lessen transportation costs. Any unfairness in the grain trade must be removed.

But there are some lessons of history which the people of Canada cannot forget in dealing with questions of this kind, and one of those lessons is this, that the United States, under a protective tariff, has become an immense, powerful, highly developed nation, probably the most highly developed industrial nation in the world to-day. Canada and the United States resemble each other more closely than any other two countries in the world. We are like the United States in people, in area, in resources, in thought, in nearly every way in which it is possible to resemble the United States. Therefore, it would be worth while remembering that Canada can profit by the lessons which she can learn from the United States.

The absurd claim has been made that the United States has been built up under a free trade policy. I use the word "absurd" advisedly, because if the United States is a free trade country, so is Germany, with her sixty-five or seventy million people and her different kingdoms with no tariffs in between. So is France; so is Austria; so is Canada; so are all those other countries. Russia with a larger area, would be a free trade country also. Free trade and protection refer to international trade, not to internal or home trade. A country which collects twenty to thirty per cent, or even more, upon the vast proportion of her imports, is certainly anything but a free trade country, and that is what the United States does. The following are some of the duties collected by the United States on some of its imports. I will name only ten lines of goods:

Cotton clothing, 30 per cent ad valorem.
Wollen goods, 25 to 40 per cent ad valorem.
Carpets, 20 to 50 per cent ad valorem.
Automobiles below, $2,000, 30 per cent ad valorem.

And those are the automobiles that the farmer and small dealers require.

Cutlery, 25 to 55 per cent ad valorem.
Oil cloth, 20 to 30 per cent ad valorem.
Kitchen utensils, 25 per cent ad valorem.
Wool blankets, 25 per cent ad valorem.
Agricultural products—the Fordney tariff.

In 1920, practically fifty per cent of all imports into the United States were dutiable. Under such conditions, the United States is certainly a protectionist country.

How has protection affected the United States? If hon. members will investigate any of the industries of that country, they will find that they have gone ahead by leaps and bounds. I am going to place on Hansard five of the United States industries.

In 1890, the tinplate industry in the United States was practically non existent; yet by 1920, thirty years later, they produced 3,000,000,000 pounds, and the imports which they had previously obtained from Wales were practically wiped out.

In 1890, the United States produced 4,000,000 long tons of steel. In 1920 they produced 42,000,000 long tons.

In 1890, the United States produced $480,000,000 worth in the manufacture of iron and steel. In 1920, they produced $3,600,000,000 worth, or nearly eight times as much.

The total manufactured products of the United States in 1890 amounted to $10,000,000,000 worth, and in 1920 to $60,000,000,000 worth.

The value of the products of their farms in 1890 amounted to $3,000,000,000 worth, and in 1920 to $22,000,000,000 worth. This is probably of more interest to the farmers. These figures which I have given cover a short period of thirty years. Probably there is not a man sitting in this House who was not in existence when the first facts which I have given were occurring, and to-day the figures that I have quoted reveal that all these lines have gone up six, seven or eight times. In the case of

dozens of other industries, anyone who cares to look up the Statistical Abstract of the United States will find that the same thing is true in regard to every one of them. It is true that the United States is practically self-supporting because of the high production of all lines of goods in that country. But that is to my mind just another argument favourable to a moderate protective tariff. It is also true that free trade might temporarily assist the farmers of the West; but in my opinion, and as was pointed out by the hon. member who took his seat a few minutes ago, it would ruin to a great extent the industrial cities of the East. And those cities would not suffer alone; the farmers who live in the vicinity of every such industrial centre would be affected as well. Would it be wise for the West to be benefited through the ruin of the East? I would ask another question also, and I would have it clearly understood that I do so out of no disrespect whatever; I ask the question with the greatest deference to hon. gentlemen from the West. All the countries of the world with the exception of Great Britain have been and are protectionist, and England has adopted the protective principle in certain directions recently. But even though England did adopt free trade in 1846, the fact that no other country has adopted it, the fact that all the nations of the world have considered it a poor policy, compels this question: Are we to draw the inference that those people in the West of Canada who advocate free trade have inherited all the wisdom of the ages, notwithstanding that they are alone in this matter?

Mr. FORKE: Does my hon. friend imagine that the world has been governed by the maximum of wisdom during the last fifty years, when he considers the condition in which it is at the present time?

Mr. MANION: Perhaps it has not been as well governed as it might have been, but I was referring to the tariff.

Mr. FORKE: If the hon. gentleman followed my remarks yesterday he must have seen that I was contending that the tariff is the great bone of contention and the cause of ill-feeling, hatred, envy and jealousy, and in short is responsible for the condition of the world to-day. I contend that the condition of the world at the present time has to a certain extent at least been caused by high tariff walls.

Mr. MANION: That is a matter of opinion. I think, personally, that the condition of the world to-day is due mainly to the fact that the German Kaiser undertook to conquer it. That is my own idea.

Mr. FORKE: Yes, under high tariff walls.

Mr. MANION: If my hon. friend wishes to debate that question I can take it up with him. As a matter of fact the German Kaiser, under a high tariff wall, was conquering the world, and if he had exercised any sense he would have sat tight and conquered it commercially. Indeed, he was gradually encroaching upon England's commerce before the war. I have already on several occasions cited figures to prove that before the war Germany was outdistancing England in very many lines of commerce. She had gained upon England in many directions. For example, the basic industry of all countries is the production of iron and steel, and Germany had surpassed England in thirty years to a considerable extent in this industry. Germany, with her protective tariff, was surpassing England under a free trade policy; and there are very many serious-thinking Britishers who thought that England had been suffering to such an extent that it would be necessary for her to fall back upon the protective principle. I believe, too, that the time will come when she will adopt protection in many lines. There is this to be remembered about Great Britain. Great Britain is a small piece of land, 120,000 square miles in extent, which could be placed in about half the area of northern Ontario. England cannot produce raw materials on a large scale as can the United States or Canada. She must have free trade in raw materials and also to a certain degree in foodstuffs. Therefore what is good for England is not necessarily good for a country thirty or forty times its size, as Canada is.

Mr. FORKE: But you told us that England would quit free trade.

Mr. MANION: And she has done so in some respects. My hon. friend is a farmer. Would he tell me what he thinks of the protection given to industries in the United Kingdom now under the Key Industry Act.

Mr. FORKE: The protection which is enjoyed by the industries in Great Britain at the present time is protection that is given to key industries. That is a little different from straight protection.

Mr. MANION: It is protection to the extent of thirty or forty per cent, and is intended to keep out the products of Germany and all other European countries.

Mr. FORKE: Some protection has been given in England to a few key industries.

Mr. MANION: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what the cattle embargo was? Was it a precaution against disease or was it not rather direct protection for the cattle raisers of Great Britain?

Mr. FORKE: I think it was protection, all right.

Mr. MANION: Then the hon. member admits that protection is given at least to many industries in the United Kingdom. I could recount many of the industries in Great Britain and show that the protective policy is being rapidly adopted in regard to a number of them. I do not think that Great Britain will ever go back to an absolute protective policy for the reasons that I have already given. The country is so small in area that she cannot produce on a large scale the raw materials that she needs for her manufacturers and the food that is required for her people. She must therefore of necessity resort to free trade to some extent. But the argument in regard to Great Britain, in view of these considerations, does not by any means apply to a country that is thirty or forty times her size, with immense natural resources awaiting development. Such a vast country could not adopt a free trade policy for reasons that would hold good in a country like Great Britain.

Mr. MORRISON: The hon. member stated a moment ago that the wisdom of this nation did not all lie in the West, and he added that the West had no right to ruin the East. I would ask him this question: Has the East any right to ruin the West by exorbitant taxation through the customs tariff?

Mr. MANION: I absolutely agree with my hon. friend that the East has no right to ruin the West; nor do I think that our tariff has been so high as to do anything of the kind. But I do not think, on the other hand, that the East should suffer in order that the West might be advantaged.

Mr. MORRISON: The West is suffering by reason of the oppression and short-sightedness of eastern capitalists who refuse to consider or to listen to statements made by western people, who, they declare, are mis-representing the facts. But the hon. gentleman, I think, himself indicated a little while ago that he recognized the fact that the West was in a bad condition. Does he propose any remedy?

Mr. MANION: I am proposing a number of remedies. I admit that the West is suffering to a great extent, but I submit at the same time that if we consider all the facts we must realize that there is not only one cause; there are some ten or twelve causes, two or three of which I have pointed out in regard to world conditions. I do not suggest for a moment that the East has any right to benefit at the expense of the West, but I repeat, I do not believe that the East has any more right to suffer in order that the West may be benefited. I take this attitude, however, that we should have a tariff sufficient to protect the industries of the country, and when I say so I am quite prepared to concede that the tariff has to be revised from time to time. And I was going on to deal with that a little later. I want hon. gentlemen to be assured that when I made the remark I did a few moments ago about wisdom, what I said was said in perfect deference to my hon. friends from the West. I certainly did not mean to stir up a hornets' nest around me, and I sincerely hope that my good friends have not taken offence.

Mr. FORKE: You are very good-natured, Doctor.

Mr. MANION: It must be obvious, however, to anyone who looks at the question dispassionately, as I have done, for I am neither a farmer nor a manufacturer, that the vast balance of opinion of the world today is favourable to protection; and that is proven by the number of countries who have a protective policy, as well as by the further fact that Great Britain, the sole free trader, is adopting the protective principle in regard to many industries.

Mr. EVANS: If we have such vast resources, why do the manufacturers require that everything they need in the way of raw material shall be on the free list?

Mr. MANION: I do not know that the manufacturers want that, but I think that these materials should be on the free list so far as we can place them there. The manufacturer has to compete with other manufacturers in the world, and if he has to pay a very high duty on the raw materials he uses he cannot carry on that competition successfully.

Mr. EVANS: Does my hon. friend not concede the same argument in favour of the farmer?

Mr. MANION: Yes, and as a matter of fact we have put most of the farmers' raw materials on the free list. Many agricultural

implements are on the free list, and others enjoy a very much lower rate than many of the machines used by manufacturers. Now, I was going on to point out the necessity for periodical revisions of the tariff. I am not one of those who think that the tariff is going to stand as the laws of the Medes and Persians; I admit that it must be changed from time to time. I believe that the tariff needs revision periodically; and I have expressed the opinion on two or three occasions, which I still hold, that we should have an advisory tariff commission who will devote all their time to the study of just such questions as have been brought up by my hon. friends to my left. I certainly think that we need a proper tariff protection for our industries; but it is my own private opinion that if an industry can get along under competition with industries of the United States with 20 per cent protection, there is no reason why it should have 35 or 40 per cent. I believe therefore that a proper advisory tariff commission who would devote their whole time and attention to the questions that relate to the tariff would do a great deal to bring about that condition which would probably be satisfactory to the West and at the same time meet the undoubted necessities of the East.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken, I think, a little longer than I intended. But there are a few more observations which I feel I ought to submit for the consideration of the House before I conclude. I wish to point out one thing to my hon. friends to the left—the United Kingdom produces a vast amount of revenue under a free trade tariff. I remember during the last general election it was said there was no such thing as a free trade tariff. England has a very heavy free trade tariff and in 1919-20 she produced something like $750,000,000 of customs revenue, more than the United States, by the way, produced under its protectionist tariff. But the difference is this that under a free trade system the tariff is put upon the necessaries of life altogether.

Mr. WARNER: In connection with an advisory committee, would the hon. gentleman be willing that whoever wanted tariff protection of his business should come before the committee and give reasons therefor?

Mr. MANION: Certainly. That would be the duty of an advisory tariff committee, to study the question at all times and to advise not only the government but this House through its parliamentary committees.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. WARNER: We agree with that; that is all we ask.

Mr. MANION: I am glad to hear it. Usually my hon. friends to the left ask for free trade. That is the difference. However, I wanted to point out that the taxes under a free trade system are to a great extent placed upon the necessaries of life. Out of this $750,000,000, $200,000,000 was upon sugar and $600,000,000 was upon sugar, tea and tobacco, and as not only a very large percentage of the men but also a large number of the women of the British Isles smoke, tobacco might be looked upon as one of the necessaries of life,

An hon. MEMBER: A luxury.

Mr. MANION: And sugar and tea are necessaries. To get away from that for the moment. I should like to know what it is that free trade is supposed to do that would justify its adoption by Canada. Under free trade what has happened in the United Kingdom? To-day they have a million and half unemployed. While conditions have been bad in Canada, they have been infinitely worse under free trade in Great Britain. And not only are there these unemployed, but they have been asked to emigrate. The reason that conditions are so bad there is because the United Kingdom is dependent for its prosperity upon the buying power of its neighbours altogether, and has thrown away its bargaining or negotiating power which it had under the protective tariff system, and which the United States and Canada respectively retain under their protective tariff systems to-day.

Frank H. Simons, one of the cleverest writers in the United States, has made this statement:

> It is certain that unless England does get back her trade which she had before the war she will have to cut her population by ten million.

Very recently I was reading the memoirs of the late Earl of Dunraven, an Irishman who lived in Ireland during the great famine of 1846 and subsequently, in which he states that the population of Ireland was reduced from eight million to four million, due entirely to the loss of the agricultural interests because of free trade having been introduced in Great Britain.

I have made the following statement before in this House, it has never yet been successfully contradicted and I make it again now, that there are now in England and were before the war more extremes of poverty and riches, more pauperism, more unemployment, and greater emigration in search of better conditions than will be found in Canada, the United States, France, Germany, and these

are all protective countries. Not only that, Sir, but agriculture has been practically ruined in the United Kingdom under free trade. Great Britain grows less grain than France, Spain, Germany, Italy, Austria—I could name half a dozen other countries—so much less that there is no comparison. France with an area not much greater than the United Kingdom grew in the year before the war 300,000,000 bushels of wheat as against Great Britain's fifty or sixty million bushels. France, because she is protectionist, and Germany for the same reason, were growing most of their own foodstuffs. There is a lower percentage of agriculturists on the land in Great Britain, than in France, Germany, Austria, Spain, Italy, the United States or Canada.

Schooling, one of the best statisticians in the United Kingdom, says:

> In 1851 in England and Wales the agricultural labourers per 1,000 of population numbered 106, while in 1901, fifty years after the introduction of free trade, that number had dwindled down to 30; in other words, a reduction of 70 per cent.

Mr. WARNER: Is not that because the English people feel they can make better use of their land for stock raising purposes?

Mr. MANION: France imports practically none of her food; England imports from 75 to 80 per cent of hers. France, Germany, and the other European countries succeed in producing not only their grain but practically all their other foodstuffs, while England is absolutely dependent on outside countries for her food supplies. I shall quote a statement by Lloyd George from an article of his which appeared in the Montreal Star of April 21, less than a month ago. He says:

> America, in spite of its gigantic manufacturing and distributing industries, still retains 60 per cent of its population on the land. The same proportion of French and Italian population is agricultural. Barely 10 per cent of British workers are engaged in cultivating the soil.

Now, I wish to get back for a few moments to the present budget and the attitude of the Minister of Finance at different times during the last two or three years. In the first place in 1919 he adopted the attitude of the Liberal platform, which was virtually free trade in many different commodities. Last year in his budget speech he stated what my hon. friend from Brandon has already referred to, that this budget was only a beginning, that it was going in the right direction and we could hope for more. This year he brings down his budget and states: "This is a moderate tariff and you cannot expect it to go any lower than it is at the present time." In passing I may say that it is practically, though not entirely, the same tariff which has been in force since John A. Macdonald introduced the National Policy in 1878, and I doubt if anyone in this country wants a higher tariff —anyway I do not know anyone who does. As I thought of the variations of attitude of the Minister of Finance I was struck with the fact that though he has passed more than the allotted span of "three score years and ten" he still retains all his youthful agility as a tariff acrobat. This permits him to chant loudly his favourite hymn "Onward, Free-trade Soldiers." while at the same time performing that very difficult acrobatic act of beating the low-tariff drum with his hands, marching forward to the music with his feet, yet consistently rolling his head in the opposite direction. There is no doubt, sir, that this has been very entertaining to the House, and in a sense also to the minister himself, but it has not been inspiring of confidence to those wishing to invest capital in this country, and there is no question that investments of various kinds have been delayed and in some cases prevented by the fact that those who wish to build up our industries were hesitant because of the uncertainty of the tariff. It is true that the Minister of Finance in introducing his latest budget gave us an assurance of tariff stability, and I congratulate him upon that. We need tariff stability. In addition to that I think we also need in a general way the same type of policy so far as our tariff is concerned which has obtained in the United States for the last sixty years—the policy of a moderate tariff, scientifically revised from time to time, a tariff high enough to equalize competition, but not so high as to give unfair advantages to the industries concerned.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the amendment moved by my hon. friends to the left. Last year we moved an amendment condemning the Liberal party for repudiating its platform of 1919, and my hon. friends to the left, to a great extent, did not find it wise to support that amendment, though I notice in theirs now they incorporate practically the same condemnation. But I have noticed another strange thing about the amendment—I do not know that it is very strange either—and that is that it is carefully worded so there is no chance of our supporting it. It is in direct support of a free trade policy, so there is no possibility of members in this corner of the House voting for it.

Mr. BANCROFT: It did not require much care in drafting.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps not. But last year, when we were not very careful how we

voted against the government, I noticed there was great care displayed by my hon. friends in voting the other way. And I may say, by the way, that in regard to very many votes it has been the same. I am not accusing my hon. friend himself of that, but many of his friends have shown a very strong attitude of guardianship over the acts of the government.

In closing, I may say that as this amendment contains a very strong avowal of the principle of free trade, naturally the members in this corner of the House cannot—much to their regret—support it.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is the usual thing for hon. members to discuss any subject they may feel constrained to deal with on the occasion of the debate on the budget. I am going to take advantage of that opportunity, and then, before I sit down, dwell for a short time upon the budget itself. But before taking up any of the themes I have in mind, just for fear I should forget it, I wish to refer to a few of the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) and my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Manion).

I have not before me the figures of the old tariff of Sir John Macdonald, but it is my recollection that that tariff was very high on farm implements. It ran as high on many articles, particularly on threshing machines, as 35 per cent. I think Sir George Foster was credited with giving the greatest reduction of any finance minister, in 1894, because there had been a tremendous agitation throughout the country against the high duties of that day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member will not forget to give us credit for making a further reduction of 5 per cent, against the protest of the hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am coming to that; but I am sure my hon. friends opposite will not expect me to take up too much of my time extolling reductions made by them. But I wanted to correct the statement made by my hon. friend—inadvertently, I am sure—that the tariff of to-day on agricultural implements is almost as high as that of the tariff of Sir John A. Macdonald.

Mr. MANION: May I correct the hon. minister? I am sure he will allow me. I did not discuss the tariff on agricultural implements at all in that connection. I stated that the tariff was practically—and I emphasized the word "practically"—the same as the tariff of the past. I did not have in mind any particular details such as the duty on agricultural implements.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Thank you. I am very glad to be corrected, but I am afraid that even with the correction my hon. friend's statement is a long way from the facts. However, we will let that go.

There are only one or two of the statements of the hon. member for Brandon that I should like to refer to, because they have already been taken up by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond). I always like to have my department criticized; I think it is good for any public man to be subject to constructive criticism. I have often complained in the smaller provincial sphere in the West that I got very little criticism, so that I am glad to get it here. My hon. friend referred to the increase in the number of officials in the various departments, including my own. Well, that is so; I hope never to be identified with a department of agriculture, in a young country like Canada, the staff of which remains stationary or goes back. I do not know of any provincial department of agriculture, or, indeed, any federal department dealing with similar matters, that has not continued to go forward and give a larger service to the country each year. The same applies to many other departments.

My hon. friend has suggested that economies might be effected by various branches within the departments themselves by paring down the estimates before they come here. If my hon. friend ever has the duty devolving upon him, which he may, of bringing down estimates, he will find that they are pared several times before they come into this House.

Mr. FORKE: With my hon. friend's permission, I would like just to state that I made estimates for twenty years for muncipal purposes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That may be so, but what I want to point out is that the paring down is carried out in spite of ourselves. The items go before the heads of the various branches and before the deputy, and they are frequently cut before they get to council, and after they get to council they have to run the most terrific gauntlet of all—every minister knows that, so that when the item gets here it is pretty well shaved down. That method of practising economy is actually indulged in, I can assure my hon. friend, to the limit.

My hon. friend very properly described the stream of wealth flowing down here from the West. Last fall I took advantage of an oppor-

tunity to run down to Montreal and get for the first time a bird's-eye view of that great harbour. Ninety vessels were either loading or unloading there, in some cases two spouting at the same berth; in one case a vessel was spouting across another vessel which lay between it and the berth. I could not help feeling a sense of pride in the fact that the prairies, notwithstanding the disabilities they have had to labour under, are able practically to choke the avenues of commerce with their products right from Montreal back to Fort William. But my hon. friend's suggestion is that this stream of wealth may be dried up unless certain reforms are instituted in this House. Well now, I have heard statements like that made thirty years ago, at a time when I was more disposed to indulge in bluffs of that nature than I am now. I do not know whether my hon. friend meant that seriously or not. It reminds me of the statement made last year before the Agricultural committee by both Mr. Maharg and Mr. Wood in which they graphically described what was going to happen to the country if they did not immediately get a wheat board. Well, they got the necessary legislation for a wheat board, but it did not come--and the next harvest was the largest we ever reaped. That shows that it is not safe to prophesy until after the event. I am sure my hon. friend does not mean that as a threat or even as a warning. But if it means anything it must mean that the people out there will cease to cultivate their farms, or will strike out into some other branch of agriculture, as indeed, they are actually doing in some cases. But the development of the country never stops. It may slow up during one year, but in no case has it ever ceased. The people are surely not going to abandon their farms; they will not, out of vexation of spirit, cease to produce crops; that would be positive madness. What are they going to do with their product if they do not send it out to the market? I think that is an idle statement; it is unworthy of my hon. friend, and I as a western man wish to dissociate myself from any such thought. The fact is that this stream of wealth is bound to become larger as the years go by, because not one-half the acreage of the West has yet been brought under subjection by the hand of man. So much for that matter. Perhaps it was hardly worth referring to, but there has been so much of that kind of talk indulged in that I could not let the statement go by without some reference to it. I have had correspondence from various parts of the United States asking if the western prairies are likely to go back to the Indian and the roving Buffalo, if there are any. I have had to correct that impression on more than one occasion, and I want to voice the correction through this parliament. So far as we can make an estimate, there is no going back; there is to be a constant going forward, in spite of the difficulties that have beset us in recent years—and to these I shall refer later.

I was the subject of another remark, apparently, with respect to an incidental reference I made to not carrying around cattle space in my vest pocket. When my hon. friend gets better acquainted with my eccentricities of speech he will not feel so much offended when I make a remark of that nature. Here were the circumstances, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORKE: I would like to ask the hon. member if he saw the description of his vest pocket in the Manitoba Free Press?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I certainly did, and it was very cleverly gotten up. I am going to refer to that—not to the description, but to certain other articles in the Free Press. The circumstances were these: Here was a business which after suspension for a period of thirty years had been suddenly restored. A good many of the applicants for space did not apply as soon as they might have. Anyway, after the space was all gone the tail-enders began to send in their applications. They evidently thought that space would be awaiting their pleasure, not at Portland, because we did not ship from there, but, say, at St. John, and they would be calling me up from here and there wanting to know where that space was. That is what provoked the remark that no matter where I went I would be found by long distance telephone or telegram or some other means of communication by some applicant for space who was too late in making known his requirements for shipping stockers overseas. I take this opportunity of suggesting that all who want space in the next rush in August and September put in their applications early and avoid the rush that is bound to occur when the ship owners themselves do not know what the requirements will be. They must know within a reasonable time in advance if we are going to have space to take care of the requirements of the shipping public.

I want to say just a word in connection with the Free Press, a journal which is very capably conducted, though not particularly accurately conducted. If it were as accurate in its statements as it is clever in some of its news editorials that are displayed on its front page we would have nothing but nice things to say about it, but some of its statements, as I notice from my correspondence have caused some anxiety in the West regarding

an alleged dereliction of duty, not so much on the part of myself—I let that go; I look upon references to myself as first-class advertising—but on the part of my department. If we are negligent we certainly deserve the reprimands that the Free Press has been giving to us in its front page news editorials for the last two or three weeks. But what are the facts? In this connection I wish to give due credit to my predecessor, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie). Before this government came into power at all steps were taken by the Department of Agriculture in anticipation of the embargo being removed. As a matter of fact everybody knew since the pledge was given by the British government in 1917, that there were nine chances out of ten that sooner or later the embargo was bound to come off, and come off in our time. Consequently in the year 1921, the last year of the life of the old government, steps were taken by the Dominion Department of Agriculture to get in touch with the National Railway Board with a view to seeing if any of the Canadian Merchant Marine boats, which were then under the administration of that board, could be converted into cattle boats, and here is a summary of the reply. The letter itself is too long for me to read, but it can be made available to any member of the House on request. This is a summary of the reply given by the Canadian National Railway Board to the Department of Agriculture in 1921:

Not practical to use vessels at present in service for carrying cattle. Two vessels under construction at Halifax that could be equipped for carrying cattle. This would be a start.

These two vessels were converted into cattle boats, and I shall refer to them later. The reason I take this matter up now is because on several occasions there have been intimations of a more or less insinuating character made with respect to this matter. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) came out frankly and intimated gross negligence on the part of the Department of Agriculture with respect to this matter. I bring it up now to correct the mis-statements that are constantly being made by the Winnipeg Free Press, and I take this opportunity to put all and sundry right in this matter. I cannot guarantee that they will stay right, but I have nothing to do with that.

Here is another letter from the Canadian National Railway management, addressed to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture by Mr. R. B. Teakle under date of April 7, 1921:

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Smaller ships not at all suitable for carrying cattle. Could carry about 138 head on main deck of big ships, but it is not worth while when the expense connected therewith are considered.

The full contents of this letter can be made available on request. Later on I wrote to Sir Henry Thornton and I have here his reply under date of March 15, 1923. That was before any shipments of cattle were available from Canada to the Old Country. I will give the sum and substance of Sir Henry Thornton's letter: .

Steamers not suitable cattle carriers. Necessary to conform to British regulations. Extensive repairs would be necessary. Approximate cost $32,000 per ship. From October to May deck of ship liable to be flooded, during storms.

These were the boats of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, which then and prior to our coming into power were under the administration of the railway board. The decks of these mercantile boats of ours are very close to the water's edge, probably six feet above it, and during the storms that are bound to come in the months mentioned the decks would be so swept by the billows that frequently animals and the fixtures on the deck would be swept overboard.

Here is a memorandum prepared by my deputy in connection with this same matter:

It has been contended that smaller boats were not suitable for the cattle trade. This is demonstrated by the serious loss of cattle from the Canadian Commander in October, 1921, when she lost 57 head from a load of 288 cattle.

There is no encouragement to shipping cattle under those circumstances. Imagine the insurance you would have to pay when it became known that these boats were liable to lose that proportion of cattle, 57 out of 288 head. I have not figured out the percentage, but it is a very serious loss.

We were not satisfied with that and efforts were made later on to see if some sheltered deck system could not be devised to prevent this untoward loss of cattle being swept overboard during a storm, but the result has been as I have intimated. When you consider the loss and the risk, it was not a practical proposition to convert these boats into cattle boats.

That is the result of the correspondence that was had by the department before I was minister. Efforts were made subsequently with the results that I have intimated. Not only that, but we have sought other sources of relief in this respect. I have got in touch with a New York firm who had under their control a fleet of three tramp steamers that could carry two thousand cattle each. We

also got in touch with other firms, with seven other steamers, all of which laid down this condition, that if they were to come and take part in the cattle trade of Canada at the fixed freight rate they were prepared to adopt, it would have to be on the condition that the Canadian government in return would guarantee them a full load every time they went across the Atlantic during the entire year. You know, Mr. Speaker, what that would result in. During the slack seasons of the year half the space would be empty, and consequently such a guarantee was impossible. What I wish to emphasize, however, is that these avenues of relief were canvassed and found to be impracticable. Well now, in view of the fact that there was never at any time over two or three hundred cattle for which space was demanded and could not be supplied, were we justified in going any further in anticipating a shortage than taking the measures I have referred to?

It is true that a number of gentlemen who are buying cattle in the West, when they got out in that broad and breezy western land and came in touch with enterprising newspaper men—well it is amazing what stories they were able to spread abroad on the western breezes. The result was that there grew up a fictitious demand for space, which had two effects. One was to run up the rates, because the moment ship owners or anybody else find a demand for their commodity the natural result is for them to raise the price of that commodity, and that is what happened in this case. Our good friends of the Winnipeg Free Press made the most of these circumstances. They made the case twice as bad as it was, but of course, that is not very bad from that source; but to read stories of that kind without hearing a proper explanation of the facts is certainly discouraging to the man who raises cattle. When the embargo was taken off we are told that the rate per head was $15. That is not correct. It was $25, but that is neither here nor there. There was a time when it was $15. That was in last December or January, but shipments had to be made from Portland and the law does not permit us to ship through that port so that it was of no effect as far as we are concerned—as a matter of benefit to us it might as well not have existed at all. It was intimated in the case of a number of steamers that had not very much to do that they were going to try and operate from Portland, for instance, at $15. They might have been prepared to do that rather than remain idle, but they knew perfectly well that they could not get Canadian cattle for stockers because the British law distinctly stipulated that they must go from Canadian ports. Consequently we can count that offer out. It never was available for Canadian cattle during last year or since shortly after the outbreak of the war. In the second or third year of the war what was the first price that was advertised for Canadian stockers? It was $20. Afterwards there was a rate of $22.50 largely as a result of the optimistic talk that was indulged in by some of the buyers back on the prairies with respect to the likely requirements of space. Unfortunately those requirements did not develop to the extent that a great many people thought. I have in mind one gentleman whose name I will not mention. I had an interview with him and from his conversation I should judge he would make a first class westerner. He was feeling optimistic and said he thought he should want 2,000 spaces. We were naturally very desirous that these buyers from the Old Country should have their requirements filled in toto if possible at this end. So we got in touch with some of the brokers in Montreal and we managed to rustle, by various means, over 1,400 spaces. That fact was communicated to the gentleman in question and then we found that he only wanted 400, so that the balance of the spaces available was going begging. These are the facts in connection with this matter. I do not want to read too many documents for it is not very interesting. All I want to do is to lay facts before the House showing that we were not derelict in our duty in this respect. I am proud to know that there were a sufficient number of high quality export cattle in Canada at that time to fill two or three hundred spaces. I would rather have conditions that way than that accommodation should go begging. It will mean a lot for the development of this trade when the requirements of the country are known and appreciated by the shipping fraternity, and when the farmers of the West, in fact the farmers throughout Canada, know what the removal of the British embargo is going to mean to them with respect to their stockers.

Now, what further did we do? We do not want to be boastful at all but since this matter has been referred to so frequently it is well that the facts should be known. You know in politics you have to be sufficiently suspicious to keep your eye on the ball and be on your guard against those who are trying to put their hooks into you. A great many people in this country resented the delay

which took place in the removal of the embargo and clamoured for the application of the shillelah, or a black thorn in the absence of a shillelah, because the British authorities did not make haste and have this embargo removed. That is not the way to get the British or anybody else to come across. This was essentially a matter for the British themselves to take action. Now, I would like to give credit, in connection with this matter, to all to whom credit is due. I remember saying, when we were discussing this matter last year that if we had the good fortune to get the embargo removed I was prepared to divide the credit for it. I have done that elsewhere in any public statements I have made and I do it here now. Every public man, every public body—whether on this side of the Atlantic or on the other—that co-operated in getting this embargo removed is entitled to a full share of credit. But when I say that I do not want anybody to swipe the credit that is properly coming to this government. One of my experiences on coming down here to take office in the government was to find that if you adopt any good measure somebody steals the credit for it before you get up next morning. The Crowsnest pass matter is an example of that.

An hon. MEMBER: And the Moose Jaw election.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, the Moose Jaw election if you like. If my hon. friend is satisfied with the result in Moose Jaw I am equally satisfied. If my hon. friend is satisfied with the circumstances which created the vacancy resulting in that election I am not going to express any dissent. I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the new member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Hopkins). I was a colleague of his for many years in the early days of the Grain Growers' Association before the evil spirit of politics came upon that noble band of heroes and workers.

Now, I have a newspaper editorial which I desire to quote. I do not accept it as being necessarily authoritative, but the Gazette is a very responsible and a very well edited paper. The editorial refers to the report of the proceedings of a certain number of shipping authorities who convened in Great Britain some two or three years ago on the question of the Atlantic freight rates. This question of the freight rates on the Atlantic is not a new question, it is a very old and very typical one, and I am sure the House will agree it is not a very easy matter to deal with. This year I had the opportunity of discussing the difference between railway rates and water rates, and my attention was drawn to the fact that while it was comparatively easy to control railway rates it was quite another question to control rates on the Atlantic ocean. The moment you begin to put restrictions on water rates the vessels concerned can fly away to the seven seas and leave you without any cargo carriers. That remark also applies to rates on inland waters, although not to the same extent. Well, there was a body of men in the Old Country representing the various interests concerned. The British representatives were appointed by the Lloyd George government and the conference was fairly well participated in by many countries including Canada. The representative of Canada was Sir George Perley who at that time was our High Commissioner. I am not going to O.K. this document because I do not know enough about the conditions of Atlantic shipping to give my approval to it but it set me thinking a great deal and I will submit to the House the findings arrived at. I was not able to obtain a complete copy of this report in any of the departments and therefore I must give credit to the Montreal Gazette for securing a copy of it somewhere and giving its readers the benefit. This is the part I desire to quote:

5 p.m.

> It appears now to be a universal condition of the larger industries in all progressive countries that there should be a high degree of organization among the chief companies, firms, or other units, and this condition is especially marked in industries which have to deal with transport. The necessity for such organization obtains clearly in the case of liner services. They have to provide for the distribution all over the world of heterogeneous classes of goods, the circulation of which to an ever-increasing extent constitutes an essential part of the world's economy. The requirements for this part of commerce are in marked contrast to those of bulk cargo in general, where large quantities of the same kind of goods have to be carried at irregular intervals. The ships which cater for this trade are in the main separate units, but the liner service requires fleets of ships operating in unison and consequently large capital resources and a carefully perfected central organization.
>
> It is clear that competition between individual liners or lines in the same trade would be quite incompatible with stability of rates—

Speaking for myself I do not like that expression very well. However, I did not use it; that is the expression contained in the report. Let me continue:

> —and that the trade would in fact tend to return to the disturbed conditions which prevailed before the introduction of the conference system, or to those characteristic of the tramp market. The shippers might for a time secure the benefit of low-cut rates, but there would inevitably be a strong tendency to abandon regularity in sailings, and there would be no guarantee, such as obtains at present, of any general progress in

the type of vessel plying and the nature of the facilities afforded. We consider, therefore, that the conference system must be accepted as a necessary concomitant of modern commerce.

What is the conference system? It is a conference amongst all those who have fleets upon the Atlantic as respects, not only time of sailing, but the charges in connection with their service. I wonder, would the First Minister consider that a combination inimical to the interests of the people that they are endeavouring to serve, or would it be one of those combinations to which the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) referred the other day, that might be one of benefit to all? I do not know enough about the matter to say which is the case. I only say that that is the condition of affairs that exists. These are the bodies that made this report. The Canadian government that preceded us and, I presume, this government also, as long as we make no protest, are parties to this arrangement. I do not know of any better arrangement that I could formulate offhand. What other plan would the Canadian National Railways adopt in the administration of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine? Either they have to work with this conference, or those vessels have to become tramp steamers. What kind of service would they give to their system of railways as tramp steamers? Tramp steamers do not run regularly like a regular line of ships; they are here to-day and somewhere else to-morrow, wherever they can get a cargo. The Merchant Marine have to join the North Atlantic Conference, to work in unison with it or to establish a line of steamers of their own. I do not know which they should do. I know I was not in Ottawa for two months until I began to dig into this question.

Mr. FORKE: Might I inquire of the minister if it gives him any particular pleasure to see Canadian boats carrying American flour four cents a pound cheaper than Canadian flour?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That does not give me any pleasure at all.

Mr. FORKE: Must that continue?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That has been partially corrected lately. I think it was the second month after I came to Ottawa that the Millers' Association drew my attention to the very question to which my hon. friend refers, that is, not so much the difference between the rates for hauling flour, but rather the difference in the cost of exporting Canadian flour via our National Railways, and Merchant Marine and, not necessarily a particular line of boats, but any line belonging to the Atlantic Conference. I took the matter up with Mr. Graham Bell, Deputy Minister of Railways, with the idea of inquiring why this Merchant Marine of ours could not run its own show. The impression that the public has is that it could do so, and my information was that it would be very nice, first, if we had boats that were capable of running our own show. These boats were constructed primarily for war purposes. I have no criticism to make as regards that; I do not want anybody to think I am blaming the government under which those boats were built. They were, I think, properly constructed primarily for war purposes, and secondly for commercial purposes. When they were put in service for commercial purposes, we found that they were, in the first place, not fit at all for cattle boats and, in the second place, not fitted very well for what is called parcel cargo. Moreover, they have not the speed to compete successfully with the average liner on the Atlantic. That is my information. We on the prairies are brought up far from the sea, and I do not claim to be an authority on these matters. I wanted, however, to know why the Canadian Government Merchant Marine could not run their own show. That was the explanation I received, and it seems rational. What are we going to do about the matter? Could we not take a crack at running our own show and see how it would work out? I was told that the way this had worked out in the past, was that they were eight or nine or ten million dollars in the hole, a deficit which the people of Canada had to contribute to. I was also informed that if they had gone on to the ocean, run their own show and accepted rates that some people in Canada thought should be in force, the deficits would have been only that much greater. I do not know how much this was being put over on me, an innocent man from the interior of this country; but it was pointed out to me that a line of boats of that description could not successfully compete on the Atlantic with properly constructed boats. You were sure to get cargoes going east, because the Canadian National Railways would supply them; but the moment you began to hunt in Great Britain for a cargo to come back with, you would have the entire North Atlantic Conference to compete with, and you would have no cargo. I do not know whether

that sort of thing is done down by the sea in this country. I hope it is not, but I feel that is exactly what would happen. I made further inquiries to find out if there would be any danger to the actual safety of the boats themselves. I was told, no; but there would be such competition and combinations put up against that independent line of steamers, that they would come back empty, and that the deficits would be greater than ever. What are you going to do against competition of that kind? Those boats are very important as regards carrying freight for our Canadian National Railways, and if you put them on an independent basis where they would be carrying cargo only one way, they would invariably come back empty. That is my information and I can see why it should be so. We think we have competition in this country; we think we have cutthroat methods, but this is not all confined to Canada. If you go abroad, you will get it in all its purity, in all its genuineness, and that is what you have to do with these liners. There is no speed to them. You might as well put an old plug of a plough horse on a race track as regards speed. But these boats are essential factors in connection with the administration of the Canadian National railway system, notwithstanding these disabilities, notwithstanding the fact that they cannot be converted into proper cargo boats.

Mr. DUFF: No, they are not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am giving the House my authority. I do not want to be reflecting on the official opposition which is up against it badly enough these days without my poking any more at it.

Mr. FORKE: The opposition seems to be from the other side.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The opposition was pretty well taken care of this afternoon by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond).

Mr. EVANS: Will the hon. gentleman say what our Merchant Marine is good for?

Mr. MARTELL: Good for nothing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am giving the House my authority. What I am primarily doing is showing the reasons why we could not by this medium provide space for the new trade in cattle this spring. These other references are only incidental. I want to make a complete statement and I hope this will prove to be the last one that I require to make.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

When my colleagues were on the sea in connection with negotiations with the British government, and two members of my staff were joining them, we at home started another course of action, anticipating the removal of the embargo. What was that? I think everyone down East knows the question of union stockyards has been a very important one in eastern Canada for ten or twelve years, particularly in the city of Montreal. In the city of Winnipeg we have a splendid stockyard, and my farmer friends know the advantage that it has been. I went down to Montreal in order to look into the matter. It is pretty hard to get a line on a large city like Montreal, with all its ramifications, just in one or two short visits. I went down there and saw the conditions for myself. I came to no conclusion, but I got into touch in September last with representatives of the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Quebec Department of Agriculture and requested them each to appoint a representative to meet in my office with a view to ascertaining if anything could be done to carry out successfully the idea of a union stockyard in Montreal. The gentleman who was chosen as chairman of the committee was a Mr. Johnson, who is very well and favourably known in western Canada, having been for many years stationed at the union stockyards at Winnipeg. These gentlemen met on various occasions, held regular sittings in Montreal and were in a small way what one might term an unofficial commission. The organization was not announced nor established by order in council; it was just a matter of mutual arrangement between the different parties interested, to see if some amicable working arrangement could not be evolved for the purpose of consummating the old problem of a union stockyard in that great city. I have under my hand the report they submitted and in which they made certain recommendations which are in the hands of the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the president of the Canadian National Railways. I do not anticipate that any further action will be taken until after the prorogation of parliament. However we have got thus far. I mention this matter to show that we have not been at all idle, and I think that those gentlemen in this House and persons elsewhere, especially those connected with a great journal like the Winnipeg Free Press, should be more careful of the statements which they send out broadcast throughout Canada. If they had taken the trouble to consult the agricultural editor of that journal, she would

have saved them from the blunders and the mistakes which they have made in this matter.

I come now to a consideration of the conditions of agriculture generally in this country. Now, Sir, we have heard some wonderful stories of agriculture in Canada; and if a man had not a backbone of steel he would have got jaundice long ago listening to the tale of woe which has been told and re-told about these conditions. All over the globe, across the seven seas, it has been iterated and reiterated; we have been told what a horrible time we have experienced especially in western Canada. But what are the facts? I will deal with that question at a later stage. However, let me hurriedly review conditions generally, for that is what more particularly concerns the people as a whole than the conditions of one particular province. Let us start with the provinces down by the sea; let us take first the little island—it is not necessary to say what island. I have never been in that land myself and therefore I have to speak at second hand so far as it is concerned, as indeed I have to speak in regard to the Maritime provinces. I had an itinerary all made out for an intended visit to these three provinces last fall, when the rumpus occurred in the Dardanelles which compelled me to cancel that visit. But I have been fairly familiar with the people that belong to those provinces. I have had labourers from that part of the Dominion for years, especially from the island. I have had men for the last fifteen years who have come from that island, and I have never got a poor man from that source. They have always been willing to do chores, which is exceptional among labourers to-day. I have found them to be reliable men, willing to accept responsibility, and I could pretty nearly always tell what religion they belonged to; I mean the denomination.

Mr. DUFF: Presbyterian.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes; they fear God and keep out of debt as much as they can, and there may be some connection between the two. There is a lesson to be learned in western Canada from the attitude of the farmers of the East towards debt. I can recall my own youthful days, which is some time ago, when we looked upon debt as something to be utterly abhorred and avoided to the last. We thought that only in dire extremity, when one was in the last ditch, was it at at all excusable to get into debt, and then only as moderately as possible. Instead of amortizing debt from now to eternity we always tried to keep out of it. And that is the reason why debt is not crucifying the people in the Maritime provinces. It is true that they are having tight times in some respects, but at least half of the people there are free from debt, and very few of the other half are overwhelmed with obligations, the simple reason being that they have never got into debt; they have played safe. Instead of running to the bank every now and then or hunting up the mortgage company and quarrelling with them because they would not give more, these people went to mother earth, dug the soil, improved the quality of their live stock and dairy products and thus obtained greater revenue from that source. And, withal, they kept their heads. Sometimes we in the West look down on the people of the East and call them stick-in-the-muds, slow and effete. I think, however, that we might to advantage acquire some degree of their caution, at least so far as the matter of debt is concerned. I have often wondered, if we struck the balance between the advantages and the disadvantages of mortgages as a means of developing agriculture, where the the difference would lie. I do not know. However, let us proceed with a consideration of agricultural conditions throughout the country, first in the Maritime provinces.

There is specialized farming in Prince Edward Island, at least to some extent; there is the raising of foxes in addition to specialization in certified seed potatoes, both of them very profitable industries. In New Brunswick there is a considerable area represented I understand by my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), that specializes in commercial potatoes. They have special equipment; their land is in shape; and their efforts during the war years were well rewarded. Now, however, the war is over and they are faced with a tremendous tariff in the United States, so that the potato growers in that part of the Dominion are in hard circumstances. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is always the way; the man who engages in specialized farming of any kind, even dairying, will sooner or later find the same thing befalls his industry. Possibly dairying and hog-growing which go together, constitute the safest line; there is the least amount of disease associated with them and the least liability to collapse. But specialized farming, whether it be potato growing in New Brunswick, fruit growing in the beautiful Niagara peninsula, or in the Annapolis valley, or specialized fruit growing in British Columbia, all run infinitely more risks than are encountered in diversified farming. That doctrine is as old as the hills, and yet a great

many of us are so slow to appreciate it. I suppose we can be excused for reluctantly admitting it. Anyone who ever got the imperial feeling that comes to a man on a threshing machine, who sees the stream of golden grain running into the waggon box, and afterwards takes it to the elevator and gets his cheque, will agree that it is no wonder that people specialize. There is a sufficient modicum of the gambling instinct in most of us to succumb to such a temptation. I have never been a gold miner myself but I can imagine a man digging and prospecting for twenty years in the hope of turning up something, until he is finally bankrupt. But we must play a safe game in agriculture. If we do, we shall be able to obtain a living and build ourselves comfortable homes and provide something for old age. Let every man do this, so that he may be his own household king, beholden to no man. And that is what is really worth while. So much for the Maritime provinces. I regret that I cannot spend more time dealing with their conditions. They form an interesting part of the country and this summer I hope to make another itinerary and have it carried out. Then I shall be able to speak at first hand.

I had an opportunity of visiting the experimental farms in Quebec last year, and some of my friends described my references thereto as a travelogue. I suppose I know in a vague way what that is, but I had an interesting time, whether you call it a travelogue or any kind of "logue". Agriculture in Quebec presents an interesting study. I do not think any province has made the same development in agriculture during the last twenty years. It may be said that Quebec has had further to go, that its agriculture was primitive twenty years ago, and therefore those responsible for the affairs of state had the opportunity of their lives. I am not going to discuss that feature. All I know is that in co-operative dairying I am safe in saying that no other province has made the same progress during the last ten years, in fact in co-operative marketing generally. Our estimates were scarcely through the House where some doubting Thomases were wondering whether anyone would take advantage of the cold storage subsidies, when we had two applications from co-operative societies in the neighbourhood of Montreal and Quebec cities—not the Harbour Cold Storage concern that I referred to the other day, but real co-operative societies run by farmers. They have been asked if they will be able to comply with our conditions and so earn these subsidies. Co-operation is the spirit of the age. I am not one of those who think that middlemen are a bunch of grafters or parasites; not at all. I think a certain class of middlemen are necessary, otherwise we must give the same service ourselves. During the present hard times we have been compelled in many places to adopt co-operation and dispense with some of the services of the middlemen in order that business may be conducted at a profit. But, remember, we are merely doing the service that in former years had been relegated by custom to middlemen.

A good part of eastern Quebec has a climate not exactly like that of the Canadian West, but sufficiently similar to make it difficult to grow fodder corn. The result is that few silos have been constructed. A considerable portion of that interesting province has been denuded of its trees, and farmers are endeavouring to till a reluctant soil that will scarcely grow a crop. It is in such sections of Quebec that you find hard times. We had a man before the Agricultural committee from Ste. Anne's. There are some beautiful spots around there, and also some very hard-looking sections which should never have been brought under cultivation. That witness told us a rueful story, as if the conditions in his locality were representative of those obtaining throughout his province. The substance of his lamentations was this: I am on poor land and I cannot borrow any money. He wanted what are known as additional credit facilities. I asked him if he had not sufficient credit facilities from mortgage companies and the like. He replied that these companies would not lend him any money or only very little. Upon further inquiry I found he was actually trying to eke out an existence on land that should have been left as forest. But there is a certain amount of intermediate quality land between these splendid valleys and the absolutely poor land where the farmers get along pretty well. But if they knew they could grow first-class ensilage by cultivating sunflowers—something which will flourish in a much colder climate than Quebec—their profits would be increased to a very great extent. Such ensilage can be kept over from year to year for provision against drouth. It is not necessary to build an upright silo. If a farmer is too poor to undertake such an outlay he can build a silo in the ground. A hundred years ago or more we find that in the north of Ireland and other parts of Europe the farmers put ensilage in a hole in the ground—sometimes brewers' grain, anything in fact that they wanted to keep in a semi-acid condition. So a man does not need to have much capital to construct a silo for his dairy stock. The use of a silo will encourage him to go into a much

more profitable form of dairying. In other words, to be profitable to the maximum dairying should be all the year around, not merely during the summer. I can recall my own boyhood days, when we stopped milking the cows and the milk factories closed we used to think it a day of rejoicing, for to lads of fourteen years of age the work was laborious and the hours very long. Well, the moment that the cows went on winter rations so many farmers put them through on such low maintenance rations that in the spring they were skin poor. That is not right. Those are the conditions under which dairying largely failed in Ontario years ago. Naturally there is a tendency if you are not getting anything from the cow to feed her very sparingly. Of course, this is a great mistake.

I hardly know what to say about agriculture in Ontario. You will travel over many seas and in many lands, Mr. Speaker, before you will find a better country than old Ontario. I do not think it necessary to spend very much time in describing farming conditions in Ontario. As to suggesting improved methods, I would hesitate long before venturing to do so. Possibly one reason why they have not very many experimental farms in Ontario is that they do not need them. But even in Ontario I venture to say the farmers are only waking up to two or three things that we should have been alive to twenty or thirty years ago. Of course, we all think of living when we should be thinking of dying. In the western Ontario peninsula there has been a tremendous hazard in the growing of fruit. The government that preceded us, in one of its moments of enterprise and progress, built a pre-cooling plant at Grimsby. That has proved to be a wonderful transforming institution in the fruit district of the Niagara peninsula. If they could get one or two more such institutions it would simply revolutionize fruit-growing by enabling them to pick their fruit from the tree and rush it into cold storage. Last year that institution was kept open day and night for weeks to the great advantage of the local fruit growers.

We are falling behind in our dairy exports. Reports from the Motherland indicate that our competitors in the Antipodes are getting away ahead of us. They have adopted modern methods in the manufacture of their butter and cheese; we have not; that is all there is to it. It does not follow that we are inferior or incompetent in these matters, because it was a Canadian in the person of Mr. Ruddick, our present dairy commissioner, who organized the New Zealand dairy industry. There is a Canadian to-day in charge down there. Well, if a Canadian can do it in New Zealand, why cannot a Canadian do it here? They have many disadvantages, on the other hand they have many advantages too. Two of our representatives have just returned from a visit to New Zealand and Australia. I have not yet received their reports, but I have had a preliminary report from Mr. Ruddick. He has also given certain statements to the press and certain evidence before the Agricultural committee with respect to our dairying requirements. In effect he says that if we are to keep pace with our brothers in the Antipodes we must modernize our methods. We have antiquated cheese factories in this country. They are too small to give a proper turnover, to give a profit either to the farmer or to the maker of cheese; too small to enable the turning out of a large volume of uniform quality. The cheese is graded too soon, taken out of the factory too soon, not cooled properly, not ripened properly; and the result is that it cannot compete with the first-class article that is put on the market of Great Britain by our competitors. We shall have to speed up if we are to avoid falling further back. For twenty-five years we were the topnotchers on the British market in the matter of cheese. We are second now, and unless we watch out we shall soon be third. We never were first in butter that I know of; we were, I think, third for a time. I do not know where we are now; I do not know where we shall be three years from now if we do not take warning and get our dairying on a better basis. That is all I will venture to say at this time until I get the report of the commissioners who journeyed to New Zealand and saw what was the last word in this connection. Well, I do not know that it is, in fact, the last word; it is like the tariff—there is no finality; even death is not final. And there is no finality about dairying. But the investigations being made have to do with the last word in dairying so far as its application to Canada is concerned. I hope, therefore, that I shall have the sympathy and support of the dairymen of eastern Canada, who have been exceedingly tolerant of a western man who is not supposed to know anything about dairying. I hope we shall have their co-operation in putting the dairying of Ontario and Quebec on a better basis so that we may be where we ought to be so far as the British market is concerned, at the top of the list—where we were before, where we should be again and may be again if we only will. But I want to warn you that you will have to submit to even more restrictions than

you do submit to now. There was a great howdy-do when Hon. Manning Doherty introduced last spring for the first time the policy of buying milk on the basis of quality and butter fat content. Just think of it: after fifty years only now waking up to the necessity of paying according to the quality of the goods you get. Why, you might as well make a flat rate for horses as have a flat rate for milk. The same may be said in regard to the cream, because in all these things we have fallen behind. Mr. Doherty is to be congratulated for taking the initiative in this matter, because as a rule the man who breaks the ice in this direction in an old province is going to get rapped over the knuckles for it. Mr. Doherty was sufficiently near this election to make it a little dangerous for him; I was sufficiently far from the election to make it comparatively safe for me to introduce this principle of grading. People would come into my office and tell me what was going to happen to me if they were not permitted to carry on their dairy boards as they had been carried on for the last forty years and to make cheese and grade it just as they pleased. Well, nothing happened; there has been no upheaval. The new grading system came into effect on the first of April and on succeeding days we woke up and found things just about as they were, except that our butter and cheese were going over with the government grade stamped on each package.

Mr.. WARNER: May I ask the hon. gentleman which province took the most prizes in last year's butter market?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think it was the province of Alberta. I am just coming to the breezy West now; I cannot afford to spend any more time on Ontario. Now we have to go through that great area of rocks and mountains and plains west of the lakes—and I will deal with the three prairies as one country. They are to a large extent the same so far as this subject is concerned, though it is true that in some other respects they are quite different. In the matter of dairying Alberta takes the lead both as to quantity and as to quality and prizes. Of course it is an easy matter for a man who is an adept at it, and who specializes in assembling cream from the best patrons, to make a high quality of butter. The western provinces have come to the front, but not because the dairymen there are better than those in the East; they are not; they are far more primitive dairymen than the eastern dairymen are. They have more primitive surroundings; they have poorer live stock; they have not as good barns; they have not had as much experience as the eastern man, having been at it a shorter time. Yet, because they have adopted proper methods, their butter commands five shillings a hundred more than any eastern butter that goes on the British market. I am sure my eastern friends will not object to our saying that; we have not much to boast of there, you know, outside of our wheat. I tell you that our country out there, notwithstanding the long winter, can be profitably turned to dairying. The adoption of new and improved methods, the paying for milk and cream on the basis of quality, enables the butter makers to turn out a first-class article. The chain of cold storages that has been established in that country enables us to take care of the butter until such time as we wish to ship it to the Old Land. Some hon. gentlemen have spoken disparagingly of co-operative activities, but it was the co-operative creameries of Regina that sold and shipped overseas more than sixty carloads of high-class butter last year—the record shipment from Canada to the markets of Great Britain.

There is not so much disparagement of diversified farming by our Progressive friends this year, and I will give them credit for it. There was last year; they are learning, like the rest of us. There was a good deal of tee-heeing and poking of fun at dairying and diversified farming. Some of our friends across the way are good at telling humourous stories. There was one very funny one that we all laughed at; it was the experience of the hon. member for South Battleford (Mr. McConica), whom we are glad to see in his seat again, in connection with sheep growing; I am sure you will all recall it. Our western country has up to quite recently been a purely grain growing country except in some parts of Manitoba, where they have been diversifying for many years; we have been specializing in the growing of grain. There have been men who have grown wealthy in that business. The fact is that you either grow wealthy fairly quickly or you go broke even more quickly—one of the two. If you are a good manager; if you are young and healthy and vigorous and can get up betimes in the morning and will go to bed while you can; if you have the capacity of getting work out of men; if either you or some of your boys know how to run a gasoline engine or some other kind of power machine to supplement your farm labour at times, and if you are a regular nigger driver, why, you can hold the pace for ten or fifteen years and you may become independently wealthy. Some have done it in less than that. But that is a pretty hard life, Mr. Speaker; it is no wonder some of those

who follow it have to go to California or British Columbia. I know of one gentleman whose case just comes to my mind now. I know his experience from the year one so far as the West is concerned. He was in my employ at a dollar a day for a week, and at the end of the week I got to my last dollar and had to dismiss him. But that is how he started out; and to-day he is worth I do not know how much. I know he has $30,000 worth of Canadian bonds; I know he has a good many Canadian Pacific Railway stocks; in fact, he is in the plutocratic class now. He also has shares in one of the local banks. And he did not make it all by working his family day and night, either, because he has not got any family. His name is Elmer Shaw, if anyone wants to look the gentleman up.

We have had a series of varying experiences in agriculture in western Canada; it has been a case of make or break. When that country was settled first there was a great rush of immigrants. That was the case in the early days of the construction of the Canadian Pacific, at the time I went there myself, and it occurred also later on, in the early days of the present century, when people were coming from all quarters of the globe to take up land in this El Dorado. Naturally a great many people came in who proved to be misfits; the attraction of a homestead for $10 was very great indeed. The thirst for land is strong in the breast of the average individual, and we still have land to gratify that thirst, but in the coming of people from all quarters of the globe, from all climes and all directions, including the republic to the south and eastern Canada, you are bound to have men who have failed in other countries and are desirous of trying their luck once more on this new land and having a farm for ten dollars. Unfortunately the same methods they pursued which caused their failure elsewhere would be very apt to occasion their failure in the West also. I am not one of those who disparage inexperienced settlers. I know men who went out there who did not know anything about agriculture except that they knew that they did not know anything about it—and believe me that is the start; when you know that you do not know anything about agriculture, then you are ready to learn at the feet of anybody whom you think does know, but if you go there thinking you know it all the chances are that you will meet with disaster before you learn the peculiar requirements of prairie agriculture. A number of these people have hung on. I know a number of them who through all these years have been just one lap ahead of the sheriff. In times like these when money is tight, and these facilities we are talking about for borrowing money are not multiplied by two, these people are squeezed pretty hard. They borrowed all the money they could get and went into one hole to get out of the previous one. Instead of improving their methods they wanted to improve their opportunities for borrowing, and then they quarrelled with the mortgage company because they could not get still more.

We will have to assume a different attitude towards debt, Mr. Speaker, before we get our stride properly on the prairies again. I can recall the time especially during and before the war, when some of us took a certain amount of pride in actually boasting about borrowing every dollar we could get on our land, and then going abroad and spending it like a lord, investing it in this and that possibly not connected with the farm and then expecting the farm to carry that obligation and help wipe it out. That is not fair. Very few debts contracted in the West have been spent on agriculture, and I say that advisedly. I think I am safe in saying that three out of four first mortgages are for the purpose of consolidating store bills and dead horses and such like, with not one dollar invested in any productive enterprise that will help pay back the loan. That was the condition. We rushed in there pell-mell, enthused with the possibilities of the development of that country We thought the thing would never end. We sowed to the wind and are to-day reaping the whirlwind. This condition of affairs, aggravated by the war, has occasioned many, many tragedies on the prairies. There is no question about it. It is something that would make your heart bleed, Mr. Speaker. But what are you going to do about it? Men who lend money must have security.

I have in mind another instance, and there is nothing that could be more tragic than what I am going to describe. Both of these parties were labourers of my own at the time they were married. They started out for themselves with nothing but the prospect of getting a home for themselves and $45, and that was not in cash. They had a three-year old filly, and they got a chattel mortgage on the filly for $45, more than what they paid for it, and made the first payment on a quarter section of Canadian Pacific Railway land. They added to that by one means and another till they had five quarter sections, all on time except the initial payment. They bought machinery on time, and horses on time.

I will not tell you how they got them or stood off their creditors, I do not know; I could not do it and succeed. After twenty-four years of that kind of experience, growing magnificent crops, if you like, and raising a family of twelve, they are finally crowded out on to the street by the mortgage company. If you did not know the history of that, Mr. Speaker, you would think it was something terrible. It is something terrible if you do not know the circumstances. But under the circumstances nothing else could befall them. The only wonder is that it did not happen long ago. There is no country in the world except the Canadian West which would have stood such abuse of farm and credit, and where this couple could have lasted for twenty-four years. I might say that the neighbours helped that couple for years and are helping them yet. Some friends in Alberta wrote to the First Minister, and the First Minister passed the letter over to me. It is a great place down here to pass the buck, you know, Mr. Speaker. I got a letter describing the case, and I told the First Minister that there was nothing else for it. I knew the couple exceedingly well. Some of the boys and girls were capable of working out, and I advised them to work for their neighbours. Hundreds of men who would make first-class labourers, are only fourth, or fifth-class managers for themselves. It takes a long time to find it out. My advice to such would be to let the shoemaker stick to his last, let the man perform that service he is best fitted for. If he cannot make a living managing his own affairs, if he is a faithful labourer and gives proper service, he may soon find himself in better circumstances than his employer.

Mr. KNOX: Does the minister mention that type as representative of the farmers of the West?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Which one? I have tried to describe two, the two extremes—the man who was a bounder and was turned on the street after twenty-four years, and the man who was a good manager, a mechanic, who knew how to get labour out of his men, got up betimes in the morning, took care of his business and became wealthy. It just shows, Mr. Speaker, how much depends on the individual. It has been said, though this is extreme, of course, that some men would make a living in the Sahara desert while others would starve in the Garden of Eden.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. KNOX: Does the minister mean to represent the man who did not go into debt as being prosperous to-day?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Debt is a good thing sometimes. It is like fire. Fire is good as long as you are the boss, but when fire becomes your boss, then look out. Debt is a good thing, I suppose, as long as you are master. It is a good servant but a mighty bad master. If we have to go into debt let us go into it just as little as possible, and just to the extent that we think we can get out of it in reasonable time.

Mr. KNOX: I am afraid the minister did not catch my point. Does he mean to say that agriculture in the West to-day, in the case of the men who keep clear of debt, is prospering?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I say that the men who kept out of debt or went into debt only very moderately are in safe circumstances to-day, and there are less failures among these than among any other class of people. I say that advisedly.

Mr. KNOX: Are they prosperous to-day?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, they are prosperous to-day. The fact that they are out of debt is a good indication of that. I say further, I would like to sound a note of warning right now. I do not think the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) exactly voiced my sentiments.

Mr. GOULD: I would like to ask the minister how he reconciles his statement about farmers keeping out of debt with the statement that was made in the Agricultural committee that for all the municipalities of Saskatchewan this year the records show an average unpaid tax of $37 per quarter section.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend will wait for a minute or two until I get to that point I will be very glad to deal with it; it is the very next item on my notes. I would like to sound a note of warning with respect to this amortization of debt, this funding of debt. One of the reasons why the man with little debt, or only sufficient debt to be controllable, is better off than the man with a big burden and heavy interest charges is this: All the time he has the consciousness of being a landed proprietor; he is sitting under his own fig tree, the dwelling he occupies is his own, and even if he has a little debt that home is not endangered. Therefore I say that the man in that condition is better off

than the man who is so burdened down with debt he does not know whether his home belongs to him or whether the mortgage company owns it—there is no question about that. And the idea of asking a man to undertake an amortization of debt which is to run for thirty years! Why, if he is thirty years old he will be a man of my age before he knows the sweet joy of being the sole proprietor of that land. I say that is paralyzing to his efforts to make a success of that farm, yet it is exactly one of the mistakes we are making. Instead of pleading before our committees for more facilities to borrow money we should turn our attention to digging wealth out of the soil and buying better live stock.

Now I will deal with the question asked by my hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould).

Mr. SPEAKER: Seeing that the hon. member is about to take up a new branch of the subject we had better call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had just finished depicting, to some extent at least, the condition of agriculture on the prairies. I had shown both extremes, the well-to-do man who was on easy street, and the ne'er-do-well, who was pretty nearly on the rocks, if not there already. Between those two extremes we have all classes and orders of people, from the man in comfortable circumstances down to the one I have described.

I will deal with another phase of this question later on in my remarks. I cannot spend too much time on it, because I presume other speakers desire to address the House on many questions during this budget debate. I cannot, however, dispose of agriculture without passing on to the Pacific. During the last ten years or so, we never looked on British Columbia, indeed, she did not look upon herself, with any great seriousness as an agricultural country. We all knew of her mines, fisheries, timber and other wonderful resources, but it has taken these last ten or fifteen years to demonstrate that she has great agricultural possibilities as well. I had the pleasure of a trip out into that beautiful country with its many diversifications, its many sources of occupation. British Columbia has two ports, and no man can tell the future possibilities of either of them. British Columbia has shown to the world her possibilities by the performance of a Holstein cow at the Agassiz experimental farm which made a record by producing over 1,600 pounds of butter, the largest output of butter in the world. In poultry also she is making wonderful records. In the northern part of British Columbia, along the Canadian National highway, there are possibilities of development that are almost indescribable for the man who is prepared to go on the land and to do some hard work in clearing it. I do not mean the heavily timbered, but the partially timbered land. I have not time at this stage to dwell on this subject any longer.

I will pass on now to the question asked by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould). I do not recall the question exactly, but it was something about debts of municipalities. Some evidence was taken before the Agricultural committee with respect to municipal debts. It is beyond that, in some municipalities, there is a very substantial and very serious bonded indebtedness. I remember Mr. Hamilton's evidence; I was present during part of the time, and I recollect he had not complete figures for all the municipalities. We were discussing this phase of the question, that before one could size up intelligently that debt, one would have to know what it was composed of. There would be first the bonded debt; there would be the current debts to the banks possibly; in addition to that, there might be and there is, in fact, a very considerable number of municipalities, I think 125 odd, that handle hail insurance. A very considerable proportion of debt might be due to hail insurance, not a municipal debt at all. In any case, whatever this debt may be due to, is it getting worse or better? If we have turned the corner, then there is hope for the future, and according to the evidence I have under my hand, we are turning the corner in respect of municipal indebtedness.

Mr. GOULD: The minister has not quite got the question as I had put it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I had forgotten exactly what it was.

Mr. GOULD: I made reference to evidence given before the Agricultural committee, that there was an average tax debt this year of $37 per quarter section on every quarter section in Saskatchewan, a debt that was recorded on municipal lands.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does that mean bonded indebtedness?

Mr. GOULD: No, average tax.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have a bigger tax than that on my land.

Mr. GOULD: This is an unpaid tax on each quarter section.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not doubt that either. If my hon. friend is familiar—and I am sure he is—with collecting municipal taxes, he knows that if things are bad, it is not the municipality or the government that is paid first. I do not think my hon. friend wants to make a case against any party. He wants to get at the facts as I do, and I want to get between these two extremes that we have heard of during the session.

Mr. GOULD: I was trying to establish the point that people who own land will not permit arrears of $37 per quarter section of land on an average throughout the whole province, if agricultural conditions warrant their paying it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know if that is correct. Possibly evidence of that nature was given before the Agricultural committee; but I am going to read to the House a statement made in the budget debate in the Saskatchewan assembly by the premier of that province. I think we can take the premier of that province as a reliable authority. I must confess that since leaving provincial politics, I have not kept close tab on municipal debts. There are some municipalities that have no bonded debt at all; I happen to be fortunate enough to live in one myself. That municipality has never had any bonded debt unless perhaps it has incurred one within the last two years, for during that time I have not been there to know. If, however, the same reeve is in office who has been there for many years, then I venture to say there is no such debt yet. But with regard to the rest of the bonded debt, $40 or $37, on current taxes overdue, the situation is getting better every day in every way. I have a communication here from the Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan, Hon. Mr. Hamilton, to this effect:

> Replying to your wire of the 14th instant, I am enclosing herewith typed copy of Premier Dunning's budget speech. The printed copies have not yet come to hand.

This is the letter accompanying the budget speech which he forwarded to me, but he gives certain information personally in addition.

> In October last a campaign was inaugurated for the selling of Saskatchewan bonds for the Farm Loans Board, and to date an amount of $902,300 has been received. Of this amount $300,000 was subscribed by the Hail Commission, and the rest practically all by farmers.

I have no records for the other provinces, but I think that Manitoba's situation is somewhat better than the condition in Saskatchewan municipally, while the situation in Alberta may possibly be somewhat worse. As I say however, I have not the facts before me, and that is merely my assumption. It will be noted that over $900,000 worth of Saskatchewan bonds were sold last year so that the Farm Loans Board might have these funds from the farmers and be able to re-loan the money to less fortunate farmers. That is their scheme. Out of that $900,000, $300,000 worth was purchased by the Hail Insurance Commission. Where did that commission get the money? They got it through the premiums from the farmers; they had that much to the good this year and invested it in Saskatchewan farm loan bonds. This is the information that comes to me from the Hon. Mr. Hamilton. He then refers me to page 27 of the budget speech of Premier Dunning wherein he says will be found reference to the sale of Saskatchewan debentures. I will not go into that phase of the situation. I do not know whether the information given me is correct, but I do know Mr. Hamilton to be a responsible man. Of course, it will be a difficult matter to get at the real facts in regard to the average overdue taxes in the municipalities of Saskatchewan, for the reason that the returns are not all in. However, I will accept my hon. friend's statement as to the amount on the average that is overdue. Again, I do not know that this statement is correct, but I will accept it any way for the purposes of this debate. Now let me turn to Premier Dunning's statement, which is rather voluminous. He said in part:

> It is not possible to say truthfully on this occasion that our economic problems are solved, that we are a very prosperous people or a very prosperous province. But I think the conclusion the House will reach, after hearing the information which I have to present on this occasion, will be that at least we have passed the low point; and, to use the phrase that is often used, we have scraped bottom and are now on the improvement so far as economic conditions of our people are concerned and the financial position of the province and its municipalities.

I am sure that this must be regarded as pleasant information. Mr. Dunning states, "We have touched bottom, we have turned the corner, we are going to be able we hope, with the experience of the past before us, to make the grade."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Glad to hear it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know whether my hon. friends are rejoicing at the possibility of their being able to put a differ-

ent construction on the phrase I have used, "touching bottom," from the meaning that Premier Dunning intends it to convey. I do not know whether it is the bottomless pit that hon. gentlemen have in mind, but apparently the worse construction is the one they entertain. Would it not be better to take that better meaning, "Whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report," and so on? I think it would be better for hon. gentlemen to take that more favourable construction when referring to their own country; I do not see what pleasure they can take in fouling their own nests.

Mr. SALES: What we want is the truth.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If hon. gentlemen can take any fun out of this I am loath to deny them the pleasure. All I desire to do is to give the information to the House. Let me continue the quotation:

This probably is largely due to the way in which Nature or Providence treated us in 1922 as compared with the previous year.

Surely Providence plays a part in our harvests and in our lives.

It is also due to the fact that our people during 1921 learned the stern hard lesson of the necessity for economy and thrift in all their dealings and work.

Premier Dunning attributes the good result to economy and thrift plus a good crop, which enabled them to turn the corner. The people learnt the lesson that was taught by the perfect orgy of extravagance in connection with borrowing which had been indulged in. Most of us have been guilty of such extravagance, Mr. Speaker. I confess that I too have been bitten by the bug of extravagance. Some of us, however, kept our businesses very reasonably in hand and when the fatal day of deflation came we were able to recover our balance without disaster, while others went with such impetus that they toppled over the precipice, with the result that everything is gone except the howl.

Our wheat acreage in 1922 decreased as compared with 1921 by over one million acres, but in spite of that the yield of wheat increased from 14.8 per acre to 20.25, or giving total figures from 201,000,000 bushels to 251,000,000 bushels in 1922, an increased production of over 50,000,000 bushels of wheat.

The province that can produce 250,000,000 bushels of the best wheat in the world surely should not feel too hard up. Surely some of it must accrue to the people after it has passed through the various avenues to the markets of the world.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister give it as his opinion that the men who grew this wheat were able to sell it for more than cost of production?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The last time I operated my farm was in the year 1921, and if I had attended to it myself instead of gallivanting around the country preparing for the election of that year I would have made it pay. As it was I did not make it pay, because I was not there to superintend and manage the farm myself; and I do not think that any man can make a farm pay unless he stays on the job. Now, to come to the matter of price.

The average net price to the farmer for the 1922 crop will be 85 cents per bushel, or 10 cents per bushel more than 1921.

That was the estimate made more than three months ago, in the month of March. The price has gone up 10 or 15 cents a bushel; at least that 85 cents will have increased to 90 cents by the time the figures are all in. So much for the statement of Premier Dunning. Now, there is not much money in exclusive wheat growing; there is no question about that; neither would there be much money in any business in which the by-products were not utilized. How much money would there be in any industry in Canada if the by-products were dissipated in the way they are on many wheat farms on which there is no live stock?

Mr. COOTE: Before the minister leaves Premier Dunning's statement would he mind reading the premier's expression of opinion in regard to that late budget just brought down?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, I think I can give it to my hon. friend. I have not got it here.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, I will give it to my hon. friend. I wired Premier Dunning this morning and I will give my hon. friend to-morrow a copy of my telegram. The concluding paragraph of Mr. Dunning's speech is something like this— by the way, would my hon. friend read Henry Wise Wood's expression of opinion on the budget?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have to apologize to my hon. friend the Premier of Saskatchewan. I do not want to make such invidious comparisons of that nature. The last paragraph of Premier Dunning's speech was something like this:

We might take this budget and that of last year as moderate indications of a desire on the part of the

government to carry out their tariff pledges of 1919. But no western Liberal will take the ground that these should be the final word in the redemption of the tariff pledges given at the national convention of 1919.

An hon. MEMBER: No stability.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That was the substance of his speech, and I can say yes to that. And who said it was the last word?

Mr. FORKE: The Minister of Finance.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Nobody said it was the last word. I was very sorry to hear the terms mentioned by the hon. leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke). I am sure he did not mean that "finality" and "stability" were synonymous terms; and yet one might infer as much from the way in which he used them in his address yesterday. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said distinctly there was no finality, that what parliament did to-day it might undo to-morrow. I think the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) gave a very apt illustration of it. We have had stability during the last two years, but not necessarily finality. I do not think we can have finality in anything.

Mr. HOCKEN: What is the hon. gentleman's definition of stability?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I cannot improve on the definition given by the hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. MORRISON: That was political agility.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend can supply his own interpretation.

Mr. COOTE: Does the hon. minister mean by stability that we have been on the bottom for the last two years that he referred to a little while ago?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, I decline to constitute myself the interpretation clause of the act. I want to produce some further evidence, Mr. Speaker, of the condition of agriculture—not from myself at all for I have not been an active farmer during the last two years except very casually. Learning something from the press of what we might expect this session, we sent out last January a questionnaire, prepared by my deputy and myself, to some hundred correspondents throughout the three prairie provinces. It is too voluminous to deal with in detail; I am only going to take the two last questions which are really the essential ones. The first is:

Is mixed farming, that is, raising beef cattle, dairying, pork production and poultry keeping, making any progress in your district?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

The other question is:

Have you any suggestions to offer as to the best line for farmers to follow in your district in order to make a greater success of their operations?

A great many of these correspondents are practical farmers; some of them are operators at illustration stations and have a little advantage in that way because they are probably in advance of the average farmer in experimentation and keeping their eyes on the results therefrom. I have summarized the answers under three colums, headed Yes, Some and No.

The first question, as to whether they are going into mixed farming or not, is I believe the most important, because after all that is the solution of many of the difficulties of our western farmers. From the province of Manitoba every answer to that question is yes. So they are on the right track to improve their condition. Answers were received from the city of Winnipeg, Brandon, central Manitoba, Treesbank, Morden, Fort Garry, Dauphin, Lake Winnipeg to Manitoba, Manitoba (Live Stock Branch) and Arthur.

From the province of Saskatchewan sixty-five per cent of the answers were to the effect that the writers were going gradually into mixed farming. These answers were received from Meota, Scott, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, Ogema, Lloydminster, S. E. Saskatchewan, Tugaska, Avonlea, Indian Head—I have often said that when Indian Head started to go into mixed farming nearly every other place would be thinking of following its example, because that is one of the earliest successful wheat areas of Saskatchewan—Regina, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert and Radville. Six say they are going some into it, namely, North Portal, Riverhurst, Saskatoon, Davidson and Pambrun. Forty-one per cent say no, they are not going into mixed farming. I hope they are mistaken in their answers. These negative replies came from Wood Mountain, Kindersley and Qu'Appelle. I do not quite understand what part of Qu'Appelle unless it is the village in the valley, for it cannot be Qu'Appelle Station, this having always been a diversified district.

From Alberta we received replies that the tendency is to go into mixed farming. These answers came from the following districts: North Alberta, Edmonton, Lacombe, Lacombe (Reed), Calgary District, Alberta, Alberta and Peace River, Grassy Lake, Pincher Creek, Okatoks, Calgary (Bain), Red Deer, and Alberta (Cormie).

Nine districts say they are going into mixed farming some, and four districts answer in the

negative. These latter are Wainwright—by the way, from what I saw when I was there last year it would appear that they were not going into mixed farming. The fact that the great buffalo herd, of which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has charge, is stationed at Wainwright would go to show that it is an excellent live stock country.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the minister imply that Wainwright is not a mixed farming country?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I should think it was to some extent.

Mr. SPENCER: It certainly is.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: But the report here says that they are not going much into mixed farming.

Mr. SPENCER: The report is wrong.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In answer to the other question. Have you any suggestions as to the best line for farmers to follow in your district in order to make a greater success of their operations? We heard from Manitoba pretty much to the same effect as in reply to the first question; 95 per cent advocate mixed and diversified farming. Here are some of the individual answers. One says:

> Cattle—better sires and better market conditions—dairying—increase live stock, more alfalfa, sunflowers, fodder corn etc., hogs, poultry, smaller farms and winter feeding of beef cattle, cut down expenses and work more.

I do not suppose any one in this House is in need of that advice—each works hard when on the farm. In the case of Saskatchewan 95 per cent of the correspondents give the same advice:

> Dairying and hog raising—better business methods—smaller farms—more corn—smaller farms, worked better.

These are all good suggestions. They also write:

> Cut down costs—too far from the railway to farm—more summer fallow—improved market conditions—farm better—keep better cows, etc.—

Now here is one answer, Mr. Speaker, that is rather unusual. This correspondent says: "Pray for rain." Now, this may be more effective and less expensive than introducing a second Hatfield the rainmaker. I commend it to the attention of my hon. friends. Then, in Alberta, "mixed farming," "better live stock"—you would think it was the same man who wrote all of this. These questions come from all over the country, and surely what everybody says in this respect must have some element of truth in it. "Dual purpose cattle; better quality of poultry." A number of them stress the necessity for improved live stock. It seems to me that no one is doing his best on a farm who insists on keeping scrub beef cattle, low-grade cows, razorback hogs, and dunghill hens. There is no virtue in live stock unless it will more than pay for the cost of keeping it. I do not think, however, that it is necessary to develop this phase of the question. Here is a practically unanimous verdict as to how we may better ourselves as a result of the effort of the individual. Later in my remarks I will come to some of the larger public questions and refer to the manner in which the individual can be helped in some measure by the state. But now I am dealing with those phases of agriculture in which the man himself is largely the dominant factor. There is no doubt that in 30 or 85 per cent of the cases the success of the man on the land depends upon his own individuality.

A gentleman whose name I have forgotten was passing through Ottawa in January, and we were discussing these things. He estimated that the farmers had 100,000,000 bushels of grain in their possession or in transit or at the terminals at that time, subject to no obligation. I thought the estimate was pretty high and I wired Mr. Snow of the Grain Commission, who replied that on the last of January there were 75,000,000 bushels of unsold wheat, with obligations attached to some of it that was at Fort William. However, over half of it was in the farmers' granary with no obligations against it. I do not think many of the men who held wheat in their granaries until the first of February mortgaged it, although I believe they can do so if they desire. My point is this: A country that can carry over from harvest time until the first of February 75,000,000 bushels of wheat, worth slightly over $1 a bushel, or $75,000,000, cannot be in a very bad condition. I have no doubt that this estimate of the Grain Commission is correct; as a matter of fact I think it is low. As I say, the obligations against this wheat were comparatively small. There would be, of course, whatever payment they would get in advance, whatever drafts might be attached to the bills of lading. And I may say that since the rapid deflation of wheat in 1920, considerably more care has been exercised in attaching drafts to bills of lading.

Mr. GOULD: Would the minister not suggest that out of that 75,000,000 bushels, provision must be made for seed as well as for advances made on the grain?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; allowance was made for that. It was the estimate made of what had to go forward.

Now, we have some figures with regard to other matters besides grain. We cannot live by grain alone or by growing it. There are too many plant diseases, too many insect pests. The way to develop insect pests is to grow the one kind of plant food for them all the time; if you do that you will soon be visited by some kind of fungus or destructive insect. That is the condition we are in now. The fungus pest is continuing its depredations; the wheat stem sawfly has become more prevalent. Then, there are the grasshoppers. We never heard of grasshoppers in Saskatchewan until a few years ago and they have been a terrible scourge.

I am going to deal now with cattle. We are developing rapidly as a stock growing country. I am sure the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) did not go headlong into wheat growing alone; he stood fast as a farmer; he carried on diversified agriculture and grew good live stock. During the calendar year 1922, 18,000 head of live stock were shipped to Great Britain, valued at over $2,000,000. To the United States we shipped 217,000 head, valued at over $5,000,000 and to other countries 4,000 head valued at $391,000. Our total exports were 240,000, valued at $8,000,000.

I have here an estimate by the Dairy branch with respect to the total production of dairy products. Last year the total production of creamery butter in all Canada was 128,000,000 pounds, of a total value of $48,000,000. Of cheese the total production was 162,000,000 of a total value of $28,000,000. The total dairy production in Canada in 1921 —milk, casein, milk powder, skim milk, sterilized milk, and so on—totalled $212,000,000. We know that in the eastern provinces dairying is largely carried on, and we are just beginning to realize the necessity of regarding dairying in the West as something more than a mere side line. In 1921, 8,000,000 pounds of creamery butter were produced in Manitoba; last year the production was 10,000,000 pounds, an increase of 2,000,000 pounds. In Saskatchewan in 1921, the production was 7,000,000 pounds; in 1922, nearly 9,000,000 pounds. In Alberta in 1921 the production was 13,000,000 pounds and in 1922, 15,000,000 pounds. There is the hope of Alberta. I am sure the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) would, if he had the liberty that we all like to enjoy, tell us how he kept his head above water, how dairying kept him afloat as it has kept many another man, especially in the pioneer days when there was nothing else to live on but the cows.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

I was going to give the total exports of wheat from Canada, but I do not think I need give the figures; they are familiar to all hon. members.

Mr. CHURCH: I understood that the minister when he was out West in a recent by-election promised that the Hudson Bay railway would be ready by Christmas. I am afraid it will be like getting the boys out of the trenches, and take a much longer time than that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman may ask a question but he cannot give an address.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend is referring to the time when I was out West on that interesting Easter holiday. I may say that I did not hear anything about that report until I got back nearly to Ottawa. I saw it on the train in some of the morning papers—of course, we read everything on the train—and that was the first time I ever heard of it. I took particular care not to discuss the Hudson Bay railway very much in that by-election. I certainly never even suggested such a thing as the railway being ready by Christmas. What is more, if I had, the people in the Moose Jaw riding, especially, in that district interested in branch lines, certainly would not have been in favour of it because they would have figured out that the more mileage built on the Hudson Bay railway the less money there would be for branch lines in the southern part of that riding. Whoever started that fake yarn did not know the situation in Moose Jaw. The people down there want branch lines, and they want them very badly. I may add that in spite of the result of that election I had occasion to make a recommendation regarding some of the earlier lines to be taken care of and one of them was in the southern part of Moose Jaw riding. I recommended that because the people need it, no matter whether they were foolish or not about whom they selected. There is nothing like casting bread upon the waters, Mr. Speaker.

I am going now to deal with an interesting subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I hope I am not too tiresome to my hon. friends. I try to be as little wearisome as possible but it is a big story, the story of agriculture in Canada.

We dealt with the subject of immigration in this House for five consecutive days, and I did not feel like rising and further obstructing the estimates of my colleague to my right (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) I want to congratu-

late the leader of the Progressive party, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) for the sane and wise attitude that he has taken on the question of immigration, not only in this House but in Winnipeg and elsewhere in Manitoba where his voice was heard after he received the position he now occupies. He spoke on the subject at Brandon too, I believe, at the convention. He takes the ground that a great many of our difficulties would be solved if we had more people. He does not think it is wise to induce any more people to come to this country until those who are here are on Easy street. Well, if we wait till that time comes we will wait till the crack of doom, for a lot of people will never get on Easy street; they are not built that way. He takes the ground that the railway situation would also be solved by immigration. We have too much country and too few people. Twice as many people would not cost twice as much to administer; that is obvious.

Then hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) is to be congratulated too, also the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) in his few remarks, and the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote). I think after all is said and done, it was the few over in that corner that offended on the question of immigration. Some people have the capacity for making considerable noise and getting in the limelight. I feel like exonerating the great bulk of the Progressive party of the charge of disparaging their own country. Why are they doing this, those that are doing it, and how much of it is genuine and how much for political purposes? I am going to make a confession. I can recall when I was in opposition. It was apparently my fate to be born in the county of Lanark where a fellow that was a Liberal was always in opposition, and in the early 90's in the West and the late 80's I can recall when we were all nearly bankrupt and would have been absolutely if it had not been for the Rebellion of '85: The government of that day, which was Conservative, would send down some of their members like the present Senator Foster to tell us how to farm. Of course, we got mad and turned around and said, "Here, we have been working at this farming business for years and are getting poorer all the time." In my younger days I used to say just the same kind of foolish things, but surely with the years should come some wisdom, and that is the reason why the leader of the Progressive party has wisdom.

What I want to point out is this. During those days of hardship there was some justification for it, because we had no tradition, we had no history; it was all a question of what the future of the country was going to be. But we have had forty years' experience now which we can look back upon as an earnest of what can be done in the future. During those bygone years I did take the ground on more than one occasion, especially when a Tory politician from Ottawa came around, that there were enough people already in the West to experiment, and that we should wait before bringing more people in—just exactly what my hon. friend was saying the other day. But there was justification for my saying that then. It was a gamble, an experiment in those days. There were only a few Hudson Bay posts and a few church missions throughout the country to tell what could be done in agriculture. I want to put myself in the same category with the hon. gentleman who was wanting me to define "stability," because I took the same ground, but I think I had some justification. The object was partly political. I am free to make that confession now that thirty years have gone by. It was partly that, and I think it is partly that on their part now. How are they going to get any political advantage out of this? I do not know myself, but the idea as far as I can understand it, and we have seen the same disposition in several of the committees as well as in this House, seems to be to blacken things blacker than your hand. Well, if that is good politics, we cannot throw a lariat around any hon. gentleman and choke him off if he wants to talk that way. This is a free country and we have free speech; there is no closure even, so I suppose we will just have to submit to it. But I understand the feelings of hon. gentlemen. I know the tragedies that have occurred on the prairie. I know homes there that are destitute of the ordinary necessities, let alone the conveniences of life. I know of the hardships because I went through them. I do not wish to refer to myself too much, but I started on the Portage plains as a harvest labourer and I know the business of agriculture, I know its hardships. If a man goes there with youth, courage, determination and health and stays with the job I know he will win out. Where would I go to for a better place to farm?

Mr. MARTELL; Nova Scotia.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Premier Dunning had an experience that I am going to relate. I do not know whether he told it at the Grain Growers' convention at Saskatoon or not, but he said some straight things there. Some person was croaking about the West. There are lots of things that are not very pleasant if you are looking for that black side, and this man was chewing about the black

things of life, when Mr. Dunning said, "I am not a wealthy man, but if you will pick out the place you want to go to I will buy your ticket." Then the gentleman thought he would stay a little while longer. He did not take advantage of the offer. It may have been a bluff, but he did not call it.

Now I wish to refer briefly to the amendment to the budget. That amendment is so remarkably like some features of the budget that it would need the X-ray to distinguish the difference between them. The amendment declares:

> And, further, that the best interests of Canada will be served by:—
> (a) An immediate and substantial reduction in the tariff, particularly on the necessaries of life and the implements of production.

How many Progressives from the prairies voted for the reductions last year? What encouragement is there for anybody to fight for a thing and have not a single Progressive from the West support it? I think the proper policy when there is a lowering of the tariff is to support what you are getting. The Progressives last year showed the same attitude towards the lowering of the tariff as the Conservatives did. The latter opposed the government's policy because there was too much tariff reduction; the Progressives opposed it because it was too little. Had either proposition been adopted the government would have been defeated. It shows the folly of group parliament. Then this amendment proposes an immediate increase in the British preference to 50 per cent of the general tariff. That is the policy of both the Liberals and the Progressives. The leader of the Progressives, I want to point out, is far too modest in asking for an increase of 50 per cent in the British preference, far too modest. He is asking for something that is already in existence, something which now obtains on many articles although not on every article. I expect that when I read the list of tariff duties which I am about to do my hon. friend will head a deputation to the Finance Minister to-morrow telling him that he will have to reduce the British preference in these cases, that it is altogether too high. Let me enumerate some of the tariff items which I got to-day. I asked the commissioner of Customs to supply me with a list of imports from Great Britain that came in under this new tariff at 40 per cent or more. Here is the statement furnished me.

MEMORANDUM

The following items of fabrics, furniture, boots and hardware, are extracts from an extensive list, showing where the present preferential rates, with the 10 p.c. discount therefrom is equal to 40 p.c. or over of the present general tariff rates:—

Item	——	Present Pref. rates	Pref. rates less 10 p.c. dis.	General Tariff rates	British rate is now the percentage indicated below of the General Tariff
		p.c.	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.
521	Gray cotton fabrics and fabrics of flax, n.o.p.	12½	.....	25	
525	Stair linen, sheets, tablecloths, etc., of cotton or linen	20	18	30	60
557	Woollen yarns	20	18	30	60
562	Coalid cloth, etc	20	18	30	60
565	Blankets, any material	22½	20¼	35	57 6/7
566	Flannels and linings	20	18	35	51 3/7
568	Knitted goods	20	18	35	51 3/7
575a	Linen and cotton clothing	22½	20¼	35	57 6/7
581	Velvets and silk fabrics	17½	15¾	30	52½
582	Ribbons	22½	20¼	35	57 6/7
519	Furniture	20	18	30	60
611a	Boots	17½	15¾	30	52½
413	Screws	22½	20¼	35	57 6/7
417	Nails and brads	20	18	35	51 3/7
426	Cutlery	20	18	30	60
427	Enamelled ware	20	18	35	51 3/7
428	Iron and aluminum holloware	20	18	30	60
435	Lamps	20	18	30	60
440	Sewing machines	20	18	30	60
450	Shovels and spades	20	18	32½	55 5/13
626	Hats and caps	22½	20¼	35	57 6/7
627	Gloves and mitts	22½	20¼	35	57 6/7

Let me deal in detail with a few of these. For example take: Gray cotton fabrics, and fabrics of flax. Under the British preference the duty is 12½ per cent. Under the general tariff it is 25 per cent. The British percentage rate is not given. Take the next item: Stair linen, sheets, tablecloths, etc., of cotton or linen. Twenty per cent is the present rate and the rate under the general tariff is 30 per cent. The British preferential rate now is 60 per cent. Now let us take woollen yarns. This is something very essential in a cold country like western Canada and sometimes it is very cold in the East too. Now in the case of woollen yarns it is 20 per cent and the British preferential rate is 60 per cent, 10 per cent higher than is asked for in the amendment. What are we going to do about it? We have overdone it, we have slipped a cog somewhere. Then we have coalid cloth. I do not know what kind of material that is but there is 60 per cent preferential rate on it. These figures were obtained from the Customs department not three hours ago and no change could have been made in that time. Then we have the article of blankets. As to that I felt guilty myself when I heard my hon. friends pleading for cheaper blankets. I tell you you need lots of them and cut wide in a cold country. I see that on blankets we have a preference of 57 6/7 per cent, which is less than one-half of the general tariff. There is no question about it the Tories will have to submit an amendment in regard to these reductions. Then we have flannels 51 3/7 per cent. I have not looked over this list very carefully and if I make a blunder it will be kind of awkward. I am therefore going to try and keep one line ahead if I can. The next item is linen and cotton clothing 57 6/7 per cent. Here at least is a case where we have even exceeded the pledges contained in the National Liberal convention of 1919. We have more than carried out our promise here, so we will put that to the credit of some other pledge and call it two. Next there is the item of velvet and silk fabrics 52½ per cent; ribbons 57 6/7 per cent; furniture 60 per cent; boots 52½ per cent. We are two to the good there. Then nails and brads 51 3/7 per cent; screws 57 6/7 per cent; cutlery 60 per cent; enamelled ware 51 3/7 per cent; iron and aluminum hollow-ware 60 per cent; lamps 60 per cent; sewing machines 60 per cent. And so on. There are twenty-four articles and on none of them is the British preference 50 per cent. We will have to have an investigation into that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A commission.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. member for Brandon and the hon. member for Last Mountain will have to ask for some sort of an inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am quite satisfied for the minister to get what comfort he can out of the present budget. I would submit to him, however, that the list he has read constitutes a very small part—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No doubt.

Mr. JOHNSTON: —of the total list of commodities which this country imports from Great Britain.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I know that. There may be one hundred or two hundred but we have not got round to those yet.

Mr. JOHNSTON: You are a long time getting there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the minister give us the preferential rate on butter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If we had the same advantage as our friends the Progressives in the matter of adjusting platforms I do not know in what position we should find ourselves. An interval of twenty-three years elapsed between the conventions held by the Liberals. After such an interval I think it is only right that the platform should be brushed up. A number of members of the Liberal opposition in parliament took the ground that the Liberal platform of 1919 should be brushed up; in fact was brushed up by a subsequent resolution. I was not there so sometimes it is convenient not to have a past. I know that very strong opinion has been expressed that the platform of the parliamentary members of the party was not the same as the 1919 platform. But two wrongs do not make a right. Surely a platform should not have finality any more than a tariff. I have here the platform of the Progressive party. It is quite interesting and I want to comment upon some of the clauses. Here is one extract from it:

9 p.m.

> By reducing the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will ensure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

That expression "in five years" was dropped off in 1920 and it now might mean five centuries. That was a very convenient expression to knock off from the old Progressive platform. The free trade plank has also been eliminated from the platform. I think the

Conservatives at least, will consider that as all right. Another plank in the Progressive platform reads thus:

That the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911 which still remains on the United States statute books be accepted by the parliament of Canada.

Did my hon. friend hear the Minister of Finance make his speech? Why repeat part of the budget asking for what they have? They were sorely tried to pad out an amendment when they had asked for a British preference to 50 per cent of the general tariff, when it was already 60 per cent, and to ask for reciprocity which they already had in the budget. An oversight must have occurred. Several hon. members probably drafted the amendment; they merged it together, and they had not time to see whether they conflicted with each other or not. This is one of their proposals:

As these tariff reductions may very considerably reduce the national revenue—

They propose this method of raising revenue:

By a direct tax on unimproved land values including all natural resources.

That is their old platform. They have dropped that, and I do not blame them, because it was fallacy. There is nothing about that in the amendment.

Mr. FORKE: What makes the hon. member think we are moving a platform? We are moving an amendment to the budget.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Of course I recognize that. My hon. friend was not present when I pointed out that he had more already than he was asking for.

Mr. FORKE: Just on a few articles. This is not, however, the place to enter into a debate, but we shall probably have an opportunity at some other time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That pleases me all right. I was trying to point out, when I was assisted by my hon. friend, that they had the advantage and the wise advantage of being able to change their platform. They are doing that now, and they are omitting a number of things that they previously asked for. Things which they are asking for now, in some important instances they already have. I think it was stated by the Regina Leader that, in the West, they had one pleasant surprise in the budget, namely the standing offer of reciprocity. It surely was not necessary for any of the oppositions to bring down another budget with the same proposition precisely. That is not an amendment. Moreover, the amendment asks for a British preference to 50 per cent of the general tariff, disregarding the fact that on some twenty-four articles, the preference is from 50 to 60 per cent already. That is quite delightful to me. Whether it is consoling to my hon. friends or not, I do not know. It is the carrying out of both of our platforms, and then some more.

Mr. KNOX: I was wondering, when the minister was quoting from the Regina Leader, if he also noticed what the premier of Saskatchewan thought about the budget.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend is three or four laps behind. I have already dealt with that.

Mr. KNOX: I am sorry I had not the pleasure of listening to that part of the minister's remarks.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They all have the same joke. We cannot expect another one. This "blue ruin" talk has developed that kind of thing.

I come now to a very interesting part of the budget with respect to bounties. We are told that it is a protectionist budget. Strange to say, so far as I have been able to determine, the change in every single item in the budget, in which there has been a change, is downwards. How in the world then, do you make out that it is protectionist? Can you make it free trade by putting it up? Can you make it lower by making it higher? If you can, there must be something wrong with this kind of figuring.

Personally I do not see any justification for the amendment on the ground that the budget is protectionist, unless it is as regards the two items upon which bounties have been placed. I wonder upon which of those two items the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) thought he discerned the vicious hydra-head of protection. I do not like protection one bit better than my hon. friend. I was not brought up on that at all.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member has changed his views.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I should like to know on which of those two articles he thinks he can detect the vicious principle of protection, that interminable protection that you cannot get rid of. A bounty is, admittedly, a species of protection; but it is the least objectionable, and it is terminable rather than interminable. I do not hear vociferous voices telling me which of these two items constitutes the pro-

tectionist feature of the budget. Perhaps hon. members straight opposite will be the authority on protection and can tell me that. I am up against it. I am not an authority myself on protection. That reminds me that there is protection and protection. When I was advocating the establishment of a new industry in Manitoba, the development of the flax industry there, some of the arguments seemed ominously like those which the Tories used to make. I can remember them, but this had the saving virtue that it was going to last only so many years. There is no termination that I can see to the other kind of protection. In my election address at my nomination in Regina, before both urban and rural representatives, I made this statement. I have under my hand what I said. I wrote it down so that I would know:

> In a young country like Canada, with so many and varied natural resources, new industries are bound to be springing up from time to time. Any of these that are likely, and indigenous to the country, could, if deemed wise, be directly assisted in a start, by means of loans, guarantees or otherwise, and then gradually withdrawn as the particular enterprise becomes established. Right in this city—

That was in the city of Regina.

> —we have two illustrations of such state assistance by the provincial government to the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevators.
>
> State nursing to exotic industries or industries already long and well established under a protective tariff is not good ultimately for labour, consumer or anybody else, except the beneficiaries thereof, and is frequently the source from which corruption emanates in our public life.

I am pledged, as a matter of fact my whole provincial experience was along the lines of starting up industries connected with agriculture by some form of state assistance.

Mr. MORRISON: Does the minister say that the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company got a bounty?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say that at all. If my hon. friend will sit down, I will tell him what I said. There are other illustrations. I could not be expected to say everything, even in this House. I will refer my hon. friend to an activity that was a straight subsidy, and that was the stockyard at Moose Jaw and the other one at Prince Albert. They were each given a straight subsidy of $25,000. I would not be surprised if my hon. friend has stock in that stockyard. I know I was canvassed for it, and if I had not been hard up, the chances are that I would have had some.

Mr. MORRISON: I have a $100 share in it, which I will count as a subsidy to the Moose Jaw stockyard, instead of an investment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was after I left that they gave that.

I am glad to find myself entirely on the side of the amendment in one important respect and that is with regard to the question of the excise. I do not know whether in this weary political world we shall ever get around to that but it is absolutely sound, and it is the only way to take protection out of any tariff. There is no such thing as an exclusively revenue tariff; the question is merely one of degree as between one kind of tariff and another. The tariff may be high enough to be prohibitive, to be protectionist, or it may primarily be just a revenue tariff; but if it is a revenue tariff it is to some extent protectionist. The more general adoption of the excise, we are told, would be most equitable all round and would relieve the poor man accordingly. "I am," the hon. gentleman says, "in theory, if you like, and in practice if I can be, in favour of an excise tariff." If that is so, let him come over and help me get it through. What is one among so many? Let the hon. gentleman come and help me. But that, Mr. Speaker, shows the folly of being divided. If I had not had the experience thirty years ago of having made just exactly the same blunder that my hon. friends are making, I would be on the other side now. But when you make a mistake once what is the sense of making it a second time?

Mr. JOHNSTON: May I ask a question?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, two if you like.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Just one. Does the minister mean to imply that he is the lone wolf howling in the wilderness, and that there is no one on the other side besides himself who holds these views?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSTON: You want us to come and help you.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say anything about wolves or coyotes or anything else.

Mr. JOHNSTON: You cried for help.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did; and there is no reason why my hon. friend and I should not be on the budget together instead of his submitting the flim-flam proposition that we have here. What is the use of asking for reciprocity? How much more can you get than is offered in the budget?

Mr. KNOX: Speaking seriously, does the minister really want to leave the impression

that as a westerner he is satisfied with the present budget?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am never satisfied with anything in this progressive world; I am always on the lookout for better things. Did the hon. gentleman ever see a Liberal who was satisfied to stay in one place? Now, I was getting around to the subject of twine, and I could not get a reply from my hon. friends from Manitoba as to whether they thought that the budget in this respect was protective. I can recall the time when Manitoba voted eight to two against reciprocity, and I am disposed to think that if they were so vigorous as protectionists at that time they will not object very much to this least objectionable form of protection, particularly when it is likely to establish an industry which we stand in very much need of and for the product of which we should be independent of the outside world. There are two or three primary requisites for which we should not have to depend on foreign countries One of these is coal and another binder twine. I remember that during the war we were at one stage almost with the last ball of twine; and if the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) is in his seat he will no doubt recall that I interceded on his behalf once and got a carload of twine hooked on to an express train that was going to Yorkton, for the purpose of meeting the exigencies of the situation there. We have become, almost overnight, the greatest exporter of wheat in the world. The estimate of the International Institute of Rome shows that we have exceeded the United States by some six or eight million bushels this year in exports of wheat. Yet here we are, the greatest exporter of wheat in the world, bound to depend on foreign nations for 90 per cent of the twine that is used in binding it. We do not want to anticipate any difficulties that may arise in the future, and probably our relations with our cousins to the south will continue to be cordial. But what about Mexico? A lot of our sisal comes from Mexico and our manilla from the Philippines. Suppose another war should occur, where would we get our binder twine? Why should we depend for our raw materials on places at the ends of the earth, especially for the manufacture of such a commodity as binder twine, or rope, or the various cordage and articles that are made from hemp? It seems to me that both this commodity and coal we should be able to produce ourselves; we should be self-sustaining so far as they are concerned. Should we allow any theory, shot into us when we were young regarding trade and economic practices, and which may be all right in theory, to prevent us from carrying out such a policy? Such a policy is not contrary to the tenets of the Liberal party. We have had subsidies before and I presume we shall have them again. A high tariff on articles not made in the country is not incompatible with free trade. There are certain things that are not inconsistent with the policies of the Liberal party, and one of those things is the permission of aid to such an industry as this. What would be the situation if we were to take the position that every new industry must either start on its own merits or not start at all? This idea seems to me to be absolutely nonsensical. How can you get capital invested in an industry that is in its experimental stages if it has to face such an old-established industry as, for example, the International Harvester Company? If you have to wait until capital will come in under conditions of that kind you will wait until the crack of doom, because that will never be. So that unless we do something to help this industry we shall have to keep on buying 90 per cent of our binder twine outside the shores of Canada. I am not an authority on the copper trade, but I have had an opportunity of visiting some of the hemp factories of Europe, and I know that hemp can be grown and has been grown in Manitoba around Portage la Prairie and the Swan river country. I do not believe there is a man in that province who has not seen it growing; and there are many parts of Saskatchewan in which it can be grown. Under irrigation in Alberta also, particularly around Edmonton, there would be no difficulty in raising this crop. There is therefore an immense industry capable of unlimited development later on which would be able to supply not only our own needs but the oriental trade and the Antipodes as well. Is there any reason why this should not be? I do not know of any country that can produce this raw material in greater bulk than can the Canadian West. Now, if this is not a protectionist feature of the budget, what is? And if it is a protectionist feature of the minister's proposals, do I understand that hon. gentlemen are opposed to it? Judging from the remarks of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), that hon. gentleman is heartily in favour of it, as we might have expected. It was not necessary for the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to put any resolution on the order paper dealing with this matter to indicate where he was. I knew where he would be. I might have sus-

pected, from our experience with the Progressives with regard to the Crowsnest pass when they swiped our policy, that any credit that was coming to the government might be encroached upon in the same way by the leader of the Opposition, in the placing of his resolution with regard to hemp on the order paper, the hon. gentleman knowing that we intended to take action in any event. If this swiping business keeps on I think we will soon have to tie on our political clothes with a logging chain. I exonerate the right hon. leader of the Opposition from any such intention. He is a straight protectionist from the word go. He never changes, and we know where he is—if that is any virtue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If one is a protectionist he is better to be a straight one.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Sure. I am with my right hon. friend. There are certain points of similarity so far as bounties are concerned that I think all three parties could agree to. Then why worry about them? This is one.

Mr. FORKE: Why worry?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with what I think are some discriminations against the West. My hon. friends over there, while they have not done all they might have done to help themselves, know the shoe pinches in some other respects too. We have known that for many years. But while they are endeavouring to get a certain remedy from the state, that is no reason why they should not come to their own relief through the dozen and one avenues that are available to them, as I have already described. What is the use of sitting back and not adopting modern methods of agriculture? Those are the only methods that can lead to success. Simply waiting for the state to come to your relief in the matter of tariffs or anything else will not get you very far. There is no system of taxation through the customs tariff that will not bear unjustly on the West. That is a statement which I think on reflection you will all agree is correct. At least, such a system of taxation can not be levied so as to bear justly on the West until we have manufactories out there equal to those in the East, and I never expect to see them. Protection, even the most modest protection you like, cannot be of any essential value to the people of the prairies in the sale of their staple products such as wheat and cattle. Our wheat goes to the markets of the world and sells on its own merits regardless of what the tariff is here. Our steers are going there now, landing at the various ports and standing on their four feet in competition with every steer from the four quarters of the globe and selling on their merits. How can you protect them? Our butter is coming to that position, too, because we now have an export surplus. I say that any tariff, whether for revenue, protection or otherwise is only a matter of degree, will bear unjustly—will bear unduly perhaps is a better word, because I do not think that any of us want to be unjust—on the West. My eastern friends demonstrated that last year when they said: If you can show any of us how the West can be assisted, even by the establishment of what we disprove of—a compulsory wheat board, for instance—we will give it to you so far as is possible to do so through this House. And they did go as far as they could in that direction. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the eastern provinces to be unjust or unfair in continuing a system of tariff taxation that inevitably must be unfair to the West simply because it cannot be otherwise. The alternative is to assume that the millennium is here, that the hundred and ninety-five representatives from the eastern provinces are ready to set their interests aside in favour of the interests of the three prairie provinces. I never expect them to do that. Then how are we going to equalize matters? There are certain causes for the discontent of the West, apart from their mighty bad farming in some instances and equally bad management. They are going into it to-day right to the eyes.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the hon. minister claim that in the West there are more bad farmers than good farmers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not been up in my hon. friend's constituency of Battle River so I do not know. But I do know there is a lot of bad farming in the West. When those farmers arrive at that conclusion themselves, it will be the first ray of hope for their betterment. Yes, my hon. friend surely knows there is a lot of bad farming in the West. How could it be otherwise when much of the country was settled by people without farming experience? And yet some of those very people, much to their credit, have made a pronounced success of their farming operations. I know many of them.

Where did I leave off when my hon. friend interrupted me?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: It does not make any difference. Start again.

Mr. FORKE: The cattle were on their feet.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: No, the butter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friends will just keep quiet for a little while I shall be able to satisfy them. I have been very patient with them and have enjoyed myself as much as, possibly more than, they have. I want to make an appeal to the entire House with regard to the question of natural resources. It is a time-honoured question in the West. There is never an assembly out there but what that stereotyped resolution is on the order paper All three of the western provinces got a splendid bargain from both the Liberal government and later on from the Conservative government in the form of subsidies in lieu of their natural resources. Those resources now, Mr. Speaker, are actually becoming a liability on the Dominion to administer. Out in the West we are beginning to feel that while we did get a good bargain in that respect, we are sufficiently ambitious and optimistic to think the time has come when we can administer those resources much better ourselves than they can be possibly administered from Ottawa. All the interest that Ottawa has is to administer these resources efficiently so as to get enough revenue to meet the expenditures involved; and that is barely what they are doing. As a matter of fact the revenues are not meeting the expenditures.

Now, why should we not administer our own natural resources? If we are going to be a happy family of nine in the confederation surely we should as nearly as possible be all on an equality. I have pointed out that we cannot be on a footing of equality so long as we have a protective tariff; I do not care how modest it may be it will bear unduly on the West. Then why aggravate that inequality by continuing a condition of affairs which puts three of the nine provinces in an unfair position with regard to their natural resources, particularly when these resources are administered by the Dominion at a loss? How do I know that? I have gone into the Department of the Interior and examined the accounts. I knew the natural resources of the prairie provinces were barely carrying themselves. I am not going to give these figures in detail, I am merely going to show the results of the last 18 years. The total includes immigration and also the Dominion parks, but their inclusion will not affect the total to an appreciable extent. British Columbia is also included in these figures, but the small amount of natural resources there and the difference between the expenditures and the revenue is so little that it will not affect the result either. However, we will knock off several millions on this account if you like. We find the total expenditure for the four western provinces since 1905—that is when the three prairie provinces were erected—has exceeded the total revenue by approximately $27,500,000. That is to say, it cost the Dominion that huge total to administer the natural resources of the western country over and above the revenues received. If we knock off $7,500,000 for Dominion parks we find the Dominion is still out to the extent of $20,000,000. That is the liability on the Dominion in respect of the administration of these natural resources.

Now why wait until this liability becomes so much heavier that the provinces will want even greater subsidies in lieu of their administration of these natural resources? That is what is going to happen. Look at the province of Manitoba. It costs in that province $5,000,000 annually to administer the natural resources, and you will not get a million and a half out of it. That is the condition that will soon prevail in Saskatchewan when the instalments for lands that were sold during the boom are all paid in. In Alberta their natural resources are gradually going to bring in more revenue. They are more fortunate than the other two provinces in regard to the permanency of their revenue-producing natural resources, due to their wonderful coal deposits and, possibly, oil deposits. I have discussed this matter not only with my colleagues but with private members, and they are imbued with the idea, that if we get the balance of the natural resources we should give up the subsidy. On the face of it that looks logical, but the fact is that any balance that is left is so small that there is no revenue in it for anybody at this time. Why, not, seeing that this is a liability to the Dominion, pass it over to these three western provinces and make that equality to exist that should prevail among all the members of confederation? Give them the opportunity of converting this liability into an asset to the various provinces. Make the subsidy terminable at some particular time, if you like; the right of that subsidy will then have been purchased by this Dominion forever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To whom is the hon. member appealing to do this justice?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The whole House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it not be a good idea to bring in a bill?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It takes two to make a bargain—the provinces and the Dominion. There has never been anything done between the provinces and the Dominion on

the question of the resources except by consultation or by conference. Suppose we could get a bill through this House, the provinces might not accept it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the hon. gentleman not succeed in making terms with the government of Saskatchewan that he just came out of?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The government of Saskatchewan knows when it has a good thing in this bargain and it is not likely to give it up. A year ago last autumn there were suggestions that the natural resources should be given plus three years' subsidy; I believe that offer was made to the three provinces. A flat rate basis of that kind will sooner or later have to be arrived at, but the provinces would not accept the three years' subsidy. They might accept ten; I do not know. It was tentatively talked about. I know that my right hon. friend, as former Minister of the Interior, is familiar with this question and interested in it. It must have some finality—unlike the tariff. I am satisfied that a settlement of it would remove a lot of the grievance on the ground of inequality of treatment through the western provinces not having control of their natural resources. You may say, why should we take over a liability? Well, we believe we can convert them into an asset at some time or other; and they are getting to be more and more of a liability administered where they are. I appeal to every hon. member of this House, those—the oppositions included, to get this involved, knotty, long-standing question solved and put off the order paper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. minister will allow me, he knows the terms that he asked for when he was a member of the government of Saskatchewan, and he knows the terms that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) asked for when he was Premier of the province of Alberta. May I ask why this government does not grant these terms? Has he now come to the conclusion that they were unreasonable?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know that any government has ever got as far as to offer the terms that we did at the last conference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean the terms the provinces asked for, that the minister himself asked for when he was in the government of Saskatchewan. Why does he not now grant the terms that he himself asked for?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was never my fortune to be in the conference. I always had the impression—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman asked the terms.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I know, and I take the responsibility for doing so. But nobody knows better than my right hon. friend the ramifications involved in settling that question by an accounting. I cannot conceive of a body getting at that in less than ten years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I tried to convince the hon. minister of that when I was in power, but I could not convince him.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Better late in getting wise than not at all. I was under the impression that this government was the first government—speaking from recollection—that had made a straight flat rate offer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: And trimmed it off with all these conditions. I am only speaking from memory, of course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no. The hon. minister is about ten years late in that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am glad my right hon. friend did think up something that was right during his regime. I am appealing to my right hon. friend's good nature. I see that he is in good humour, and I do not want to put him otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does my hon. friend not think that we were pretty nearly right on the tariff too?

Mr. MOTHERWELL. No. Some of it you cannot get away from, I admit, but you were not right, just the same.

Now, as to these natural resources, we are going to get further in wrong, we are going to get a greater liability. The instalments on the Saskatchewan land will all be due next year; the same applies to Alberta. After that the receipts will gradually grow less and the deficit will grow greater. We will have one more deficit added to that of the Merchant Marine, one more added to that of the National Railways—which, by the way, I hope will soon disappear altogether. There is no sense in letting one deficit disappear and having another bob up on the horizon like this one, but that is what will happen. I appeal to hon. members of this House, all of them, to consider the advisability of handing these re-

sources over on some conditions associated with a terminable period of years after which the payment of subsidies would stop. Naturally the number of years would be smaller in the case of Alberta than in the case of the other two provinces. I am not going to suggest how many years should be stipulated, but in my opinion that is the proper basis on which to arrive at an agreement.

I apologize for taking up so much time, but I think the responsibility is equally divided over the House.

Mr. E. J. SEXSMITH (Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I am persuaded that my contribution to this verbal deluge will not, perhaps, be of very great value. Still, on account of the importance of the subject before the House I feel it incumbent upon me to express some of my opinions in connection with this budget.

I admit that the task of discharging the duties of a finance minister is a tremendous one, involving perhaps more labour and care and ability than many of us have a true conception of. Therefore I find mingled in my suggestions this evening feelings of sympathy and respect for our worthy Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). Perhaps in my remarks tonight I may deviate somewhat from the general line of discussion that has been followed. I desire not to be specific but to talk along lines of general principles.

Canada has a debt of approximately two and a half billion dollars. If we consider this debt in comparison with her undeveloped abilities or her resourceful wealth we have grounds for optimism; but if we consider this debt in comparison with her volume of business and her population this problem is a bit more serious. Yet I take it, Mr. Speaker, that every statesman, every representative should have a determination and express that determination that this debt can and must be paid. Indeed every citizen should feel that Canada is his country and that the defeat or success of Canada means his personal defeat or success, that the distinguishment of the country means his distinguishment. A national debt means a depreciation in the value of individual possession. Therefore, every one should feel that it is his imperative duty to endeavour to pay this debt of the country. In order to make this privilege proportionately possible governments have as far back as we can remember resorted to taxation.

In raising the revenue there are certain fundamental principles to be observed. Governments try if possible to bring down a balance budget, or to go one better and bring in a surplus, but when large war debts accrue and post-war conditions obtain I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, that to bring down taxation proposals that would produce a surplus in any one fiscal year might not be the wisest policy to follow. It might create demands that would encourage and lower the morale of the people and retard national progress. We, however, both governments and citizens, should try to decrease the deficit. In the report brought down by the Finance Minister for the fiscal year 1922-1923 we were told that the revenue estimated on the then existing method of taxation amounted to something like $332,000,000 and that the expenditure was $460,000,000 odd. This convinced, or should have convinced, the people of Canada of the necessity of accepting the burden of additional taxation, but I am free to state that no hon. gentleman here decided within his own mind that we would have a balanced budget, that there would not be an increase in the deficit. In talking to many people in my riding I estimated that there would be a deficit of perhaps twenty or thirty million dollars. I regret, however, to learn that that deficit amounts to about forty-five million dollars. Now we are facing a condition. The business of Canada will not permit an increase in taxation. Neither would it be wisdom to decrease our revenue from taxation. Then whence is relief to come?

I wish by way of constructive suggestion to refer to two well-tried principles that are fundamental in this connection; First, an increase in national business, and secondly economic retrenchment in financial expenditure. It is necessary for Canada to have more people. You cannot have a greater business unless you have more people. Our population is about nine million; the population of the United States is about one hundred and twenty million. I would therefore suggest that the federal parliament and the provincial legislatures should co-operate in a vigorous policy of an effective kind to induce immigrants to come into our country. No matter what their vocation in life, so long as they are not abnormalities, speaking in the broad sense of the word, let them come. We are not importing machines; we are importing men and women, men who are eager and willing to start at the bottom of the ladder. Men who start at the bottom of the ladder generally look up, but the man who starts at the top generally looks down. If we get enough people who will appreciate the

great privileges that the Dominion of Canada has for them, and will take hold of these privileges, that will be a great help in increasing our business. Along with that I would suggest that the government of Canada try in every possible way to develop our natural resources. Canada is rich in minerals, and I was pleased to hear the Finance Minister speak of the efforts put forward for the mining of copper. I hope that there will be efforts put forward for the mining of coal, for I believe that we have coal mines in Canada capable of supplying our people with all their fuel requirements. It is true that in its early development any mine or any works might not pay, but if we persist the time will come when the output will be prolific enough that it will pay. The development of the natural resources and more people in this country mean more business.

Let me now take up my second thought, economic retrenchment. It is true that in the development of a country the spirit of miserliness must be forgotten. We must carry on necessary public works, but it does seem to me sometimes and to others who have spoken to me that parliaments that handle money by the millions of dollars seem to forget the value of the hundred dollars. Of course, we know that all departments try in every possible way, or at least they ought to, to curtail unnecessary expenditure, but I sometimes think that the members do not try very hard to do this. They come here with requests from the different provinces and from the people of their riding for all manner of new public works, post offices, dry docks and so forth.

Mr. LOGAN: What about the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr SEXSMITH: I think it is only right that members should consider the financial condition of the country and not encourage those who ask them to try and further such works. It would be a help to the men who have the responsibility of carrying on these works.

Let me mention a few things that, perhaps, may not be very popular. Aside from the expenditures on public works, economies might be effected in other directions which would save, I think, millions of dollars to the treasury. With all due respect to the late government, as well as to the present government, the administration of the country's affairs is far too expensive and has been for some years. I am well aware that my suggestions for retrenchment may be unacceptable. They certainly will not be very popular in the city of Ottawa. However, I want to make a few remarks as to the cost of government here and if I am wrong in any respect I am quite ready to be corrected. First of all, there must be a retrenchment in expenditures in connection with the Civil Service. I voted for an investigation into the salaries, classification and numbers of the staff of the Civil Service. It seems to me that the investigation which is being conducted into these matters ought to result in a very substantial saving. Salaries are disproportionately high. They have been increased from time to time because it was the custom so to do. In that respect we have been following a practice which obtains in other countries, with the result that the stipends are in very many cases too high.

Then I would restrict, in great measure, the expenditure on superannuation and retiring allowances. Why should men who have been receiving large salaries for the greater part of their lives receive a retiring allowance when quitting the service when hundreds of thousands of people who are following vocations that are essential from the standpoint of the national well-being and who are in every way good and commendable citizens get no such allowance when the time comes for them to quit work. This question has been impressed upon the public mind by the very large amounts granted to officials of the government railways on retirement. The electors are asking why, for example, a railway president who has been receiving a salary of from $35,000 to $50,000 should be retired on an allowance of $35,000. If the expenditures of the public departments are carefully studied it will be found that there are many directions in which retrenchment is possible thus, possibly, causing a saving which could be devoted to the reduction of our national debt.

I want to speak now for a moment or two on the question of taxation. As fair minded citizens we cannot rebel against just and equitable taxation, but we can protest against extravagance and we, as a parliament, can show the lead to the rest of the country by practising economy ourselves. To my mind when budget proposals are brought down the effort should be to relieve the burden of taxation where it bears heaviest upon the great mass of what I might term unprivileged people, and to impose such taxation as is necessary in the interests of the revenue upon those best able to bear it. At the same time I do not believe in the doctrine of equality which we often hear preached: I think that is something which ought to be discouraged as undemocratic. On the other hand, men who are in

responsible positions should do their utmost to discourage that spirit of selfishness and graft, too often present in the human character, and which in the past has resulted in oppression, the oppression of the financially weak by the financially strong. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is exceedingly difficult to arrange equitable methods of taxation. There are some methods that commend themselves to all of us; there are other methods that we do not approve of. It seems to me, for example, that there could be no fairer tax than the income tax. Nevertheless we find people who have never paid a cent of income tax in their lives raising the greatest outcry in regard to it. I also believe that a business tax is fair. If a man is conducting a good business he certainly can afford to pay a tax of some kind. Then there is a consumer's tax. If it is absolutely such as represented and can be made workable I cannot see that there is anything so particularly wrong about it, provided due regard be paid to the principle of which I have spoken. I had intended saying something about the sales tax because in calling upon different business concerns in my own riding complaint was made that it was unworkable. I understand, however, that the Minister of Finance, having had various deputations wait upon him has made the necessary changes so that the same ground for criticism no longer exists. There are some methods of taxation of which I certainly do not approve. The tax, whether direct or indirect in its nature, which builds up one industry at the expense of another is unfair. It is based on special privilege which is unjust and will result in bringing about an unbalanced economic condition.

10 p.m.

In 1878 or 1879, Sir John A. Macdonald introduced his National Policy, a policy to build up cities. I remember hearing a speech delivered by him in our county town, to the effect that if you build up your towns, your cities, you build up home markets, and thereby you build up your country. All this, however, had to be done at the expense of the rural districts. Nobody ever built up a city from above, nor from below. This, to my mind, has obtained too long in the interest of the cities' wealth and the cities' privileges, and it has resulted in the neglect of rural interests. People are expecting a revision of this policy. Not only have I heard men who believe in the Liberal platform or in the Progressive platform, but I have talked during the last year to men who professed to be Conservatives, and they say emphatically that there must be a downward revision of this protective feature.

[Mr. Sexsmith.]

Leaving for a moment this campaign football, the tariff, let me say that there are other questions of momentous concern for men who are in responsible positions as ministers of the Crown or even as representatives of the people. There are forceful organizations which are national octopuses, and they are chaining the hands of governments and parliaments. In North America, governments are strangled; they are helpless. The forceful feature, for instance, in the labour unions—and I say this with all respect to labour—has become reactionary. There was a time when labour was not recognized as it should be. I know that because for several years when I was younger I worked as a mechanic; I have associated with such men and I know whereof I speak. But silently and subtly, this union has been working until the plumb line has gone the other way. Strikes are unprofitable from the fact that they throw men into idleness for a certain length of time during the season, and they keep up the high cost of living the whole season around. Vigorous efforts should be made to try, by commission work and in every other way, to see if there cannot be some conciliation between labourers and their employers. During the height of the coal strike in the United States, President Harding is reported as saying that the United States government would take over the mines and they would see that the people were supplied with the necessary fuel. Immediately after that he received word that he had better go slowly and be considerate, or transportation would be stopped. This is a serious condition. It is a more important matter to occupy the minds of men in responsible positions than for them to play party politics.

There are other unions which are fixing, maintaining and controlling prices, and it is a problem to know how to manage them. Retailers report that in many lines of merchandise their price is fixed from above, and that price is maintained by controlling the outlet. Would it be justifiable, if it were possible, for those engaged in agricultural pursuits to form unions, combines, and monopolies, and to fix the price of the foodstuffs of the world? Certainly that would not be right. That is the very feature of protection or monopolies in any respect that we as Progressives stand against. I am sure that organizations or industries that are financially strong enough to form combines of that nature do not need protection. It will be to the eternal honour of some government to at some time make this decision and, in spite of any influences whatever, act upon it.

Let me speak for a moment on agriculture. After hearing the Minister of Agriculture (Mr.

Motherwell) talk for two hours and a half, I do not know but that I might almost feel optimistic. I will, however, make this statement, that farmers have not come to parliament to have glass beads hung about their necks, nor to receive bouquets for the farming interests and nothing else, and then to run home like children. Those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits are broad enough to know that there is a diversity of industries in Canada, and that every industry, no matter whether it be great or small, must have its status. Since I have been in Ottawa, I have arrived at some conclusions in connection with the duties of parliament. One is this—and I say this conscientiously and with due respect—that the man who has been brought up in a city has a very slim conception of what it means to farm. Another conclusion to which I have come is that partisan politics is costing this country too much, and people are beginning to find this out. The trouble with the agricultural industry to-day is, plainly speaking, that the prices of all the supplies that the man who is engaged in agricultural pursuits requires, are so governed by combines that he has nothing to say. If he cannot afford to buy those supplies, there is no use in saying so; the prices are fixed, and it will be observed that when prices can be controlled, they are not fixed, maintained and controlled without a commensurate profit being given. On the other hand, if an agriculturist has anything to sell, there appears an army of respectable people, of course, whom you could not coax or persuade in any way to go out on a farm. They stand between the consumer and the product of the farmer. They have to be kept, and this creates a spread. They cannot ask too much because the consumer cannot buy the article, so they have to go the other way and force the price down on the agriculturist until it is almost impossible to coax or persuade young men to continue in agricultural pursuits. We hope that the very effective work of the different parliamentary committees, together with the Combines Act, will tend to relieve conditions. At any rate they will reveal those conditions, which will be realized by the public, and will create a sentiment which may perhaps have the effect of ameliorating matters.

As regards the budget, I must confess that I am very much disappointed. We were told some things last year that we thought justified us in supporting the minister's budget at that time. We realized that it was the government's first year in office and that there were post-war conditions and difficulties in the way, and we had a promise that there would be a reduction in the tariff. I do not know that I object to the tariff so much as to that feature of it which is called protection, and which continually exploits one class of the community to build up another. That is the part I object to. The amendment is more elaborate than I should like, but there are principles in it which I feel will compel me to give it my support.

Mr. HATFIELD: Did I understand the hon. member to say that he supported the budget last year?

Mr. SEXSMITH: Yes.

Mr. HATFIELD: Did the hon. member's party support it?

Mr. SEXSMITH: No, not all.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): My fellow members will agree with me that we have had a very interesting day. I listened with a very great deal of interest to the address of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) and was very much pleased with the good humour that he exhibited practically all the way through. I did detect, however, signs that the hon. gentleman was just a little bit sore, a little tender around the place where he got kicked at the Moose Jaw election. The minister does not take very kindly any reference to that matter. With regard to the other interesting speech with which the day opened, I may say that on this side of the House we always listen with kindly interest to anything contributed by the member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond), and I will not make any lengthy reference to his speech except to observe that his definition of stability apparently is going to be historical. His definition of stability is the stability of a ship, which can be stable at the same time as it is making progress. When he mentioned the word "ship" in connection with Liberal policy my mind went back a good many years. Association of ideas is a wonderful thing, and when the hon. member mentioned that word "ship" in that connection I thought immediately of the Jolly Roger which used to float so bravely over the good ship Hispaniola. I do not know which member of the Liberal ministry is responsible for the policy of this budget, but he might be likened to the good old John Silver, that man of attractive yet questionable genius. I think that if we could put a wooden leg on the Minister of Agriculture himself he would fill the character very well. Whoever else on this side of the House has failed to appreciate the present budget, its policy, its delicate con-

cessions to the people of Canada, I shall try in the few minutes at my disposal to do it what justice I can.

During the war, and under the stress of the conditions that prevailed then, very many experiments were tried in federal taxation. These included the sales tax, the customs war tax, the income tax, the business tax and the luxury tax, the two latter of blessed memory. Some of these were rough and ready means of raising money in a time of stress and were justifiable solely from that standpoint. But we are no longer at war and it might reasonably have been expected that before this some sincere effort would have been made to place our taxation on a more equitable basis. Instead of that, last year the Minister of Finance chose to perpetuate these crude methods and not only to perpetuate them but to make them bear more onerously upon those elements of the community that always find it difficult to bear any extra burdens of any kind. I think we may be grateful that the income tax is still with us. It is probably the tax that is most easily adapted to the requirements of equity and the economists tell us that it is the only tax that will stay where it is placed. It is a tax that exacts money where it is expected that money can be got. I do not say that our present income tax law comes anywhere near to that ideal. I am sure it does not; it is clumsily and inequitably graduated. The well-to-do people of Canada are not taking a fair share of the burden of Canada's taxation.

We have heard many expressions of appreciation of England during this session. In that wonderful little island the principle of noblesse oblige is practical politics, and the well-to-do person is expected to pay a fair share of the country's expenses. For instance, a man in receipt of an income of $10,000 over there pays in income tax an amount equal to about 18 per cent of his income. In Canada a man in receipt of a similar income would pay about 9 per cent. The well-to-do person, the person who has the good things of life, is getting off very easy in this country at the present time.

There is another defect in our income tax law that might very well be remedied, namely, the failure to discriminate against unearned income—income which comes without any effort or enterprise on the part of the recipient. At the present time there is about a billion and a half dollars in the hands of well-to-do Canadians that did not exist until the war had been in progress for two or three years. That is to say, an income of over $50,000,000 a year was diverted by war into the pockets of certain people. According to all the rules of equity such income ought to bear an extra share of the expenses of government, especially when more than half of our national expenditure is for purposes arising out of the war. In a word, this is the income of people who do not sow, neither do they spin.

There is another form of tax neglected by our federal government, no matter which party is in power and no matter whether we are at war or at peace; I refer to an inheritance tax. This is a form of property upon which the state has had an unchallenged claim from time immemorial. There never was a time in the memory of man when the state did not have a claim upon both real and personal estate at the moment it passed from one generation to another. A short while ago I was reading that even the contemporaries of the late lamented King Tutankhamen of Egypt paid inheritance duties, and I rather think that is the best explanation yet of that monarch trying to carry so much property with him—he was evidently dodging the inheritance tax. We know that the Roman statesman of old, who laid the foundations of much of our present system of statecraft, thought the most appropriate end that could come to an affluent career was some form of compulsory bequest to the state, and they saw to it that such careers were so fittingly closed. Let us look at little England again—a never-failing source of sound precedent, I notice, to certain hon. members. Those lovers of the constitution who are so well sprinkled over the benches of this Chamber when any uncomfortable constitutional question arises always look to England for their precedents. Well now, as soon as England emerged from its political tutelage, at the time of the Revolution her statesmen imposed a tax of this kind, and it has been kept in force in more or less the same form ever since.

Now, it seems to me that such an inheritance tax approaches as nearly as a tax possibly can to the principle of painless extraction. It hurts nobody. That it is a perfectly just claim established by time, reason and sound democracy, cannot be denied. Therefore it seems rather odd that our federal government should so long have overlooked this source of revenue. I would go as far as to say that all our sister dominions have adopted such a tax, for the reason that in most of their legislatures there is a greater carefulness for the interests of the common people than has been displayed in this House for a good many years. Indeed, when it comes to the principle of equity in taxation Canada is the laggard of the British Empire.

The principle of discrimination to which I have already referred was recognized during the war to some extent in the business profits tax. The history of the imposition of that tax is very significant as illustrating the spirit that has prevailed in this House, irrespective of party, towards equity in taxation. There was a tax that, while it contributed very justly to the cost of the war yet was inaugurated very timidly, very tentatively, very apologetically, and it was provided with a kind of automatic stop lest, I suppose, some future finance minister—possibly a Progressive—might forget to stop it. That is one of the pieces of legislation that is not altogether rare in our history whereby a law comes to a silent unseen termination and nobody is the wiser. And so the business profits tax was allowed to go out of existence. It was a just tax, an equitable tax, a tax which if in existence to-day would to a great extent relieve the consuming people, the common people of Canada.

That leads me to a brief discussion of the sales tax and its failure to discriminate against luxuries. The luxury tax was inaugurated on May 19, 1920, and after a short, unwelcome existence it went out of this world of fiscal sorrows on the 20th of December of the same year. The circumstances surrounding its death were very significant—just as significant as the circumstances surrounding the death of the business profits tax. The former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) said some very touching things at the graveside. He said in effect: "It has fulfilled its purpose; it has checked extravagance and lowered the cost of living in this country." Above everything else—he did not actually say this, but it must have been in his mind—it made it easier for the people to swallow the sales tax. There is no doubt that that was the hidden motive behind the luxury tax. It was imposed at the same time as the sales tax. When this tax was dropped the opposition of that day, constituting the present party in power, were silent; they were suspiciously acquiescent; they consented to its death. I think I am right in imputing that attitude to them, because the present Minister of Finance has not, so far as I know, as much as mentioned luxury taxes during the last two years. It is true that one lone voice was raised against the elimination of this tax, that of a gentleman who until recently sat in the ministerial seat but is now translated to a better position, without the responsibility of office. The protest made by that gentleman was remarkable because of its picturesqueness, its biblical imagery. He said: "The Minister of Finance is pandering to the millionaire. He has stood by and allowed the Queen of Sheba to mince past in her furs and diamonds and all her gay apparel, while he has stood by, with a cudgel for the poor workingman." That came from the Opposition benches when the luxury tax was dropped. I have wondered how that fervent advocate of the poor man felt last year when the hon. minister allowed not only the Queen of Sheba to go by, but also King Solomon in all his glory, while the minister lay in ambush, with a club twice as big this time, for the poor workingman. These are the kind of discussions we get in this House; things are allowed to pass quietly; they are never known to the public at large. Taxes are born and taxes die, both parties consenting thereto. We have this silent, invisible pact whereby the masses of the people always get the heavy end of the burden, and the well-to-do people get things easy.

I want to say a word further in regard to the principle of indirectness as it predominates in the taxation of this country. Canadian governments, it does not matter whether Liberal or Conservative, believe in taxing the consumer—and "the consumer" means that entity which we sometimes refer to as the common people, the great mass of the people who are not very well able to bear taxes upon the necessities of life. This House, irrespective of party, believes in taxing the consumer, making the consumer pay for the war, making the consumer pay for the cost of government. The figures for 1922 show that the consumers of this country paid in that year 67 per cent of the money raised in taxes to carry on the affairs of the country. I think I am safe in saying that in no other country in the English-speaking world do any such figures apply. When we come to apportioning taxation, irrespective of what government is in power, the poor man gets it every time. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) this afternoon suggested that Great Britain laid very heavy taxation upon the necessities of life; that in spite of the fact that it was a free trade country, Great Britain was making things very burdensome for the poor people. Now, I want to say that in Great Britain the principle of laying the burden where it can most easily be borne is carried out to the fullest extent. There not more than 30 per cent of the cost of running the country is laid at the door of the consumer. I could go a great deal further than that, because I am just referring to what is collected under customs and excise. I think the hon. member for Fort William referred to these as neces-

sities of life, but I would point out that customs and excise taxation in England correspond to our excise taxes here. I want to know how many necessities of life are included in our excise taxes? Nobody but a Scotchman would call spirits a necessity of life, and that is about all that is contained in the British customs and excise—except sugar, of course, and sugar is taxed fairly heavily. The same applies to tea, matches, and, to some extent dried fruit. Outside of these things there is nothing that can at all be called a necessity of life. I do not think that more than 5 per cent of the total British revenue is raised upon the necessities of life. I would not be so unfair as to say that 67 per cent of our income is raised from the necessities of life, but the great bulk of our revenue comes from the consumer, is laid upon what he purchases and what he uses. That is a serious thing for Canada, a country that is finding great difficulty in maintaining its population. The people are just slipping through our fingers all the time. Some time ago there were a good many allusions to this subject and I do not want to cover the ground again, but since the Minister of Agriculture has been handing out congratulations I think I will follow his example and hand out a few more. The gratitude of this House—I do not suppose it will be expressed in a formal manner—is coming to those upon this side who attempt to bring the House face to face with the facts. It takes a courageous man to tell the truth sometimes, and that is exemplified from what has followed in this House from action along those lines. I have been pleased to note that since some Progressives made it the fashion to tell the truth, others have followed suit; it is not so hard to tell the truth once somebody has broken the ice. Not long ago the attention of the House was drawn to a front page article in a responsible and influential western journal which stated that last winter 6,000 families had gone from its own city to the United States. I notice that the Minister of Agriculture, when he referred to that journal, did not make the reference with perfect equanimity; he is not on very good terms with it just at this time. The reason is that the minister feels that public opinion in the West is going one way and he is left alone to go the other way. I am reminded of the story of the little boy who went with his mother to see his big brother's regiment off to the war. They saw the regiment march down the street, and the little fellow said "Mother, look! They are all out of step but our John." Now it seems that the Minister of Agriculture does not like it because that great organ of public opinion in the West is going in the opposite direction to him. But we are very glad that it is. We are very glad to think that one of the most powerful organs of western opinion is coming around to the opinion as expressed in this House a few weeks ago. This is not only a western matter. The other day on the front page of a very important American daily I saw an article in which the present leader of the Opposition was represented as saying that thousands of people were leaving Canada every day because of the high cost of living. Now when I read that statement and saw that it was not associated with the name of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) I had a grand and glorious feeling. After all it is not the Progressives alone that are telling the truth. The Progressives having made it easy to tell the truth the others are beginning. It is going around this way to my right and it may be that it will get across to the other side.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think I can let that go quite unchallenged. I did not make a statement so strong as that. I do not know where the hon. member read it. I went to the limit of the truth but no further.

Mr. BIRD: The hon. member will have to settle his accounts with the New York Tribune. He did say incidentally of course, that the high cost of living was due to the management of our friends across the way, but I thought it not advisable to say that. In that article there was another thing with which the right hon. leader of the Opposition had nothing whatever to do. This article on its own account, I believe, said that on a certain day in Montreal there were four hundred skilled Canadian workmen who applied to the United States consul for entry into the United States. That was in Montreal, not Winnipeg. I may add to these a little news item that I collected from a local paper in my own district at home which read like this: We are sorry to see so many of our Swedish neighbours leaving us; four families left last week for the United States. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of immigrant that is held up to us as being most capable of adapting himself to conditions as they are in Canada. So from city, town and hamlet they go in thousands and tens of thousands. Then there comes along a certain type of patriot and says: Do not mention it; hush it up; breathes there a man with soul so dead that he will draw the world's attention to a thing like that? An open vein spouting out the rich, red life of Canada, and these lachrymose

patriots say: Cover it up; bring a funnel and pour in more; bring a force pump and pump it in; bring Mr. Coué and let us cure it by auto-suggestion; let us woo the immigrant in, and check immigrants from going out; let us cure these things by simply denying them. Now some people call that patriotism, but we on this side of the House call it stark foolishness.

Now there is another side to this inequitable taxation story besides the national one. I do not see how you are going to attract people from countries where they leave the poor alone, into a country where they make a practice of giving them the heavy end. Apart from that, this is a social question. This iniquitous system of taxation that has prevailed in this country before and during the war and is carried on now succeeds in accentuating unjust conditions that already existed apart from it. I am referring more particularly to the farming community in this country, because I am more particularly associated with them. Some hon. members in dealing with this question of farming conditions have pointed to other countries and said: Look at the farmers in other countries, you Canadians. See how they are getting on. If you only take stock of farming in England and the United States and other places you will be satisfied to stay in Canada. Mr. Speaker, that is poor comfort. It is the kind of comfort that Job got. It means this: You are trying to comfort the Canadian farmer by showing him how widespread his trouble is. I think he could endure it if he thought it was only local, but when he is told it is a world-wide condition, that farmers are getting it in the neck throughout the universe, that is pretty hard on the spirit of the farmer.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the agricultural industry throughout the world for the past few generations has been gradually pushed into the background by growing industrialism. The farmers throughout the world have wakened up at last to find they are living in a world that has been moulded to suit the ideals and aims of urban life. Educational, social, fiscal, financial, in transportation, in almost every important economic item that you can mention, our modern life has been switched away from the farmer, and it does not matter what country you lay your finger on you will find the same thing. This trying to compare British farmers with Canadian farmers does not amount to—that! The Canadian farmer and the British farmer are suffering from the same thing—the neglect of governments that did not understand them and did not want to understand them, that bid for their votes at election time but when it came down to their economic difficulties they did not know and did not want to know. I say this is true whether of the British farmer or of the Canadian farmer, and the fact that the British farmer wants protection and the Canadian farmer free trade makes my point all the more clear if you will only think about it. Free trade and protection does not matter that much! It is the negligence, the callousness of governments that have not tried to understand the principles that govern rural life and the industry of the farmer. Yes, the world has been aroused, "a green international" has come into being and the farmers throughout the world feel that they are standing on common ground. This has resulted in what? It has resulted in the birth of certain political forces that have shaken the old political parties to their foundations—in England the National Farmers' Union, a non-political body but exercising tremendous political influence, in the United States the Farmers' Bloc, an inter-party body that absolutely dominates the parties in the United States, in Canada a direct political movement that may not dominate the old parties but it has them pretty well worried, and it will have them more worried yet, mark my words! In Canada this movement has taken its most logical course because the Canadian farmer stands in this world as being the man who relatively is the worst off. I say relatively advisedly, because the Canadian farmer has no business to be as badly off in a rich country like ours as farmers in other parts of the world. Relatively speaking conditions have pressed most hardly upon the Canadian farmer, and it has resulted in a party so sane in its demands, so democratic and broad in its constitution—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BIRD: Wait till I am through—so broad in its constitution and that so appeals to the man who loves a square deal that I prophesy for it that it is going to transform the public life of Canada and divert it into channels that will be more conducive, not only to that national prosperity that we hear so much about, that is registered in bank clearings and factories and exports, but the prosperity that is registered in the homes, the lives and happiness of the people.

Some gentlemen in this House try to persuade themselves that this is a temporary movement, that it is an ebullition of class consciousness that will die a speedy death. But those gentlemen are ignorant of two

things. They are ignorant of the depth of the wrong from which the Canadian farmer is suffering in the first place, and they are ignorant moreover of the economic and political enlightenment that the farmer of Canada enjoys to-day. Now, the consciousness of a wrong is no assurance of permanence I admit; history is too sad a testimony of that. There are plenty of wrongs that have been keenly felt but that have never been redressed. But a wrong that is backed up by enlightenment and the ability to organize, is the thing that is going to win out; and I want you older politicians to think of the organizations that exist throughout Canada: The little local, the little spot of light in a local community where there is just as much intelligent discussion of economic and political matters as there is on the floor of this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Far more.

Mr. BIRD: —I want you to remember that before you try to make any prognostication, because if you do not remember that you will be all out. You will remember it sooner or later. This is not an ephemeral thing you are dealing with. Oh, you may exercise your eloquence pointing out the defects of our political ability. We have not been very long in the game, we have not learned its tricks and all its deep and dark ways, but we are getting on. We are learning quickly. If we are here a year or two more we will know most of the things that make the politician notorious in modern life. Now, the shaft of ridicule that hits us does not hit the movement that is behind us. You may wipe out everyone of us twice over but you will not touch it. This movement could get on without any of us. It will not only break the man that opposes it but it will break the friend that is false to it. You may point over here and say "Scratch them deep enough and you will find the old Tory and the old Liberal." You may hit the nail on the head sometimes, but in saying that you are unconsciously paying a compliment to this party. The party that has been able to take hold of the old Tory and the old Liberal and make them, for the first time in their lives, step forward on the path of progress, has something in it that you have got to reckon with. Even the man that goes back "to the flesh pots of Egypt" will never forget the exhilaration he experienced while he was here.

Now, just a word more specifically in regard to the principle of protection that underlies our whole taxation system. I have criticized the taxation system but all my criticism comes to a focus upon the principle of protection. While other English-speaking countries have been forging ahead and achieving a degree of equity Canada has been lagging behind because its system of taxation has been vitiated by this principle of protection and so long as you have protection as the basis of your taxation system you will never get equity. The protectionist does not want equity because if you get equity you will not get protection. The protectionist who goes out to seek for equitable modes of taxation would rather he did not find them because if he did find them it would spoil the scheme of protection. That is why we have not got an inheritance tax in this federal parliament, that is why we have not got other taxes that would be successful. We do not want an equitable and successful form of taxation in this federal parliament because it would endanger the very existence of protection as a revenue producing instrument. No, protection is the thing that vitiates the whole system from top to bottom. Now, the proof of this, the proof of the influence of protection upon this parliament is to be found in that annual work of art we call the budget. What is the difference between a Conservative and a Liberal budget? It is like the difference between finality and stability. That is not a conundrum, it is a serious question. What is the difference between a Tory budget and a Liberal budget?

11 p.m.

Mr. HOEY: They are both Tory budgets.

Mr. BIRD: The only difference that I have ever discerned between the Liberal budget of last year and the Tory budget of the year before was in the literary style. There is a great deal of difference between the respective styles of the present Minister of Finance and his predecessor. But I do not think that constitutes a sufficiently important difference to perpetuate two parties where one might well do. The difference betwen last year's budget and that of the year before might be expressed in a very small decimal fraction, and I believe that fraction, strange to say, is in favour of our friends to the right. For over fifty years what have we had? We have had a tariff in this country which has not varied more than 2½ per cent any way. Somebody said the other day there was a fatality in that figure. I think there is a fatality in it. For over fifty years this country has been embroiled in a 2 per cent controversy. The people of this country have been agitated, stirred up all these years for that, with all the train of corruption and waste that has gone with it. There is not very

much difference I can vouch, between a Liberal and a Tory budget. I am reminded of the feud that existed between the Big-endians and the Little-endians in a mythical country. It began at table one day. One faction said: "Now the big end is the proper end at which to crack an egg." Another faction rose up and said: "No, it is the little end," and from that moment there began a feud that lasted for centuries and that involved millions of innocent people who had no interest in the question whatsoever.

The state of politics in this country for two generations has been like this: When it came to the annual business of opening the purse of the taxpayer, the Conservatives said: "It is the big end." The Liberals said: "No, it is the little end." But when the taxpayer counted up what was left, there was not very much difference; there was not any It was all the same, and it is still the same. There is not any difference, just a difference of words, just a cloud of argument that is meant to go out through the daily newspapers and blind the people of this country to what is going on. There is no difference whatsoever. Two parties, but one policy—that is all there is to it. Do not let us try to see what difference there is between Conservatives and Liberals, because that is not worth the trouble. Assume at once that there is not any difference, and let us get down to business. I had the curiosity to go back a few years in order to see what this purse opening had led to, and I found that, as an actual fact, it is just as easy rifling it from one end as from the other; it does not make any difference. Going back fifty years, I find this astounding fact that the Canadian consumer has paid $2,500,000,000, to help the manufacturers of this country to establish themselves. Those grey-haired boys that refused to grow up have received $2,500,000,000 of the hard-earned money of the people of Canada. That is equal to our present national debt. It is an amount that would lift every mortgage off every farm in Canada, and I believe it would pretty nearly buy every farm in Canada. It would build enough houses to house those people in Canada who find it hard to keep out the frost and the cold, and to be as patrotic as some of the people who represent them in this House. That amount would not only build those houses, but furnish them; It would make them comfortable. The interest on it, in a very short time, in about the length of time that we are discussing this budget, would handsomely complete the Hudson Bay railway. I had to work around to that because of my interest in it.

My criticisms to-night are of this character. I have made some strictures upon the policy of the present Minister of Finance; but those strictures are no indication of my personal feelings towards him, because as one of the younger members of this House, I have a very real admiration for his character, ability and public spirit. But I think the Minister of Finance has put himself in a somewhat ambiguous light before the young and rising generation of this country. I do not think his explanation of the divergence between his policy and the Liberal platform of 1919, will be clearly understood by the young people who are rising up to take their part in the public life of Canada. We have heard much about scraps of paper. I do not think responsible public men and responsible parties ought so easily to go back upon their word as that. After all, moral questions enter into public questions, and it is a serious matter that a traditional party in this country should so lightly, so light-heartedly go back upon a written statement of what its policy should be if it were returned to power in this House.

The Progressive party has no ambitions for power, and a statement of its policy does not look forward to any assumption of power. But the Progressive party believes in itself and its policy, and I think the people can easily see that in the Progressive policy there is nothing inconsistent with running the country economically and efficiently. I do not see that there is any just criticism of the proposals that we have laid down whereby the country can be run without imposing upon the consumers a burden that is hard to bear. The Progressive party does not stand for a financial policy only. That is only the skeleton beneath the flesh so far as we are concerned. It stands for the broad prosperity of Canada; but as I said before, it wants to see that prosperity registered in the actual life of the people. The Progressive party stands for economical adjustment. It does not envy city life and urban life, but it does not want to see the urban dweller getting all the good things of life. We are out for economic readjustment, because we believe after all, that is what touches our life most closely, and we are out for political reform, not as an end in itself, but as a means to an end. We believe that politics are not necessarily evil, but that they are evil only when they are made an end in themselves. We believe if politics are subjugated to the work of readjustment and to keeping adjusted the social

and economic relationships of this country, they will purify themselves; they will become serious; they will lose their corruption automatically, just as in our personal life, if you have a consuming purpose, your life is kept stronger and straighter.

And so it will be in political life, if we can only forget the idea that politics is an end in itself. We are out for political reform because we want to see things done, we want to see Canada a happier place; and we are out, let me say, although one hesitates to say it, as men who love their country. We are out as patriots, we hope, but we are out for that kind of patriotism which seeks to inculcate the love of country by making the country a place that one can love. I could take you to place after place in rural Canada which it would require a man of strong imagination to work up any affection for. You cannot build up patriotic Canadians upon that basis. Patriotism is not a vague feeling; it is not altogether founded in the affections. It is a matter of sentiment in regard to real things, things that a child can be trained to love and to have a real affection for. We are out to transform the countryside of Canada and make it a place in which people can live and be contented to live, and which they can grow up to love. I want to say moreover that the Progressives are out for the unity of Canada, and I make bold to say that we have the only basis upon which there can be such unity, that is, the basis of justice as between classes in Canada and as between sections in the community. That is the only real basis upon which there can be any unity. We have no traditional spites and no petty feelings of strife behind us. Our sole stock in trade is what we carry with us, just a straightforward economic policy, that is all. It does not matter what you are religiously, socially or provincially, you are equally welcome into this fellowship, because we do not specialize in any of those things that divide one Canadian from another. The basis on which we work is the basis on which all the people can co-operate.

Just one parting shot at the policy of the Liberal government. I was reading some of the earlier budget speeches of the Minister of Finance, and I discovered that he made his first budget speech on St. George's day and another subsequently on St. Patrick's day. Now I want to make the humble suggestion that he deliver his next budget speech on Holy Innocents' day, because no budget he has yet made has killed any dragons or driven out any serpents, while I am afraid they have taken in quite a lot of innocents.

[Mr. Bird.]

On Motion of Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Graham the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Wednesday, May 16, 1923

The House met at three o clock.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That this House do agree to concur in the appointment of a joint committee to consider the following matters;

1. The forms of bills and the best means of affording information and assistance in the consideration thereof at all stages of legislation in both Houses of parliament;

2. The better distribution of the work of legislation between the two Houses;

3. The practical operation of the provisions of the Senate and House of Commons Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapter 10, respecting the attendance of senators and members of the House of Commons, and the expediency of making any alterations in those provisions;

And that Messieurs Boivin, Charters, Euler, Hudson and Millar be members of such committee on the part of the House;

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours of the above resolution;

That the Clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the unanimous pleasure of the House that the motion be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

RUMOURED RAILWAY APPOINTMENTS —IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): There is a newspaper despatch to the effect that Colonel Balfour, formerly an assistant to Sir Henry Thornton in the management of the Great Eastern Railway of England, has arrived in Montreal to assume the duties here of assistant to Sir Henry in the management of the Canadian National Railways. It is also stated that a Mr. A. J. Thomas, who as well was a former assistant to Sir Henry Thornton in England, has come to Montreal to take office here. Will the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) inform the House whether these statements are correct, and, if they are, what Canadians are being displaced?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways): I have no information in reference to the matter except what I have seen in the press.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will my hon. friend get that information? There is another matter which I desire to bring to the attention of the government. I see, according to the press, that Sir Henry Thornton has made a certain speech on the subject of immigration, in the course of which he declares that four things are absolutely necessary in connection with immigration. The first he gives is a capable Minister of Immigration who will co-ordinate the efforts of the people.

Mr. FIELDING: That is all right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask the Minister of Railways whether Sir Henry Thornton is speaking for the administration and whether any changes are in contemplation.

Mr. GRAHAM: So far as the government is concerned, I can assure my hon friend that there is in office at the head of the Immigration department just the kind of minister that is referred to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, you do not agree with Sir Henry Thornton.

DR. A. M. LOWE

CANADIAN CITIZEN IN NORTHERN CHINA CAPTURED AND MALTREATED

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LADNER: Have the government received any information regarding a Canadian citizen, Dr. A. M. Lowe, a prominent merchant of Vancouver, and a native of Victoria, British Columbia, who was beaten, bound and made captive in northern China? If they have, do they intend to require an explanation of the Chinese government?

Mr. SPEAKER: This question has already been asked and answered at a previous sitting.

ADULTERATION OF MILL FEEDS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the numerous complaints that have been received by the Department of Agriculture regarding the adulteration of mill feeds, will the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) introduce at the present session the contemplated bill which he referred to on 23rd February? Possibly we are nearing the end of the session, and I have not yet seen or heard any intimation that the bill will be brought down.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Speaking for myself, I have not so far decided whether it would be advisable to introduce the bill at the present session. We have had a good many bills of a similar character, multiplying restrictions manifold; and while I am personally willing to put further restrictions upon the people, I am not at all certain that it is advisable to impose them too heavily and too frequently at such short intervals. I am, however, quite willing to be advised by my colleagues and by my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) as well with respect to the advisability of introducing the bill at this session. I may observe that I have it all ready.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EMPIRE DAY ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYS: What is the intention of the government with regard to the 24th of May? Is there any thought of adjourning next Wednesday night over the week end?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government proposes to follow the custom of previous years and observe the 24th of May as a holiday, but I think it would be advisable for the House to sit on Friday.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 15, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Robert Forke.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): Budget pronouncements, Mr. Speaker, are always important in the life of every parliament, and this budget has been no exception. Before proceeding to deal with the budget direct and the matters that I shall refer to briefly this afternoon in connection with it, I desire to say a word or two with respect to the minister (Mr. Fielding) whose duty it has been to prepare the budget and who has just brought down his seventeenth financial statement in the parliament of Canada. It has been my great pleasure, and indeed my good fortune, to have been associated with this hon. gentleman for a period of over one year. It is scarcely necessary for me to say that the relationship has been most pleasant, that I have acquired a great deal of information that I did not formerly possess as to the management of the affairs of government, and that I have learned to respect the opinions of the hon. gentleman

whose duty it is to prepare annually a financial statement for the people of Canada. I hope he will continue to bring down our budgets for a very considerable number of years, and I am sure he will always retain the love and respect of all parties in this parliament.

The science of government, Mr. Speaker, is rather a difficult one. To the uninitiated it always appears to be easy. I have no desire to criticize my hon. friends opposite, indeed I have watched with a great deal of interest their efforts to solve our social and financial problems in both the federal and provincial fields. Undoubtedly in those provinces in which they have the responsibilities of government they are finding much more difficulty in their administration than they anticipated. Let me say that I for one would have no objection in the world to seeing my hon. friends of the Progressive party occupying the treasury benches for a term of four or five years in order that they might have an opportunity to put into practice some of the principles which they advocate so zealously in opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman should know what that is like.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has had a similar experience, and, frankly, I may say that it does not seem to affect me in the same way as it does him. I wish my hon. friends who may displace me all the success in the world.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman know anything I promised in opposition that I did not redeem in office? If he does I should like him to give it to the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Farm implements, I should say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My right hon. friend has had the advantage of having been a member of this House a great deal longer than I. I have never attempted to criticize his administration because I did not come directly in contact with it. But I am speaking of the things whereof I know, and I may say frankly to my right hon. friend that although perhaps on other matters we were never very far apart, on one fundamental issue, I always disagreed with him. He may say that now I have seen the light I am not prepared to go as far as I advocated in former years; but I may inform him that I am still prepared to go all the distance I was always prepared to go when the occasion offers and the time is opportune. But my right hon. friend and his government have made it exceedingly difficult for any administration succeeding them to offer the measure of tariff reduction that I think this country is entitled to and some day must have. What I started to say was that when we have to tackle the job of government, when we are responsible for the budgets to run the country, we have to view everything not from a sectional standpoint but as it may affect our people throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. That is no new observation, nor do I offer it as such, but I want to deal with our national affairs from that standpoint.

My hon. friend (Mr. Bird) who preceded me last evening intimated that both parties in dealing with public affairs were not just exactly honest with themselves or with the people. Well, if the time ever comes when my hon. friend is entrusted with the responsibilities of office he will find that perhaps he will not be able to be so drastic and so radical in his administration as he expresses himself to be when in opposition. I have no serious criticism to offer my hon. friends except in one or two instances. I know somewhat of the responsibilities of carrying on the war, and therefore I am not finding fault with the tremendous financial burden that has followed from the war. But we have to deal with that burden, it is an everyday problem, and for a population of scarcely nine million people the preparation of a budget to meet the ordinary expenses of administration to the extent of $372,000,000 is rather a serious obligation on any government. Not only that, but if the government is fair to the provinces and to the municipalities it must make that burden as light as possible upon all parties concerned, because we cannot forget that our war obligations entail huge expenditures. I have heard those expenditures criticized on the ground that they were not in every case judicious, that great savings might have been effected. And in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Forke), the leader of the Progressive party, who cited to us the other day the conditions in England, let me say that during the war there was a vast difference between taxation in Canada and in England, in this way, that in England much heavier taxation was levied to meet war expenditure than was attempted here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman give figures to show that? I dispute his statement. I say we paid a larger proportion of our debt than England did.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My right hon. friend will not deny that taxation so far as incomes and profits were concerned was levied to a much greater extent in England than here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was on the moderate incomes, not on the higher, and on profits not so high.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): But my right hon. friend levied little or nothing on profits.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, far more than they did in England.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not in comparison with the profits that were made. Of course, that is a matter of opinion, but on the whole I think that in England, irrespective of whether it be applied on a per capita basis or generally, a greater proportion of taxation for direct war purposes was levied during the period of the war than ever was attempted in Canada. That, in part, answers some of the criticisms of my hon. friend who leads the Progressive party.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it is not correct.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I leave my right hon. friend to deal with that if he speaks in this debate. Not only in agriculture, in business and in commercial life, but in every line of activity we had inflation in Canada during the war period. I am not blaming our predecessors in office for that; inflation was prevalent in every country. But some of our problems to-day are resultant from that inflation. My right hon. friends of the Progressive party have laid great stress on the fact that agriculture in this country is in a critical state. I am vitally interested in agriculture, indeed, outside the business of looking after some of the departments of government I have no other interest, and therefore I know something about our agricultural conditions. I do not deny that they are critical, but I do deny that this is the most strenuous period through which our agriculture has passed. In my own experience of less than forty years I have known worse conditions agriculturally than we are going through to-day. The economic condition in Canada is not altogether responsible for all our difficulties; if it were, similar difficulties would not prevail in other countries. I challenge my hon. friends in any part of the House to name any country to-day in which agriculture is in a prosperous condition. It is true that in the United States we have the reverse side of the picture; we cannot say of the United States, as we have to say of Canada, that as a result of the agricultural depression there is depression in industry as well. While the present conditions are bad, we have had other periods just as bad, and I will name one: the period between 1890 and 1896 was characterized by just as much depression in agriculture as exists to-day and that depression was just as severely felt. We recovered from that, however, and made splendid progress in later days.

Now, what is the main difficulty that we have to face to-day as a government? As a result of the war we have to provide a huge annual budget. We have been extravagant in many directions in Canada, and we have not been alone in that respect. The conditions through which we passed induced it and encouraged it. One of the most difficult things to prevent in any country is a condition of inflation, something we fondly call prosperity, a condition that leads to extravagance, large expenditure, and unfortunate speculations that afterwards we must pay for. The war placed a tremendous burden of taxation upon the people. In addition, our provincial governments through force of circumstances, have been extravagant in their expenditures, have in many cases expended beyond the legitimate bounds in many cases. Perhaps the province of Quebec, from which my good friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) comes, is an exception; they have not gone as far in that direction as the other provinces. Our municipalities, too, have expended beyond legitimate bounds. So that to-day we have the problem of paying the accumulated debts and the borrowings that we made against future prosperity. I do not wish to paint a picture that will indicate lack of hope, or the impossibility of improvement, or the impracticability of our emerging from these difficulties with credit to ourselves. I do not think that states the case at all. Nor do I wish to be classed as an optimist who has no good reason for his optimism.

We have, then a public debt, as the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) pointed out the other day, amounting to $450 per capita. My hon. friend was more than generous in his estimate of the earning power of the Canadian family of five, which he placed somewhere in the neighbourhood of $3,000 per annum. He stated that each family must make provision for $100 to meet its share of the public debt. That is a very heavy drain. But we have in Canada vast resources which are yet untouched, great areas of cultivable land, valuable mineral districts, large timber properties, pulpwood areas, and

so on, all awaiting development. We have a splendid heritage; let us hope that we shall be able, notwithstanding the tremendous burdens that we have undertaken, to emerge successfully from our difficulties.

The situation becomes a serious one from the point of view of taxation. My hon. friends of the Progressive party say that we have not gone far enough in the way of reductions. While the depression began, perhaps, with agriculture, it has spread to other lines of business and has made itself felt there. If my hon. friends had to raise money to meet Canada's obligations and to carry on the public service, they would have to exercise due care with respect to the position in which we find ourselves. And what is that position? As the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) enunciated yesterday, for at least thirty years business and industry have been built up in Canada under a system of protection. The statistics show that the number of businesses operating in Canada have increased in the last ten years from 14,000 to almost 35,000; that the investment has doubled and the number of people employed has more than doubled. Rightly or wrongly, representatives of these various businesses have repeatedly stated that they cannot compete with industries across the line and elsewhere unless they are given reasonable protection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask a question?

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. COOTE: I would ask the minister—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Who is first?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask the minister whether he thinks it was right or wrong that these industries have been built up under a system of protection?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can answer in one word: I think it was wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why then is my hon. friend starting to build up another by the same system, namely, artificial silks?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I say it was wrong; I believe that industry would have prospered without the extreme protection offered in many cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not the question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend says it is out of the question.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I said that was not the question. But I will leave the first one and take his answer. Will he answer the second now?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend asks me if silks are to be protected—

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): —to the extent of 30 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not say that. I said if it was wrong—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have got my hon. friend's question; will he permit me to answer it? There has opened up in Canada an industry for the manufacture of silk. Let me say to my hon. friend that I have grave doubts whether we need so much protection for the silk industry. But at the same time, unless we are prepared to reduce with one stroke the protection that exists upon silks, then in fairness I think we should let the industry start on the same basis as those already existing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the duty my hon. friend is putting on that I am asking about. If it is wrong to encourage industry by protection, why is he starting in now to encourage another?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend, of course, will say that the logical answer for me to make is to reduce both, and then see whether this industry would start or not. He will agree that if it is necessary—and those who are engaged in the industry say that it is necessary—that that industry should have protection at the moment, then in fairness to the man who wishes to start a new industry of a similar or almost identical character some protection should be afforded so long as the government are prepared to leave that protection on. So far as I am concerned, I want to know definitely the reason why it is necessary that so heavy a protection is required for any industry in Canada. But let me go back to my original statement. I do not believe and I have had nothing to convince me, that so heavy a rate of protection is required as is given to many of the industries existent in this country to-day. But it is also true that many industries that have enjoyed protection have built up their business under that system. We find ourselves in peculiar conditions in Canada to-day, depressing conditions not only with regard to agriculture but business as well, and much as I would desire reductions in many lines, particularly on the commodities

that enter so much into the lives of our people, reductions that would mean something considerable in the cost of living to the people of Canada, it is not my desire nor is it the desire of this government at this moment to jeopardize any of these industries while they are passing through such a trying period as they are to-day. That I think is a fair answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see it has some bearing on the first, but what bearing it has on the second beats me. If it is a wrong system, why recommence it with respect to any industry?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think I have answered my hon. friend's question fairly. I have said on the other hand that I consider the conditions serious, and I think he and any hon. gentlemen who know anything about business conditions in Canada will agree with me that this is a serious time in the business life of Canada. My hon. friend may say that that is the result of a change of government. I have sometimes heard him say that the Liberal party are responsible for a great many misstatements made throughout Canada. Let me say this to him: I do not believe the Liberal party, or the Progressive party, or any other party, was responsibile for his difficulties on 6th December over a year ago. Perhaps he may apply the same remark to me. I have no complaint to offer for the treatment that I received. The people of my province desired that someone else should take the reins of government, and I was quite willing that that should be done. I am watching with a great deal of interest the results of the new order of things in my province. I am also watching with a great deal of interest the effect of the new order of things in the province of Manitoba. I do not say that in any critical spirit, but with the hope that perhaps they may be able to give a better brand of government than we were able to give in the past.

With regard to the condition of industry in Canada, I do not think the government would have been warranted in going a great deal further in the way of reductions than they have gone in the budget brought down to parliament on this occasion. I have no doubt that we shall be criticized, in fact, we have been criticized already, because we did not go a great deal further in making reductions. While I believe that the tariff plays a very important part in the lives of the people of Canada and in the economic condition of our country, I do not believe that it is entirely responsible for all our difficulties. Sometimes we turn our eyes away deliberately from the real facts. In many cases we are forgetful that inflation is responsible for a large part of our difficulties. We are forgetful that the drought in western Canada is also responsible for a fairly large amount of our difficulties, forgetful, too, of many other things that have contributed to the present condition. We are forgetful of extravagance, for instance. We must get away from that because I see in the future the strongest kind of competition coming from every part of the world. Our transportation systems have made competitors of all our neighbours, whether they be near or far. Furthermore, and here I think my right hon. friend will agree with me because I have heard him make the statement repeatedly almost every country in the world has been increasing its protective duties. That makes it incumbent on those who are charged with the responsibility of government to go somewhat slowly in the direction of reductions, but as a member of this government I want to say this: We are going in that direction, slow though my Progressive friends may think our progress. They may say that it does not amount to anything. Well, if that is the case, it should be a grain of comfort for the protectionists. Our Progressive friends may attack us on the ground that we are not going far enough, but I say to them that if they had upon their shoulders the responsibility of office at a time like this they would consider very seriously before making further reductions. I hope that in the very near future, however, it will be possible without injury to business to make reasonable reductions in the customs tariff of Canada. While perhaps I am not thoroughly convinced that more reductions could not have been made, I for one believe that we have gone as far as we reasonably could have been expected to go at this particular time, bearing in mind the conditions prevalent in Canada.

I want to associate myself with the statement of the hon. Minister of Agriculture yesterday that he did not understand that the statement made by the Minister of Finance on the tariff was a finality. I did not so understand it, nor do I think the Minister of Finance meant to convey that idea. If my hon. friend were sitting where the Finance Minister sits and were being daily interviewed by business as well as agricultural interests throughout Canada, and listened to the varied cases presented, I think that they would say with all the information before them that the Finance Minister had gone as far as he thought it was safe for him to go at this particular time.

I want to deal for a moment or two with the question of immigration. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) was anxious to know when there would be a change in this particular department. Well, I have made some statement with respect to that. I have the responsibility of quite a number of departments, and I would not worry a very great deal should my leader decide at any moment to make changes. Just let me cover the situation as it exists so far as immigration to this country is concerned. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is unwise to place people upon the land in Canada. I argued some weeks ago in this parliament that there was a vast difference between the man who came here with a respectable amount of money and settled on the land, a man without any encumbrances hanging around his neck, and the individual who had accumulated a great deal of debt had taken upon himself large obligations for its repayment. If the man of that first class I mentioned is properly located, I said then and I still think, he will have a fair chance for success. I do not anticipate that there will be a very great difference between the price of the commodities that he must purchase for use in his business and the selling price of the products of his farm. Of course, as the Minister of Agriculture pointed out, the price of most of his products is regulated by conditions in the markets of the world, while the prices of the commodities that he uses are usually regulated by conditions at home. That situation will continue, but I still think that in the reorganization and readjustment of business, in the readjustment of labour that must take place, freight rates will play a very important part in the matter of cost and they are bound to play a much more important part in the future. A reduction of freight rates will count fully as much, in my opinion, as even a drastic reduction in the customs tariff to-day in the lives of the people of Canada. What my hon. friend pointed out yesterday certainly could be done and if followed up by a reasonable reduction in the customs tariff the things hoped for will come about. They undoubtedly will come about if the statements of my hon. friends opposite are to be taken at par as to what they propose to do in the future, and also what may be expected in a reasonable way from this government if we remain in office.

Mr. HANSON: I agree with what the minister has said as to the effect of a drastic reduction in the freight rates. May I ask him what efforts this government are making at this time to bring about that desirable condition of affairs?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If it is true, and I am accepting the statement as true, that the increased cost of labour to the railways represents more than 60 per cent of the advance in the cost of operation, and that there has only been so far a reduction of less than 20 per cent in that cost—I am speaking now of a government owned institution where there are no profits going to the investment but rather a loss incurred—it will come about in a reduction of labour costs. Let me ask my hon. friend, does he think that the government of Canada, or any other government, can regulate the cost of labour upon railways or upon anything else? I do not think they can, nor do I think they would be warranted in trying to do it. These things will adjust themselves, they will be bound to do so. I have been accused in Canada of preaching deflation, but I have no thought that living conditions will be worse for labour even if a further reduction is made in the cost of labour on our railways and in other lines of activity. But that reduction will undoubedly come. One of the reasons why it has not come earlier is, perhaps, that in the country to the south of us there is an inflation which is probably unprecedented in the history of the United States. That will undoubtedly go on for a time. But it is causing considerable uneasiness in Canada because it is attracting many of our best citizens from the Dominion. However, I hope and predict that they will come back to us when the period of inflation in the United States comes to an end.

Dealing with immigration let me say this. Take the statement, if it were made, and I do not believe in newspaper statements on all occasions, that we need co-ordination in immigration work, well, with respect to that let me enumerate some of the things that I have been endeavouring to do, very imperfectly perhaps, possibly it may be said that I have made a very serious failure; but I do not believe that the government of Canada would be warranted in borrowing large sums of money to attract people to Canada and through the medium of loans placing them on the land; I believe they should be attracted in a legitimate way. I believe somewhat with my Progressive friends that the best immigration agent you can have is a happy and contented settler; and with that thought in mind and keeping it constantly

before me, I have endeavoured to so arrange conditions that the settler will write back to the country from which he came advising other people to come and settle in Canada. I do not think anyone will quarrel with me about that. But certainly you could not invite labour to come to Canada when, as last winter, you had unemployment in every city in the Dominion, when various Canadian cities were telegraphing us to know what we were prepared to do in conjunction with the municipalities for the relief of unemployment. I think you will agree with me that it would not have been wise, in view of the conditions which then prevailed to invite immigration of that character. Therefore we set about co-ordinating the activities of the transportation companies and our own activities in Great Britain and on the Continent for the purpose of bringing to Canada people whom we thought we could assimilate, and they are coming forward to a much larger degree than they were one year ago. Our port reports for the past three months indicate a one hundred per cent increase over last year. We have not as large an influx from the United States as we had a year ago, but probably it will come later. Let me say to my hon. friends opposite, and especially to those who are agriculturists, that while conditions are bad in Canada all they have to do is to cross the line and they will find out that agricultural conditions are even worse in the United States where they are having, as I pointed out, perhaps the greatest expansion in a business way in their history. Now, that does not tend to make it easy to attract settlers from that country.

Mr. KELLNER: Does the minister claim that agricultural prices are lower in the United States than in Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, not in every case but freight rates are higher. The price of wheat and commodities of that character are somewhat higher. These prices always have been higher although they vary very considerably in a period of years.

There are other conditions, conditions of taxation, that my hon. friends opposite complain very much about. There is, for example, inflated land values that agriculturists in the United States have to contend with but which are not found in Canada, and for that reason the higher prices there are more than offset. Let me say to my hon. friends—for I am getting authentic reports from the United States as to the conditions over there—that I can give statement after statement of individuals who, if they were able to liquidate the properties they hold in the United States at a reasonable sum, would be willing to emigrate to Canada at once and who will do so as soon as they conveniently can. So that the prospect for immigration seems to be reasonably reassuring. No matter what may be done in the future in respect to immigration I do not for one moment believe that it is necessary for this country to embark upon a scheme that will involve the borrowing of huge sums of money for the placing of people on the land. I agree very much with my hon. friends opposite that it is better to make the settlers we have happy and contented if that is possible. However, it will not be possible for a few years until they have recovered from the serious depression through which they have passed and the obligations which they undertook during that time.

I have tried to point out in a very brief way some of the difficulties that we must encounter in raising the revenue in an equitable manner. The one complaint made by hon. gentlemen opposite is that the budget is not equitable in its character. It is complained that the duties do not bear heavily enough upon luxuries and that commodities in general use in Canada are too heavily taxed. But the point must be borne in mind that we have in this country no large class of rich people in comparison to the population; that most of the business of the country is carried on very largely by the savings of the people; that most of the deposits in our banks do not represent the money of the wealthy but are rather the accumulation of the saving of the middle-class people. An hon. gentleman who spoke yesterday referred to the taxes as bearing too heavily upon the consumer. Well, I presume we are all consumers in that respect. I made the statement once in the province of Alberta, in dealing with this question, that if we are to succeed in paying the public debt of Canada every individual in the country will be required to contribute to the public revenue according to his ability. There can be no question about that, and if it is inequitable, then I would like to sit down with hon. members and consider wherein changes can be made, because I think that in a country like Canada you cannot go to the extreme in taxing capital, as has been advocated by some hon. members. I am very much interested in the experiment of public ownership, but our hope for the future depends upon the development of our natural resources, and the individual who has not capital cannot develop these resources. While we are bringing people to Canada for the

purpose of labour in Canada, and offering them an opportunity in that line, we must bear in mind that it is desirable to attract to Canada capital in a very large way, for the development of these resources. You cannot start a new industry upon labour alone, you must have capital to develop it. If there is need for assistance it is in the earlier stages of development, and if an industry cannot exist after being assisted in the early stages, it should go out of business.

But, hand in hand with the development of Canada we must have the importation into Canada of people and capital as well. The mineral resources of Canada alone will pay the debt of Canada a thousand fold, if properly developed and preserved for the people. Some complaint has been made that we are not conserving as we should the mineral wealth of the country. I have given considerable thought to this matter, and I ask, what have we done in the development of oil alone?—that, perhaps, is a concrete case which might apply to all developments. We have not taken the public funds for the purpose of developing oil, but my hon. friend who preceded me will agree with me that we have made it as easy as possible for capital to come in and start the development work in the search for oil; and if it is discovered, I think the public, after all, are entitled to a fair share of the profit. So far as coal production in Canada is concerned, the provinces that lease their natural resources are taking a toll on coal production—perhaps we should take more. In the case of the timber we are doing the very same thing. The day has long since passed when governments were in the habit of handing out to private individuals the natural resources belonging to the people —where I think they properly belong—and permitting them to be exploited in the interests of private individuals. The hon. member also said that the inheritance tax should be increased.

Mr. BIRD: Does the minister think it is a good thing for the people of Canada that we should fail to balance our budget year by year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree with the hon. member that it would be good business to balance our budget year by year, but would it be good business to undertake to pay off in one or two or three years the railway debt of Canada? I think the hon. member will agree with me that it would not. I do not think we should transfer to posterity any more than is absolutely necessary, but I think my hon. friend should bear in mind the fact that we have a unique condition in Canada, and that we should make taxation as light as possible, having in mind, of course, the fact that we should not delay too long the repayment of the public debt. I think it is advisable not to tax too heavily at the moment. If the proposition I submitted a moment ago had been followed in the earlier stages, there would have been no difficulty about being able to tax sufficiently to pay all the running expenses of Canada, but under the railway conditions that exist to-day—because we are collecting more than enough for ordinary expenses—I doubt the advisability of attempting to clear off by taxation the rising deficits that have occurred the past year or two. We hope conditions will improve and that it will be possible in a year or two to make revenue and expenditure balance each year, and that we shall not carry to posterity an increased public debt.

4 p.m.

Mr. KELLNER: Will the minister tell me how he anticipates that the people are going to be benefited by having coal and oil mergers developed in Alberta?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The people will undoubtedly profit by the royalties collected. The Alberta government are collecting a tax of ten cents a ton on coal. Perhaps the people are entitled to more from that commodity; however, that is the tax they have decided to impose, that is what they think fair and reasonable when they allow private individuals to do the development work and carry on the industry. I think that is as it should be. I do not believe we should go entirely into the business of public ownership in connection with all our public utilities and public resources, but we should preserve for the people what they are entitled to from the vast wealth in these resources. I think on the whole the provinces are attending to that feature pretty well.

I have tried to show, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances we have made an honest effort to cut down wherever possible in the customs tariff. Looking to the future when business conditions are different, perhaps greater reductions can be made. But whoever happens to be Minister of Finance, charged with the responsibility of levying taxation, will always have to bear in mind the conditions of the moment, and not the conditions of the future. Because, unless we increase very rapidly in population—and I hope we shall—and unless our railways begin to produce balances on the right side of the ledger, then the present conditions are

bound to recur. I think that the spirit of recklessness that was abroad, has passed away, and that the people realize that due caution must be exercised in the preparation of our budget.

My hon. friends opposite have seen fit to move an amendment, and I have no particular quarrel with their doing so. But in that connection I wish to say something which I intended to say a moment ago with respect to the income tax. I am not altogether satisfied with the income tax as it is constituted. The one man who pays to the utmost limit, who has no escape from the income tax, is the salaried man and, perhaps, he contributes more in that regard than any other individual. On the other hand, I think my hon. friends will find, if they examine the matter carefully, that the income tax hits fairly heavily the man who has a respectable income from all sources, no matter how large it may be, and that he contributes, according to the money he has a pretty respectable proportion, as things go, in the way of taxation. I may say that one hope for the future in Canada is that we have not yet adopted a direct land tax. In the provinces this has been done in a very moderate way. But it leaves an opportunity for the lands of Canada to be developed, and for a livelihood to be obtained from them; and for the next decade or two agricultural conditions will be the barometer by which business and other conditions will be judged in Canada; that is bound to be the fact. That being the case, I think we should leave that field of taxation entirely in the hands of the provinces and the municipalities themselves, for they will need all that the land can stand in the way of taxation for the carrying on of their own affairs.

With regard to the inheritance tax I want to say just a word or two. For years I have had not only a desire but a hope that a very great increase in the inheritance tax might be placed upon estates by the provinces themselves. I know that the statement is made that you cannot collect this tax. Let me assure the House that there is no desire on the part of the federal government at this time to invade this field. I do think, however, there should be as little restriction as possible on the opportunity of a man to make wealth But if he has enjoyed prosperity and has accumulated vast wealth, then there is no reason whatever why the province in which he has acquired it should not in a much larger way than has been the case in the past take for its own benefit, particularly for educational purposes, a greater inheritance tax. But that is outside the field of federal taxation, and I make this statement merely in answer to my hon. friend, with whom I agree entirely.

Mr. HOEY: Would it not be far more equitable for the Dominion to impose the tax and split it fifty-fifty with the province? If the province imposed a heavy tax a man might leave shortly before he died, settle in some other province, and so avoid paying his share of taxation to the province in which he had made his wealth.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I must leave that to the Minister of Finance. I brought up the matter simply because it was mentioned in the discussion yesterday and because I agree most heartily in the principle, no matter how the tax may be imposed. I have heard the statement made that it would be impossible to collect the tax if you went beyond a certain point, and the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) pointed that out in connection with the cigarette tax the other day. It is possible, in connection with many of the taxes, that if we went too far we might fail of our object; and in this particular case, if we exceeded a certain limit it is not improbable that the distribution of the estate might be made before the tax could be collected. At best, taxes are bound to be heavy on the Canadian people, although I am hopeful for the future, judging by the experience of the past: and looking back over a period of twenty years, I think that Canada, irrespective of what particular government has been in office at any time, can congratulate herself on her progress. In all lines of endeavour huge strides have been made. It has been said that in Ontario particularly, agriculture is lagging and indeed is dying out. The statistics do not show that. They do show, it is true that there are fewer people on the land; but they reveal as well the fact that one individual on the land to-day, with modern and improved machinery and equipment, can produce very much more than five or six persons could twenty-five years ago. And that is being demonstrated. Manufacturing industry and agriculture in Canada are running about equal. I do not think that is necessary. I believe that agriculture should lead in a very large way, and I am prepared as one member of this government, so long as I have responsibility as a minister, to assist in every way possible, and to encourage legislation that will in every respect assist, this industry and promote its interests. After all, agriculture is the basic industry upon which the wealth

and the prosperity of Canada is built. While I say that, however, let me make it clear that I have no desire to interfere with business or industry, believing that it should be encouraged in every way and that industry should be enabled to establish itself, and believing that in every legitimate way it should be fostered. Our aim should be to have industry and agriculture progress in Canada in order that we may have a well balanced condition of affairs. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to cover as briefly as I could a few of the criticisms that have been offered in this debate, and I commend to the good judgment of the House the budget which has been brought down this year by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (East York): In rising to contribute a few remarks to the debate on this budget, to which we have been giving so much consideration, I want to request the Minister of Finance to listen, if he will, to two or three words. First of all, let me congratulate the hon. gentleman on the vigour and energy he has shown in presenting to parliament his seventeenth budget. At this session, particularly when he has to consider a review of the Bank Act, I am sure that the Minister of Finance will receive the greatest sympathy of hon. members in all corners of the House. But I do not think that his colleagues on this account can be relieved of responsibility for the consequences of the budget which the minister has brought down. It is my earnest wish that the minister may be spared a good many years to serve this fair Dominion, not in his present capacity, but on this side of the House. I say that advisedly, because in looking through the budget debates of previous years I find that that hon. gentleman on former occasions has been a very able critic. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we were to take some of the criticisms of the present Minister of Finance, of budgets brought down in years that have passed, and if we were to submit those criticisms in toto from this corner of the House, we might feel that we had done justice to the present debate. In confirmation of this assertion I am going to ask hon. members to listen while I read a few words that fell from the lips of the minister as member for Shelburne and Queens. In 1920, the minister is reported at page 2,509 of Hansard as follows:

> The Minister of Finance to-day gave us some tariff changes which we shall be better able to understand when we read them in detail in Hansard. Let me say, however, that I am sure there must be deep disappointment on the part of a great many members of the House who were, or are, supporters of the government, to find that the tariff reform which they are getting—if you call it tariff reform—is of such a moderate character. We must not forget that the government have for the last two years been, shall I say, coquetting with this tariff question, jollying their friends along and promising that something was going to be done. If I might use a quotation:
>
> "They promise, prepare, propose, postpone
> And end by letting things alone."

Mr. FIELDING: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARRIS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that that little quotation, even if I went no further, would exactly describe the position to-day. But I should be remiss in my duty if I did not indicate a few things which I feel are worrying, to a great degree, the people of the Dominion at this time. Before generalising in regard to conditions I want to refer first of all to some of the irritating forms of taxation which it has been deemed necessary to put on the statute books, not only of the Dominion House, but also of the provinces and of the municipalities during the past decade. The one I have particularly in mind is the sales tax. I remember that in 1915 or 1916, when it was first proposed, the people in the part of the country from which I come were told that it was necessary not only for agriculturists and manufacturers but even for individuals to re-arrange their budgets and cut down overhead expenses, to pay the cost of carrying on the government of the country. I submit that in a large measure the sales tax of one and two per cent as first instituted was absorbed by the manufacturer or wholesaler, so that in the final analysis the ordinary people were not paying more for their goods. But we were not content to rest there, we continued to increase the tax until now it is as high as 6 per cent. Even when it was placed at 4½ per cent we found the higher it was raised the more it was passed on from one person to the other, until to-day, the consumer is paying the sales tax in its entirety. That is what I find fault with in part.

There is another point in the same connection in contrasting the sales tax as imposed under the old regime with that which is now proposed by the Minister of Finance. Formerly goods imported from other countries were subject to a sales tax of 6 per cent, made up of 2¼ and 3¾ per cent; whereas goods manufactured in this country were only carrying a sales tax of 4½ or 2½ per cent as the case might be. Right away I suppose some hon. gentlemen will be inclined to say: There is another form of protection given to the Canadian manufacturer. But that was not the case. Briefly, it worked out in this way. For instance, take as a concrete example a purchasing agent setting out to buy goods in this

country. He went to the various manufacturers and wholesalers for quotations, and perhaps obtained other quotations from abroad. But he always bore in mind that he would have to pay a sales tax of 6 per cent on any goods he imported. What was the result in the majority of cases? It was simply this—it tended to encourage our people to buy goods direct from our own manufacturers rather than from some wholesaler, who had in turn bought from a jobber, who had in turn bought from the manufacturer's agent and who in turn had bought from the manufacturer himself. The proposed amendment will leave room for a large number of such middlemen to again find a vocation. This was discouraged under the provisions of the old Special War Revenue Act, for the reason that immediately the manufacturer sold to the manufacturer's agent, and he in turn to the jobber, and he in turn to the wholesaler, each found it necessary to pyramid —if I may use that expression—the cost of the goods. But the purchasing agent realized that and he was wise enough to buy direct from the source of production. In that way since the inception of the tax under the government which is now represented by this quarter of the House the purchasing agent stepped over all these intermediate men and dealt direct with the manufacturer. This proposed amendment discourages these direct transactions with the manufacturer and will give rise to an increase in a class of people who are not necessary—the middlemen. They should be kept down to a minimum. Large numbers of people live on others' mistakes, and this classe of middlemen in particular will live on the mistakes of this government. I submit that we have quite sufficient middlemen in the community already. Of course, there is room for a few ministers of the Gospel, there is room perhaps for a few lawyers, there is room also for a few undertakers, but there is not room for more of the class of people who want to live on other people's mistakes.

Perhaps I would be remiss in my duty if I did not notice some of the remarks which fell from the lips of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). It was interesting to see him on the horns of a dilemma, to hear his declaration of whether we are free trade or protectionist. But he has been on the horns of that dilemma before, and perhaps he has already endured sufficient criticism for this session. When he rose to defend the government he took refuge in like manner as the Minister of Finance did when introducing his budget, he said: It is easy enough for those who have no responsibility to rise in their place and say that we should balance our budget. He added: Of course, we can do that by taxing the people. But, Sir, in my humble opinion he missed one particular feature which should be voiced more and more on the floor of this House, and that is the cutting down of the cost of civil government. The hon. Minister of the Interior said that he had one vocation outside of filling the Treasury bench—that he was a farmer. I ask him: In his private operations did he not find it necessary during the last four or five years to retrench until it hurt in order to balance his own budget? I say to him: Now you have come into power—you are over there and we are over here—and we propose to criticize you in good spirit. We feel that you are not doing right by the people when you do not bring down the cost of civil government to the point where you can eventually balance the budget. It can be done. You, or at least your supporters, told us on your election platforms from Halifax to Vancouver that this balancing can be done by rigid economy. I am not going to suggest that it should be done by slashing the salaries of our civil servants, for no doubt there are lots of branches in which our employees are not now sufficiently paid. But we see every day around many of the buildings in this fair city of Ottawa one department overlapping another; we see—to take the lowest stage—doorkeepers and other unnecessary people waiting on us hand and foot; we see statistical and other information from one department conveyed to us by another department. In a word, throughout all our government institutions there is too much overlapping. It should be cut out. The people who stumped this country from Halifax to Vancouver in the last general election in support of the party now in office all pointed out how economies could be effected and promised drastic retrenchment if the Liberal party was returned to power. Now I want to see some results.

The ship of state, under the direction of our friends opposite, is drifting. It is manned —I hesitate to use the expression which runs in my mind, but I am going to let it go: the ship of state is manned by a bunch—I hope the Speaker will call me to order if I go too far—of men who are really like a lot of sailors. You know the kind I mean; I do not need to tell you. The Liberal party are drifting, drifting, on to the rocks of destruction. I sincerely trust that they will wake up to their responsibility and see to it that they balance their budget. The Minister of the Interior spoke in the House this afternoon; what relation has his immigration policy to the

budget? In other words, what has the budget done to help him out of the predicament in which he now finds himself? Is there anything in the budget that can be held up to prospective settlers? Is there anything in the record of this government during the last fifteen months which will make the people of other countries say: "That will be a good place for me to settle, a good place for me to bring up my boys and girls?" Is there anything in the budget, anything in the record of the present government, to encourage people to come to our shores? It is time we rose to our responsibilities; it is time we had a little bit of statesmanship here. Let us bring governmental institutions to the same business-like basis as that upon which ordinary business institutions are run, and in the end we will solve many of the problems which at present face the people.

There is one other paragraph in the budget to which I should refer if I am not to be remiss in my duty to the good old Conservative party—tariff stability. I congratulate not only the Minister of Finance but the Liberal party as a whole in coming to an acknowledgement of the absolute necessity of tariff stability. I expected to see with one accord the whole party to my left rise to their feet, but perhaps they will do it with a vengeance when they once get started. It is quite easy to criticize the protective principle; those who have not reviewed the conditions prevailing in Canada from Halifax to Vancouver are wont to agree with many of the policies enunciated by people who are desirous of having in this country a certain amount of free trade. When I think of free trade I am reminded of an industry that I have observed for quite a number of years. It happens to be located in the heart of the riding represented by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). We have there an industry which is indigenous to this country, its raw material being drawn from our own natural resources. It comes under paragraph 9 of the tariff schedule, wood and woodenware products. I am going to give a reason why I feel that it is necessary to have a reasonable tariff as applied to many industries of that nature. These people manufacture such things as clothes-pins, wash-tubs, patent pails and rolling-pins. We have in Canada at present but nine millions of people. The raw material for the things these people manufacture—and I have mentioned only about four of them—is capable of being manufactured into a great number of other lines of goods. If we had a population close to this industry which would absorb the whole output of any one of these articles being the sole product of industry, the whole attention of that manufacturing plant could be concentrated on that one article, and it would not be necessary, perhaps, to have a tariff against similar goods entering Canada. Take any one article you wish—the rolling-pin, for instance. There are more Mrs. Jiggs' in England and the United States than there are in Canada. But take rolling-pins; if that factory were able to do nothing else but work three eight-hour shifts a day in the manufacture of rolling-pins alone, and if there was a market for the product close to the factory which would absorb all the rolling-pins turned out, then it would not be necessary to have protection against that article. I am not going to dwell on that, because twenty or thirty per cent of the material in the Library of parliament deals pro and con, not with tariff stability, perhaps but with tariffs in general.

I am sorry to note in the budget speech the paragraph that has to do with reciprocity. The people of Canada gave notice to the governments of Canada that they did not want to put themselves in the position—oh, I was going to use the expression, of beggars waiting for crumbs in the way of reciprocity to drop from the industrial table of Uncle Sam. It is well known to the powers that be in the United States that we have a Liberal party here which is pledged to reciprocity. Why make the people of Canada feel badly in the thought that they have on record in black and white, embodied in this budget, a request—to my mind, and I am speaking for myself, a begging request—that Uncle Sam should drop a few crumbs of reciprocity from his industrial table? If he should do so, he would only give us something from which he would receive the majority of the benefit; otherwise he would not give it. I submit in all sincerity that it is bad business. It will not be good for the young people of Canada to feel that we lower ourselves—I hesitate to use that expression; but to feel that we put ourselves in a begging position so far as Uncle Sam is concerned.

I must hurry on, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want to take up too much time. I have some sympathy for the view expressed by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) who has suggested on a number of occasions that twenty minutes is sufficient for the average speech. At that rate I have about one minute to go.

A great many committees of the House are sitting at the present and are doing a lot of good work. They are accumulating a great deal of useful information, and I am going to refer to one item of information I gathered from one of these committees on Thursday

last. It has to do with a subject which I am sure is of vital interest to every citizen of Canada, of particular interest to my hon. friends to my left who come from the prairie provinces, as well as to the hon. members for Quebec city. It has to do with cattle shipped from Winnipeg to the port of Quebec for export to Glasgow and Liverpool. Anyone who has sat in the Railway Committee room and looked at the map hanging there, instead of perhaps listening to the orations that have been delivered from day to day, must have been impressed with the shortness of the route from Winnipeg to the port of Quebec and with the possibility of our taking a great deal of the products of our western provinces over the Canadian National down to Quebec, and from Quebec to the markets of the world. It impressed me that way as I sat in the Railway Committee room some two or three weeks ago. I recognize, and we all know, that the transcontinental railway now known as the Canadian National Railway is a white elephant on the hands of the people of Canada. But we are Canadians, and we can rise to the occasion and take hold of that expensive organization that is on our hands now and use it to the best advantage, and here is one opportunity in my humble opinion for us to make use of it. The rail haul via the Canadian Pacific from Winnipeg to Montreal is 62 miles longer than the Canadian National route from Winnipeg to Quebec city. The grade over the Canadian Pacific to Montreal is much harder—I use that word for want of a better term—than the Canadian National grade from Winnipeg to Quebec. Why not, then, ship the 60,000 cattle, which we expect to ship to the Old Country in the next open season, over the Canadian National to Quebec city, and from there to the markets of the world? I merely bring this point up on the floor of the House, not because I hold any brief for the city of Quebec or for our western friends; and I hold absolutely no brief for the cattle industry of this country. I suppose you would expect me to be a little narrow and sectional and think only of Ontario or perhaps one of the Yorks where I come from, but I feel that in short-circuiting Toronto and Montreal in this way we would be doing something of benefit to the country as a whole.

I want to enlarge on that for a moment if I may. There is also some 18 hours shorter travel for cattle going over the Canadian National route to the port of Quebec. There is also that 24 hours' delay avoided going down the river from Montreal to Quebec. What is needed now is a recommendation perhaps from the Agricultural Conditions committee or from some department of this government that the shipping interests shall give the same privileges to the port of Quebec, so far as shipping space and facilities are concerned, as are given to Montreal, and to see to it that perhaps some of the boats of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine—I know some of them were used in 1921—be diverted to take care of this particular traffic, and more particularly to see that no influence emanating from the city of Montreal shall in any way interfere with this flow of trade on that railway—that great white elephant which we still have on our hands. Any remarks I might make in regard to the cattle industry will in my humble opinion apply in the same degree to other products from the western provinces, such as flour, which may flow to the markets of the world.

In view of the fact that I have said this much for the province of Quebec and for our friends from the West, I want to ask their indulgence for a moment while I say something which more particularly concerns the people of Ontario and our western friends, but which in my humble opinion concerns also the whole Dominion of Canada, and that is the canalization of the St. Lawrence river.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARRIS: Someone says, "hear, hear." I do not bring this matter up with the idea of saying that to-day or to-morrow we should immediately go on with the canalization of the St. Lawrence river; but what I do say is that when the Prime Minister of this country receives a message from the United States of America asking his consideration of this great project, the people of Canada should have the benefit of a good and fair debate on the pros and cons of the issue as it was submitted to the First Minister. They should have that debate, so that public opinion could be roused throughout the whole Dominion of Canada, and when that public opinion was sufficiently roused and sufficiently instructed as to the pros and cons and the wisdom of going on with this great piece of engineering work we would be in a position to act on that public opinion. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be in the interests of Canada if some of the academic questions which have been discussed on the floor of this House, such as the single transferable vote, proportional representation, and things of that kind, which do not matter to the same degree as such projects as the canalization of the St. Lawrence, should be put to one side in favour of bigger issues.

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

Mr. HARRIS: Somebody says "louder." Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Agriculture in his oration last night, in his monthly instalment of amusement given to this House, mentioned something about the crack of doom. Now I have always been taught to believe that when the crack of doom is heard an angel shall descend from heaven, and placing one foot on the sea and one foot on dry land, shall proclaim to the people of the earth that earth shall be no more. Mr. Speaker, when that day cometh, I imagine that the hon. member who said "louder"—I do not know who it was, but I think it was the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam)—will probably rise in his place and say, "Louder! louder!"

Mr. PUTNAM: I want to assure the hon. gentleman that I was able to hear him distinctly, and made no such request.

Mr. HARRIS: I most humbly beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but I heard the word drift across from some quarter of the House and naturally thought it came from over there. Was it the hon. gentleman who wears the hat (Mr. Leger)? Perhaps he comes from some part of the country where the sea joins the dry land and will therefore be quite close at hand to receive the message of the angel on descending.

When I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, I was dwelling on a subject which is close to my heart, and that is the canalization of the St. Lawrence river. At the present time we have, as all know, the Welland canal nearing completion, and there is an absolute necessity of reducing the cost of bringing the products of the western farmer to the ocean and to the markets of the world. The cost of getting the grain out of that western country absolutely must be cut down, and if it can be shown to the people of this country that the potential wealth of electrical energy to be developed from the St. Lawrence waterway will be quite sufficient to pay the cost of that whole development and not saddle the people of this country with any extra cost, then I submit that all arguments pro and con should be submitted and public opinion and enthusiasm be roused. It is questions of this sort that should be given consideration by the people of this country. I do not need to dwell further on the subject. All hon. members know the magnitude of that fall and flow of water down the St. Lawrence, and can imagine the millions of horse-power that could be developed and the vast possibilities to follow. I do not want to appear as a dreamer, but I ask the earnest consideration of this House for projects of this kind rather than academic questions.

Before resuming my seat I would like to say something with regard to two or three expressions of opinion I heard in this chamber. One of those expressions emanated from the Progressive side of the House. I did not discover who uttered it but hon. gentlemen will remember the remark was something like this: "The breezes are blowing in the mulberry trees". The speaker seemed to have in mind the idea that part of this country should belong to the United States. He said: "The breezes are blowing in the mulberry trees. How long will it be before these breezes shall turn into a hurricane and sweep these western provinces from us"? Mr. Speaker, that is a wrong attitude, in my humble opinion, to take with respect to the issues in this country. The greatest feat of statesmanship to be accomplished, I think, during the next decade, will be to keep Ontario and Quebec united with the western prairies separated as the eastern provinces are from the West by a thousand mile gap. We in Ontario, and I can speak for the hundred thousand people that I represent, are ready to stand to a man with the rest of the country in repelling onslaughts upon the Dominion such as were hinted at in the remarks referred to. There was also a sort of doubt cast by an hon. member from Quebec, the other day, in speaking about Great Britain, as to whether or not this country really belongs to the British Empire. I do not want to indulge in any flag waving because I did no soldiering myself during the Great War, but let me say to the hon. gentleman in question, one of the gallant men who fought in the period from 1914 to 1918, that the British Empire, in my opinion, has been the greatest agency for good in the whole wide world.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARRIS: I do not want any applause for that, it may seem too much like a recognition of flag waving, but I wish to say that it is absolutely imperative that we stand shoulder to shoulder in defending this great country of ours from all assaults, let them be from within or from without, and to preserve it intact in the interests of the civilization of mankind

As far as the budget is concerned I shall say nothing more than to apply to the action of the government the words quoted in this House by the Minister of Finance on a previous occasion:

> They promise, prepare, propose, postpone
> And end by letting things alone.

Mr. D. F. KELLNER (East Edmonton): Not being possessed of a voice like that of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Harris) I have moved from my customary seat to a position near the centre of the chamber. Like other hon. members who have spoken I would like to commend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for the manner in which he presented the budget to the House. I understand that previous budgets have received considerable commendation because of the manner of their presentation and I think it would be entirely unfitting if we did not extend the same courtesy to the Minister of Finance on the present occasion. There is one point about the budget which seems to be causing a little confusion. That is as to what is meant by "stability." I would like to be possessed of the same powers of oratory as the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat in order to be able to tell you what, in my opinion, this term means. I think that in the West it means "low tariff"; in the East it stands for "protection"; at any rate that is what this term has usually meant in the past and no doubt the same definition will continue to be applied to it.

I discovered in a western paper a characterization of the budget which perhaps, describes it more correctly than I could do. With the permission of the House I will read that article. It says:

> Upon the receipt of Mr. Fielding's budget in lake Winnipeg there was tremendous excitement and enthusiasm among the fish. A flounder dashed in with the great news—"the duty on machines for making fish meal had been abolished." A mud fish refused to believe it and got entangled in acrimonious debate with a catfish. The whole colony of whitefish stood on their ears and wiggled their fins for joy; the suckers received the news open-mouthed, and then proposed that a message of thanks be sent to Mr. Fielding for taking such a burden off the backs of the poor fish in the West. Carried swimmingly.

The foregoing excerpt is taken from the Manitoba Free Press under date of May 14. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the pleasure of hearing many of the speeches so far delivered in this debate; I have been obliged to spend a great deal of my time attending one of the committees. Consequently I hope that in what I say I shall not be threshing over matters which have already been brought to the attention of the House. I have had the privilege of listening to only one or two speakers so far but I would like to make a few comments on some of the statements made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) last evening. I must express a little sorrow that the minister, before giving his speech to the House, did not run it through a cream separator in order that we might grasp its substance more easily. Personally I have not had time to read it all and I am afraid I shall never get that opportunity. The minister endeavoured to impress upon the House that he knew all the troubles that were afflicting agriculture and the remedies for them. He sought to pose as an authority on what kinds of live stock the farmers should keep and he was in no way backward in advising us respecting the manner in which they should be kept, the kind of crops we should grow, and the sort of immigration policy the country ought to pursue. In a word it would take a good-sized encylopaedia to contain all the information and advice which the minister handed out. The hon. gentleman wound up his long address with the bald statement that bad farming is practically responsible for all the ills of the western country. The minister also endeavoured to discredit the amendment moved by the Progressives to the budget, and stated that the reductions in the British preference for which we are asking were less than the government are proposing. I wish to deny that statement most emphatically. The minister gave a table professing to bear out his statement. I have a table which contradicts in some respects the rates given by the minister. Let me quote from it:

	Present rate Per cent	Rate under Government proposal Per cent	Rate under Progressive amendment Per cent	General tariff Per cent
Gray cotten fabrics and fabrics of flax	12½	..	12½	25
Stair linen sheets, table cloths, etc., of cotton or linen..	20	18	15	30
Woollen yarns.	20	18	15	30

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is my hon. friend quoting the relative reductions under the amendment and the budget as respects the British preferential tariff?

Mr. KELLNER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course the hon. gentleman is aware that cotton fabrics now come from the United States. It is from there that we experience competition in cotton fabrics. It does not matter in that case what reductions are made in the British preferential tariff.

Mr. KELLNER: I admit that, but the Minister of Agriculture stated last night that

the government's reduction in the British preferential tariff would be more than under our proposed amendment. It would be a greater reduction, of course. I have a long list of items here, twenty-four in all, and they are all in the same category. The following is the list of these items, with the present rate of duty, the rate proposed by the goverment, the rate under the Progressive amendment, and the general tariff.

	Present rate	Government proposal	Progressive amendment	General tariff
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
Ribbons..	22½	20¼	17½	35
Furniture.	20	18	15	30
Boots	17½	15¾	15	30
Screws	22½	20¼	17½	35
Cutlery	20	18	15	30

Then we get into a line of importations. The first one is iron and aluminum hollow-ware. Hon. members may have noticed that the minister stumbled a bit when he came to that item last night, and I could not help wondering if he quite realized what hollow-ware was. I think I should tell him that it is material for making up caskets and they make it in two different forms, iron and aluminum. They bury their old political pledges, the ones which they never expect to resurrect in the iron casket; it is heavier, and they stay firmly in place. But matters like the tariff, which they expect to bring back and use from time to time, it is much more convenient to place in the aluminum casket. This list continues:

	Present rate	Government proposal	Progressive amendment	General tariff
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
Lamps..	20	18	15	30
Sewing machines.. ..	20	18	15	30
Hats and caps	22½	20¼	17½	35
Gloves and mitts.	22½	20¼	17½	35

I took a great deal of pleasure this afternoon in listening to the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) in his address when he told us that he had no very great objection to the Progressives assuming power in Canada, and he also made the statement that in the provinces where they are now in power they are not making a very great amount of headway. Let me tell him that in mostly every province it was the relics of a poor Liberal administration that put them into power, and it is going to be pretty hard for them, or any other government, to make very much of a showing for a little while at least. He made a very strong plea for capital, and I do not blame him, because hon. members will remember that in the last federal election capital showed itself to be just a little frivolous. In the beginning of the campaign it got in behind the Conservative party and tried to elect them, but before the campaign was very far advanced it switched and got in behind the Liberals and did elect them. Now I think members of the government to-day ought to feel as though they owed a great deal to the capitalistic interests of Canada. The minister also talked about an inheritance tax, and said he thought it should be a part of the provincial taxes. I do not know whether I agree with that policy or not, but it seems to me that at the present time all the millionaires that we have in Canada seem to die either in Montreal or Toronto. I think probably we make them out West, but when it comes to crossing the Great Divide which the member for East York (Mr. Harris) so very touchingly described a few minutes ago, they always end up in Montreal or Toronto, and the inheritance tax is collected in those cities. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that in discussing the minister's statement of last night I omitted to read an extract from the Toronto Globe of April 17th, which I ask permission to read at the present time. It says:

5 p.m.

> In Wednesday's Globe, April 11, is a message from Hon. Mr. Motherwell, Minister of Agriculture, in which he blames the raisers of the scrub steer the off-type hog and the dunghill hen—

A class of animal that is very well known to hon. members of this House; we have often heard of it. The article continues:

> —for the complaints in regard to the condition of agriculture at the present time. If the Minister of Agriculture will travel through any part of Lambton county, Ontario, and I have no doubt any other county as well, he will see for himself the kind of stock kept on the farm and he will hear from men who know their business that the farmers are facing difficult problems.
>
> There is not one man in one hundred who can start on the farm under present conditions and pay for his farm if he lives in the way any civilized man ought to live. The lifting of the British embargo may help stock raisers. It is to be hoped it will, but the best market by far for the Canadian farmer is just across the border.

And I have yet to learn that our Liberal government has taken any step to secure that market for the Canadian farmer. If our government realized the seriousness of the situation, they would remove the duty on all the necessities of life and on all farm implements. If Canada had free trade with the United States, this country would prosper as never before, not only the farmers, but every class in the country, and, to my mind, that is the only way to make Canada the country it ought to be. At present we have apparent prosperity in our large centres of population, but if present conditions continue the pros-

perity of our cities will vanish. The Globe in the same issue makes the statement that the prosperity of the whole country depends on the success of agriculture—scrubs, steers and dunghill hens included, I presume. The Globe says—

> The Globe in the same issue makes the statement that the prosperity of the whole country depends on the success of agriculture: this being so, and there is no denying the fact, it is up to the Globe to use its whole influence for the removal of the obstacles that are throttling agriculture.
>
> The Liberal party should put into practice the platform adopted in 1919 or hand the reins of government over to our Conservative friends who are the fathers of protection in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be bad.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would rather get them another way.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hope springs eternal.

Mr. KELLNER: I think it would be well not to read the rest of the article. I am sure I could not expect any applause for it; so that I will desist.

I desire to offer a few remarks on the budget from a personal point of view; I want to criticize it as I see it myself. I do not know that I shall have the entire support of all Progressives in this section of the House in my stand on this budget and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to have it known that I am speaking only for myself and that part of the West which I represent. When this government took office I think the people of Canada had more hope and greater expectations of its members than had ever been entertained on the accession to power of any former government in Canada. Just previous to the return of the present government we had experienced a period of very great inflation followed by a time of depression. We were still suffering from that depression when hon. gentlemen opposite took over the reins of power. When the armistice was signed there was a lull in the activities of the country. I believe that the people were of opinion that the devastation of war having ceased they could afford to rest on their oars. But very soon we were told that it was necessary for Europe to be rehabilitated, and the people were requested to get to work immediately and produce even more than they had done during the war. It is our opinion now that this request was made probably because certain persons who controlled the destinies of Canada wanted time in which to set their house in order so that they might be prepared to meet the shock which they no doubt knew would come. It has been a great pleasure to me in listening to the discussion of this budget to learn that at last we have reached bottom and have got as far down the abyss of financial depression as it is possible for us to reach. That at any rate is the good news which we have been given.

In my opinion our financial troubles started at the frontiers of our country long before they began in the more urban sections. In the far East and the far West we felt the pinch many months before the people suffered in this section of the country. And that is ever the case. The people living in those outlying communities are never as prosperous as the people in sections like this, and a smaller loss brings them down to the bread line sooner. They are further from the centres of wealth, so that any reduction in the value of their goods is more keenly felt and takes a greater percentage from their profits. Probably that is the reason that we in the West have been more insistent in bringing to the attention of the House the deplorable conditions in which the country finds itself to-day. I hesitate to mention this matter to-day, for I was among those who a few weeks ago were classed as calamity howlers for having referred to the matter at all. We were told that this was one of the things we should not have go out to the world; in fact we were given to understand that it was just about the lowest depth of degeneration even to mention it.

It seems to me, though, that it is a rather poor policy for us to shut our eyes to the unrest that is becoming more pronounced day by day. There is no doubt that people are sinking in financial morasses from time to time through no fault of their own, and they are getting into a frame of mind which this government or any other would do well not to disregard. They seem to feel that human sympathy is dead and that depressing calculations are their only outlook. If that is the state of mind of the Canadian people to-day I think it is high time that these matters were brought to the attention of the House in no uncertain way. This present depression is even influencing social and religious life. A few Sundays ago I sat in Chalmers Presbyterian Church in this city when their budget was brought down, and I gathered from the statement submitted that day that this year there had been paid into the church more money than ever before in one year and that the revenues were greater than in any past year. On the other hand, however, from every remote section of the country it appeared that missionaries had to be called in. Retrenchment is the order on the frontiers of western Canada and in foreign lands, and I believe this is due largely to the fact that a great

volume of the money that is collected is taken up in paying interest charges and meeting similar obligations. And this is the same in everyday life in all occupations.

Now, these were largely the conditions that prevailed when the Liberals took office. But the people seemed to have an unusual amount of faith in that party at that time. No doubt the promises of hon. gentlemen when they were in opposition were still ringing in the public ear; the people were still listening to speeches of the kind made in this House in regard to war graft that had gone on, besides graft in connection with the merchant marine and things of that sort. The people hoped that when this government took office it would be the champion of the working classes. I believe that the people had a special confidence in the Prime Minister who seems to have had a reputation as a man of democratic tendencies and one who had especial sympathy for the weak and those who needed help. If I doubt not the people of the country trusted him to a very large extent. But I am afraid that to-day that trust and the hope they entertained then have gone.

The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird), speaking last night, said that there was no difference so far as he could see between the Liberal and the Conservative parties. I do not think he carried the argument quite to its logical conclusion; I would enlarge on his statement to this extent, that in my opinion, it does not matter which one of these parties is in power, it does not govern the country anyway. I believe that this country is governed largely by unseen hands, by different financial institutions; and it matters not who for the time being occupy government benches, they get their orders. And so far they have been carrying out those orders. At all events, the faith which the people had that a better state of affairs would ensue on the accession of this government to office no longer exists; and if Liberalism means anything to-day I believe it means something shady.

There is just a little too much selfishness at work in this country of ours. There seems to be a supreme desire on the part of some of those who are controlling our destinies to get just a little more than it is possible for the country to let them have. The manufacturers say that it is essential that the prices of goods be kept up; they tell us that it is not wise to monkey with the tariff. They say that if we bring in goods from other countries in competition with them they will have to close their factories with the result that employees will be thrown out of work.

[Mr. Kellner.]

The financiers tell us that we should keep interest rates up and get back to the gold basis as quickly as we can; while the merchants claim that their sales are small and that prices must be maintained because they are not doing a large business. Then the railway companies come along and declare that freight rates must not be brought down, that they must be kept up in order that dividends may be paid. And I do not think that anyone will doubt that the professional men of the country have gentlemen's agreements to keep up their charges, and that they are doing so.

On the other side are a large number of people paying these excessive charges—people who live neither in Montreal nor in Toronto—and their purchasing power has been so greatly reduced that commercially they are of little benefit to the country. They are asking for cheaper money, for lower tariffs, for the lessening of taxes on the necessities of life; to all of which this governmenet turns a deaf ear. I think the government's real policy is probably brought out a little clearer in some of the speeches we hear in this chamber from their supporters rather than in the budget proposals, and as far as I am able to size up their policy from such speeches it amounts to about this: Work harder—cut down expenses—raise a lot more goods and send them to some foreign country to be sold at about two-thirds the price they will bring in Canada.

The charge is made that poor farming is largely responsible for conditions as they exist in the West to-day. I think the charge is very unfair. Going back to the days of the war, when we were asked for greater production, I would put this question to hon. members: What country anywhere in the world produced in anything like the same proportion as western Canada? And is there a farmer in any other country to-day who produces anywhere near as much as the western farmer does? One hon. gentleman in speaking during the debate on immigration, I think it was the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), stated that it was the farmer's own fault that he found himself in the position he occupies to-day. "Why," exclaimed the hon. gentleman, "he does not live in a sod shack like he did in the days when I was a boy; he lives in a real house now. He is spending far too much money. He even climbs into a Henry, steps on the gas and runs around like other people do. The farmers of the West to-day are overstocked in land in machinery and in other things." I should like to compare the ad-

vancement of the farmer with the advancement of people engaged in other occupations to-day. Would hon. members who feel that way about it care to go back a few years and view the life that professional men then lived? I think they will find that then there were very few of our professional men living in modern houses such as they are able to afford to-day; most of them would be found above a store or in similar quarters. May I also call the attention of the House to the fact that from the standpoint of intelligence the professional man is not by any means outclassing the farmer? We have quite a number of lawyers and doctors in this chamber, and I want to ask you: If you had a very difficult case to argue which one of these distinguished gentlemen would you engage? Would you rather do as the Dominion government did, go down to Toronto and hire a lawyer at $400 a day, and perhaps go across the line and hire two or three more at a similar rate? I remember in the days when I was a boy on the farm back in Ontario we had a doctor who used to visit our farm, a distance of eight miles from his home, and he did not drive a McLaughlin Six or any car of that kind but a horse and buggy. He made those eight miles for $2.50 a trip—just about what a doctor to-day will charge for writing a prescription.

The difference between what those engaged in the various professions are earning and what our farmers earn was plainly brought out before the Banking and Commerce committee the other day, when the manager of the Weyburn Security Bank told us that they had received reports from two hundred and forty of the best farmers in Saskatchewan which disclosed that their annual revenue above operating expenses had been $600. Now, in nearly every instance that would represent the wages of two people, in many instances the wages of several people—the farmer, his wife and family. For a whole year's work they got the magnificent sum of $600. No doubt that meant getting up about four o'clock in the morning, milking the cows, feeding the calves and working until probably six or seven o'clock at night, and then doing the same chores again before going to bed.

Mr. PUTNAM: I suppose the hon. gentleman does not overlook the fact that those two hundred and forty farmers each made $600 over and above living expenses?

Mr. KELLNER: No, I had not overlooked that. I am quite willing to concede that in these cases they did make their living and $600 in addition according to the evidence of the manager of the Weyburn Security Bank. I was very much surprised to hear this for I did not think it was possible. However, would the hon. member wish to compare that income with, say the income of Mr. Tilley when he was acting for the government in the Grand Trunk arbitration—$400 a day and expenses? That is just a little bit too much of a spread. While the farmer had his living during the twelve months he was making his $600, so also had Mr Tilley when he was making his $400 a day.

Mr. PUTNAM: If I might answer the hon. gentleman, I do not think the comparison at all relevant. But I have heard that the ambition of the Noble Foundation Farm did not differ from Mr. Tilley's.

Mr. KELLNER: I might advise my hon. friend that that farm is in the hands of a receiver at the present time.

Mr. GOULD: Absolutely

Mr. PUTNAM: I said the ambition of that concern did not differ from the Tilley ambition. The only difference is that one had luck, the other had not.

Mr. KELLNER: I do not think "luck" is the right word there. One had an organization behind him to see that legal fees did not go too low; the other had no such organization to see that his grain prices did not go too low. I think that is probably the crux of the situation.

In discussing this budget a good many hon. members try to ridicule representatives of the West because we come here and ask for lower tariffs. They try to make out that we do not altogether know what we are talking about and that it would not be a good thing for us to have lower tariffs. I may tell this House that these hon. gentlemen can never make protectionists of the people of western Canada. Neither can they convince western Canada that the people in that part of the country should submit to the excessive interest rates that they are paying to-day. They cannot convince them, either, that it is their duty to pay the high freight rates they are paying to-day. When we ask for lower interest rates it is not going to do us any good to tell us we have the best Bank Act in the world, and say, "You farmers keep your horny hands off it." And when we tell you that we want lower tariffs, it is not going to do any good to get into a discussion of tariff stability or anything of that kind. When we ask for lower freight rates, it will not get you anywhere to tell us that the present rates are just

as low as they can be and permit the payment of dividends. I think there is a spirit abroad in the West to-day that will not be much longer denied. When we see the transportation companies and the elevator companies exploiting us from coast to coast in weights, in grades, in transportation rates, it is only natural that we should feel just a little bit strong on some of these questions. We cannot be intimidated, either, by being told that we do not know what we are talking about; the dissatisfaction which prevails in the West will, I am sure, never die out until times are made better. If this House cannot conceive of anything that will enable us to get on our feet, then I say to you in all sincerity, do not do anything to increase that flame. If conditions are such in this country that we cannot live together as one family, by all means do not interject anything into this House that will keep us from being good neighbours.

I have often thought while sitting here in this House that those who have control of the government frequently lose sympathy with the people. It has often been given as the reason why Rome fell that she had disregarded the soul of her people, and I am just a little bit afraid there is a tendency in this House and in this country at the present time to disregard the soul of the Canadian people. There is nothing that will inspire men to the same degree of feeling as a fight for their existence, and that is what the West is fighting for to-day. We are rapidly losing our homes in that district, and it has been well demonstrated that if there is anything that will inspire a man to action it is to see his home going.

Before I close I would like to call the attention of the House to the very awkward and unsatisfactory position which the Progressives are in at the present moment in this House. We realize that we have little to expect unless we are well enough organized to go out and win enough support to carry the government of this country. At the present that is hopeless, for we have no organization in the East at all. Probably it could be accomplished in the very near future, but at present it is out of the question. Now, we are forced to this position of affairs: Should we defeat this government by some manoeuvre or another —and no doubt we could do it—what in the name of common sense have we to expect from the Tories? So we are forced to sit here; we take the ridicule of the press quite frequently, but we are helpless to better our position, for if we did switch parties the chances are we might get the worst of the switch.

An hon. MEMBER: It could not be any worse.

Mr. FORKE: Do not be so hopeless. There is a chance for us yet.

Mr. KELLNER: In conclusion, I think it would be well, if this country wishes to avoid broils and internal strife, that more attention be paid to the demands which come from the West. The representations made should not lightly be passed by; we should not merely be told it is our own fault. There are many of us who have been through the mill. We have seen the homesteader go in there and work as hard as any man possibly could, exercising all the frugality that any man could be expected to exercise, and the blame is not his; it is that of the method by which our business is carried on in this country. It is my opinion that that method must be changed; otherwise it is very doubtful whether the boundaries of our country can be maintained as we know them to-day.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the budget, I feel that my first duty is to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for having, after barely fifteen months of administration, so considerably improved the financial conditions of the country. What a change he must have noticed, after having been in office in 1911. as Minister of Finance during the fifteen years of the Liberal regime and having left the Treasury well supplied, he found the country, after ten years of Conservative administration, indebted, ruined and at the threshold of bankruptcy, without mentioning all the other evils—the race question, the strife of capital versus labour—which afflicted the country.

It is an established fact, Mr. Speaker, that in 1911, when the Canadian people, in an hour of weakness, threw over the Laurier government, the national debt amounted to only $340,000,000, and, in 1921, the debt of Canada had reached the figures of $2,340,000,000. Under Laurier, the interest we paid amounted to only $12,000,000 per year; the interest we have been paying since 1921—after the Borden-Meighen administration—amounts to $140,000,000 per year. In 1911, the debt per capita was $47, and ten years later it had increased to $266. These figures speak for themselves and I challenge our opponents to deny their truth. Some may

say, this is a fact, but it is due to the war. Yes, we have experienced a war, but it is not the only factor responsible for all this increase in our debt. Have we so soon forgotten the Borden government? Who does not recall that members of this House supporting the Borden government were forced to resign because they had speculated, for instance, on drugs, on articles of first necessity to assist our soldiers who were wounded on the battlefields? Who has forgotten that another member was obliged to resign for having speculated on horses bought by the government for the war? Who has forgotten the gift of $100,000 made out of the public funds, to a lady stenographer? Who does not recollect the boot scandal, boots made from paper and paid the price of first quality goods, and all this to enrich the government's friends. Yes, Sir, we have had a war; it was a costly one, however, the country's debt would be but half as large, if we had had an honest and economic government, whose object had not been to enrich trusts and profiteers. Under Laurier's administration, that is between 1896 and 1911, we passed through the golden age; everybody was earning; agriculture had progressed, lands rose in value, farmers having become comfortably off were entirely satisfied, the labouring class was happy, salaries were ample, the cost of living was low; but, during the ten years of Conservative administration, agriculture fell, farmers were imposed upon, farm products found a market but it was the middlemen who carried off the profits, speculated and enriched themselves. I still have a vivid image of these leeches, these vipers with human faces known as trusts who acquire at low prices the products of the farm, such as beef, butter, cheese, etc., hoarding them in warehouses and only agreeing to sell them at exorbitant prices, while during that time the working class was starving, all this taking place under the watchful eye of the Borden-Meighen government.

Mr. Speaker, this is the origin of the United Farmers and Labour parties. The farmers were imposed upon, the labouring class suffered, they were discontented, they grouped together into associations, in political parties in order to protect themselves, rightly have they done so. Under the Laurier regime, the country had expanded, two new provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan took their place on the map of Canada. All these facts cannot be mere accidents; we should infer from them that the Liberal policy established by Laurier and followed for the last fifteen months by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is the wisest policy for this country, a policy of the people, an entirely democratic one whose object is not to enrich a small number of select people to the detriment of the consumer, but whose aim consists in everybody participating in our national wealth, developing our industries in towns, not neglecting however the first of all industries: agriculture, which is the foundation of our national wealth.

Yes, we must encourage the farmer because he is the one,—this noble artisan of the soil,—who is the most necessary to the growth of our country. This truth is so evident, Mr. Speaker, that in the face of this world-wide upheaval caused by the Great War—this after-war crisis—all thoughts have turned to the land, to the development of agriculture, our only hope to save the country. I, therefore, take this occasion to ask the government to still lower, if possible, the duties on agricultural machinery and all the implements necessary to the farmer. We want to lower the cost of living. Well, let us be consistent; let us begin by lowering the cost of production, let the Dominion government acquiesce in the provincial governments' requests and grant them the money necessary to build good roads in the country, let them establish everywhere model farms so as to improve the farming methods, give these people the means of enjoying life, procure them comfort so that their children will give up the thought of leaving the farm and emigrating to cities for the purpose of enjoying the comforts which they are deprived of in the country.

I wish to congratulate the government and especially the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine on their achievement, during their last trip to Europe, in concluding trade connections with France and Italy. The United States have so enhanced their tariff that we are almost unable to trade with them, we, therefore, need new markets for our farmers and industries. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) has also travelled all the way to Australia so as to come to a trade agreement with that Dominion; I trust that his trip will bear good results.

I also want to thank the right hon. the Prime Minister for having had the courage to refuse the invitation of Mr. Lloyd George, then Prime Minister of England, to take part in the war which seemed impending with Turkey. It was more than time that some one put an end to this excess of imperialism. The whole Canadian nation, the entire press of Canada approved the Prime Minister's conduct in this matter; there was but one critic, one dissenting voice, that of the right

hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). He would have liked, I suppose, despatching our Canadians to be killed across the seas; he would have felt some satisfaction in forcing upon us a new conscription act.

Let the hon. ministers pursue their good work. The Canadian people do not expect that the present government will succeed in remedying, in a few months, the wrongs perpetrated by the Borden and Meighen governments, during their ten years in power, with their policy of wanting to sacrifice the very last man, the very last dollar to save the Empire. Nor do the people expect that they will immediately change deficits into surpluses, the wretched times into a golden age, but they do expect the government to improve the financial conditions of the country by practising a strict economy, by ceasing to meddle in European affairs and by initiating a policy essentially Canadian, and for the Canadians.

I wish to say a few words, Sir, on the immigration question. I fully realize that it is a serious and embarrassing problem; indeed, the question before us is whether we shall disburse large sums of money to bring hither immigrants from Europe, when many of our best Canadians emigrate to the United States. I know full well that the greater half of our territory is yet to be settled; that we have an abundance of natural resources, which only await willing hands to develop them; I realize that we have a territory that can feed 100,000,000 people and that we number hardly 8,000,000; I am aware that we have a railway system which is a burden to the country, and does not pay for its upkeep because we have not the traffic nor the necessary population to feed it; I concede that it was immigration which built up the wealth and developed the United States which, at the time of their proclamation of independence, in 1775, consisted only of a few thousand people, while to-day they have reached the enormous number of 112,000,000. Notwithstanding all this, I wonder whether, in the present financial conditions we are placed in, the time is propitious to disburse money to bring over immigrants who, perhaps, will swell the number of the unemployed in cities. I wish to protect the Canadian workman, he is the one who needs most protection because he is the most affected by the present crisis. For the last few years, there has been a shortage of work, salaries have dwindled down to such an extent that many of our families in Hull and elsewhere are forced to cross over to the United States to earn a living. It is sad, Mr. Speaker, to witness our young men, capable and vigorous, cross the border to enrich the United States citizens when we have here a country just as advantageous as theirs. Let the government find means to keep on this side our population rather than spend money to bring over immigrants.

I realize that the government mean well, they want to place these immigrants on the land so as to develop agriculture, but I fear that these people who, for the most part, have not been brought up on the farm, will make but a short stay on the land and eventually find their way to the cities, displacing the Canadian workman. Would it not be wiser for the government to make use of this appropriation to keep our people here instead of disbursing money to bring in strangers who have neither the characteristics nor the ways of Canadians. I would suggest that instead of spending millions to promote immigration, the government begin immediately the construction of the Georgian bay canal which will open up the country and will give work to our people for a number of years to come.

I also wish to make a few remarks in regard to the Civil Service Commission: when the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) submitted to this House his resolution to abolish this Commission, I happened to be sick and could not give my views. I am opposed to this Commission as it stands today. I maintain that it is unconstitutional and I fail to understand why the government tolerate a Commission which has more power and more prerogatives than they have. Let candidates pass the Civil Service examinations for the positions of copyists or type-writers, but let us return to the Act passed under the Laurier government—that will be satisfactory. According to this Act, the Commission only exercised its control over the inside service but I cannot conceive how the commissioners should be in a position to judge of the qualifications of candidates to positions in the outside service, for instance, a lock-keeper, a postmaster, a carpenter, a labourer, etc. This is so much the case, Mr. Speaker, that for these kinds of positions, the Commissioners are advised by a committee of citizens gathered a little everywhere in Canada. Do not imagine, however, that the members of this committee—amongst whom I see the names of defeated candidates at the last general elections—do not favour their friends; therefore we have a recurrence of patronage, though in a roundabout way and under different control. Why not leave the appointments to the government who would in turn be advised by the members who, at least, are responsible to the people. I was quite astonished

to hear the Conservatives say, at the time this discussion took place, that the Commission must not be disturbed as it would lead to a return of patronage. These good Tories have become over-scrupulous; yet they are the ones, who, in 1911, when they came into power, dismissed 3000 employees because they were Liberals and replaced them by their political friends. They had appointed commissioners to make an inquiry throughout the whole country, and, Conservatives seeking positions had but to come before these Commissioners to have Liberal employees dismissed, stating that they had taken part in the political campaign. In my own place, the city of Hull and the county, many were dismissed through such means. If only the government of the day had been satisfied with replacing those employees who were dismissed! But things were much worse than that; in order to please their friends they crammed all the departments to overflow: 12,000 new employees were appointed. It was at that stage that American experts were called in, the Griffenhagens, to establish the famous classification, which was carried out with a great deal of partisanship and injustice, to such an extent that 15,000 employees appealed from the ruling of this classification. I congratulate the government for having appointed a committee of inquiry who will re-establish the facts and will, I hope, facilitate the amending of the Civil Service Act.

Before closing my remarks, I wish to remind the government that last session this House adopted unanimously a resolution which I had the honour to move, asking to adopt an old age pension act. ,I fully understand that the financial situation of the country is such that it is difficult to even comply with just demands, but this legislation is so necessary, it commends itself so strongly that it should be the first to be taken into consideration by the government. I do not wish to repeat the speech I made last year on this subject, but allow me to remind you, Sir, that the Canadian people expect that the government will move in the matter. I have received hundreds of letters, from all over the country, asking me to follow up this project, and even lately, I had the honour to join a Nova Scotia labour delegation which waited on the Prime Minister. They came here to impress upon the government the necessity for this old age pension and ask the government for immediate legislation to that effect. I was very much pleased with the encouraging reception that the Prime Minister gave this delegation and specially in hearing him say that it was one of the subjects on his programme, that he had at heart the carrying out of this project and that the legislation in question would certainly be brought down as soon as the government's finances permitted.

Before I resume my seat, I wish to state that I shall vote against the amendment of the Progressive leader (Mr. Forke). I place very little faith in their policy which only favours the western provinces. If we want the country to progress and Confederation to be maintained, we must have a policy which favours equally all provinces and all classes. It seems to me that the old eastern provinces have done their share of sacrifice to develop the West. If to-day we are overburdened with taxes, if we have a system of railways which shows a large yearly deficit, it is because we have built two transcontinentals so as to help in developing the West. If the government were to accept the Progressives' suggestions and establish free trade and abolish the duties which are the main sources of our revenues, where would they get the money to meet the $140,000,000 of interest which is due yearly? Where would they get the money to administer the affairs of the country? They would be forced to have recourse to direct taxation, and again it would still be the old eastern provinces who would have to pay the larger share, since they have reached a higher degree of development than the western provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I have full confidence in the Liberal party and its leaders. I approve of their policy; I shall therefore vote with pleasure for the budget as brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, the small attendance in the chamber during this debate evidently indicates that now the session has entered upon its fourth month members are about prepared to go home. In my opinion no good object can be gained by delaying the session.

First of all I want to congratulate the veteran Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) on the budget statement he presented the other day. The minister has served a great many years in public life and is admired and respected by everybody.

I must say that I admire the manner in which those who have so far spoken in this debate have presented their case. There is room for differences of opinion in a big coun-

try like Canada, but up to the present those hon. members who have spoken have displayed good feeling and a spirit of fairness which have won the respect of those who have listened to them.

Bearing in mind that this is the 105th day of the session I am sorry there should have been so much delay in bringing down the budget. I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Finance has a good many outside matters in the French and Italian treaties to attend to and that he is really overworked; but I think it would be better if this government in future would copy the example of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Old Country, Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin, who presented his budget speech in the British parliament on the 10th day of the session. If this government emulates that example in the future I think it will be a step in the right direction.

In my opinion the tariff is not a political question, and I would urge that an authority be set up in this country that could act in an advisory capacity to the government, in relation to this particular problem. The tariff should never have been made a political football by this or the other political party in Canada. It is not a political question in any sense. It is an economic question, a business question, a question of trade and commerce; and more than that it is a great national, patriotic question that concerns every citizen of this country. Neither is the tariff an academic, or what you might call an abstract question, or an abstract theory; it is a national and economic necessity.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond), who yesterday made an able and very fair speech, characterized by courtliness of manner, spoke of the tariff question as being a study in national psychology. I do not agree in that statement. I believe the tariff question is a great problem which concerns everybody and for that reason should not be approached from the party spirit, or with a view to reaping party advantage. There has been a tariff in Canada ever since Canada has been a country. There are those who would like to abolish the tariff; and if I understand the purpose of the amendment it aims to practically eliminate the tariff. Even as far back as 110 years ago we had something in the nature of a tariff.

The Liberal-Conservative party has always been a consistent protectionist party. From the days of Sir John Macdonald every Conservative government we have had have been protectionist, and the party preached the same gospel of protection in every part of Canada. In the last election the leader of this party Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, preached that doctrine whether it was in the Maritime provinces, in central Canada, in the prairie provinces, or on the Pacific coast.

Wherever he went he preached the gospel of moderate protection adequate for the industries of this country. After all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, it was not any political party that made Canada a nation. The people themselves had something to do in bringing that about as well as the government. In my opinion, however, it was the National Policy that made this country the great nation which it is to-day. You may criticize the National Policy if you like, because it has some defects, but when you criticize the defects of the National Policy do not forget its virtues. It is owing to those virtues that Canada has achieved her proud position as a great industrial nation.

The present Minister of Finance has been responsible for the inauguration of seventeen budgets and if you take the seventeen tariffs introduced under them they are what economic writers would not hesitate to call protective tariffs. Eighty-five per cent of the products of Ontario have a home market in the near cities and towns, and the producers obtain the highest price that can be realized in fair competition on this continent to-day. That home market is not one that is here to-day and away to-morrow. It is a steady market, and is to be found in many cities and towns along lake Ontario, lake Erie, the upper lakes and in the district south of the National Transcontinental in Ontario. An election is pending in Ontario now, and I say that I do not believe the farmers of Ontario believe in free trade, nor do they believe in reciprocity. If it were not for the protection which the farmers of Ontario have had, in view of the hostile tariff commonly known as the Fordney-McCumber tariff, the farmers of Ontario would be 100 per cent worse off than they are to-day, and the province would be suffering from under-production, unemployment, depression, and rural depopulation to a greater extent than at the present time. That remark applies to eastern Canada as well. A very distinguished statesman, Hon. J. Israel Tarte once said that platforms were made to get in on and not to stand on.

My Progressive friends, for whom I have every respect, had a platform in the late election, not only in Ontario, but in other

parts of Canada, which was commonly called a free trade platform, and they made good their promise by placing the principles of that platform in the amendment which is before the House to-day. While I do not believe in the principles which they enunciate. I give them every credit for their sincerity. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Raymond) preached the gospel of adequate protection for the industries of his great city of Brantford. That city is a great industrial centre, in common with other cities in Ontario such as Toronto, Hamilton, London and others. Why? Owing to the principle of adequate protection for the industries of the country. In 1878 the city from which I came had to open soup kitchens. These soup kitchens had to be opened to meet the wants of the large number of men out of work. Many people emigrated to the United States, and the Mayor of Chicago said that that city had become at that date the third largest Canadian city in the world. There was a great deal of unemployment at that time. We had many vacant houses and stores, and evidence of distress on every hand. When the policy of protection was adopted it stimulated the growth of Toronto, Hamilton, Brantford and other places, and the trade and commerce and the population of these cities have greatly increased. Toronto has doubled in population every ten years. The post office receipts for the city of Toronto were over $5,000,000 last year, and the receipts from customs, inland revenue and other utilities, to say nothing of banking, industry, trade and commerce have increased prodigiously. Toronto is only one of the many cities which have made industrial strides as a result of protection. Geography has taught the people of Canada a lesson in more ways than one. It has taught them not to leave themselves at the mercy of a foreign country like the United States in regard to fiscal affairs, especially when the people of that foreign country are the wealthiest and most prosperous, ambitious and industrious people in the world to-day.

Every country in the world is increasing its tariff. Not only the various countries in Europe, and the United States, but Australia, New Zealand and the countries of South America are all increasing their protective tariffs. Can it be argued that all these countries are wrong and that the Progressives in Canada alone are right? I maintain that, as a result of the Great War, more protection will be required to meet the changing conditions in the years that are to come. Sir Richard Cartwright once said that if his party were returned to power he would remove every vestige of protection from the statutes of this country. If you examine the seventeen budgets of the present able Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), as I said a few minutes ago, you will find they are all protective tariffs. The tariff resolutions before the House to-night are all of a protective character. The best part in the whole budget speech I think was that in which the Finance Minister spoke of the stability of the tariff. That is an economic principle which is accepted the world over. He said:

> There is a thought which does not receive as much consideration as I think sometimes it should be given in public discussions, and that is the desirability of something like tariff stability. Business men do not like to be always threatened with changes in the tariff. There is no finality in legislation either as respects that tariff or as respects anything else. That which parliament can do to-day it can undo to-morrow. Everybody knows that. Everybody must conduct his business in the light of that fact. Nevertheless it is desirable that something like an assurance of tariff stability should be given to business men.

I may say the very able and distinguished Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) has on more than one occasion agreed to that doctrine, and I am glad to say that we have, such an able, patriotic and well liked member of the government in the very responsible position of Minister of Justice, because he has done a great deal to instil a sense of responsibility into the government along the line of stability of tariffs.

I may say, as one of the harbour commissioners in Toronto in 1919-1920 and 1921, that we lost a large extension of a basic industry, the Baldwin Tin-Plate Industry from Wales. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer was the president of that company. We had a contract signed and sealed by them to lease some thirty-six acres in Ashbridge's bay, in the industrial area.

It promised to be one of the largest concerns on this continent, and they were going to manufacture granite plates, and tin plates.

Some of the directors came from Swansea, Wales, the headquarters of the company. They spent a large sum of money in erecting a factory, machine shops and buildings, and they were going to in time employ 1,800 men. Just as they got under way bad times came, and there was a conflict between the political parties with regard to the great economic question of the tariff in Canada.

Statements had been made in the House and out of it to the effect that if there were any people in Canada or out of Canada who were contemplating establishing or extending new lines of business in which they felt protection was necessary, they should not do so.

A distinguished member of the present government made a speech and said: "I will do them a friendly service and say to them 'Do not do it'". Such remarks were made, not only by a distinguished member of the government, but by others, including some members of the United Farmers of Ontario. As a result, the Baldwins did not go on with the proposition because at that time the tariff was in politics in Canada with no guarantee of stability and for that reason they did not proceed. In that way we lost a large basic industry, with the result that many of the men who were engaged for that industry had to leave our city and go to the United States, and there were a lot of skilled workmen among them. For that reason, if for no other, I agree with the statement of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice in this connection, and I think it will commend itself to the wisdom and judgment of the country. I am not one of those who blames the government for changing its policy completely. After all is said and done, a government is something like a progressive business man or individual. A man may conduct a business one way to-day and change it to-morrow, and he may change his policy through no fault of his own. For that reason, I have never believed in talking about what one party has done and what another party has done, because two wrongs do not make a right. Therefore, I give the government credit, when they came into office, for being business men enough not to upset the old order of affairs in the matter of protection which had been a good thing for the country, for the city man and the farmer as well.

In looking over the tariff proposition before the House to-night, one could not consider the proposed tariff a low one. When an article is marked up as high as artificial silk, which is 37½ per cent, you could not by any means represent the tariff that gives you this rate as a low tariff. Nor can you say that this is a tariff for revenue only, because the revenue is not equal to the expenditure. Although there has been deducted the sum of $2,500,000 on sugar at the rate of a half a cent per pound, there is a decrease in the budget for excise of $5,600,000 and a deficit of $57,000,000. You cannot therefore say that this is a tariff for revenue alone, because, as I have just indicated, the revenue is not equal to expenditure. Furthermore, the Minister of Finance cannot claim that it is a free trade tariff: if we look over the duties and bounties, and take into consideration direct and indirect aid to industry, we are forced to the conclusion that the budget is far from being one of free trade but is a fairly High Protectionist one.

Now, I am opposed to the amendment which has been submitted to the House and I shall vote in support of the minister's motion. I believe that the national policy of Canada should be brought up to date and that further amendments should be made in it for the purpose of conserving our own industries for our own workmen, and keeping our own markets for our own products. That is the policy that this country needs, and inasmuch as the budget goes to some extent in that direction I shall support it. Among our imports from the United States during the last year we purchased potatoes to the extent of $423,000. The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) speaking in this House the other evening made this statement:

> Since the hon. member has coupled my name with this, I should like to dissociate myself with it entirely. We want free entry of our potatoes into other markets.

In other words, the hon. gentleman wants free trade in potatoes. Well, Mr. Speaker, is that practicable or advisable? If we had free trade in potatoes with the United States where would it land us? In this connection I would ask the House to bear with me while I quote an article which appeared in the May Bulletin of the National City Bank on the question of potatoes, which shows the disastrous condition of affairs that now exists in connection with this particular product in the United States. Before I read this article I want to say right here that I agree with the policy of the government in imposing a duty on potatoes. This, I think, is only proper, and I am convinced that the farmers of Ontario as well as those of the Maritime provinces will see the wisdom of the Minister of Finance in maintaining the tariff on this product. The article I am about to quote from supplies the answer to the hon. member for Carleton in regard to his proposal of free trade in potatoes. As I have stated, it appears in the monthly bulletin of the National City Bank, which is one of the largest institutions of the kind in the world. It publishes a bulletin monthly on the economic affairs of the world including the United States, Canada and other countries. With regard to the question of potatoes this article has the following to say:

> It is easy to see what has been the matter with potato prices. The acreage last year was large, and the average yield per acre also large. The big consuming sections of the country had enough potatoes grown locally to nearly supply their wants and did not require to import them long distances, hence potatoes were in over-supply in states like Minnesota, the

Dakotas and Idaho. Potatoes are not a crop that stands shipment very well or that can be carried over from one year to another. Incidentally, as they are not a crop traded in on the exchanges, the low prices could not be laid at that door.

From the quotation I have just submitted to the House it must be obvious how impossible it is for us to have free trade with the United States in potatoes, for the simple reason that they have not a market over there at the present time for their own crop of last year; and the balance of that crop of theirs will just about equal the demand for this particular commodity in the United States. I stated a moment ago that we import from the United States $423,000 worth of potatoes, and I am firmly of the opinion that the minister is acting wisely in placing a duty on this article. There is another commodity on which I should like to see a duty imposed, and that is eggs. If we want to trade with the people of the United States we must have something to trade with, and I have just proved that there is no basis upon which we can trade with them in the matter of potatoes. The people of this country during the past year imported from the United States $3,162,600 worth of eggs. I would place a duty on this article coming into Canada, because I think we should preserve the home market in this commodity for the Canadian farmers, and this would be a nice little side line for them in Ontario. There are many hon. gentlemen to my left who apparently are of the opinion that Ontario is interested only in wheat, but I can assure them that the farmers of Ontario at any rate are also greatly interested in many other products, including the one I have just referred to of eggs.

Mr BRETHEN: Would the hon. member inform the House what the respective prices of potatoes are in the United States and Canada to-day?

Mr. CHURCH: I am not an authority on the price of potatoes, and in any case it fluctuates considerably.

Mr. BRETHEN: In the market reports a week ago potatoes were quoted in the United States at $3 a barrel, and I think that the hon. gentleman who is sitting at my hon. friend's right (Mr. Spence) can tell him that potatoes in Toronto have been selling at from 75 to 85 and possibly 90 cents a bag, that is, about $1.50 a barrel.

Mr. CHURCH: As I say, I am not an expert on the question of potatoes, nor am I an expert on small potatoes either. I may say, however, that in the city from which I come it is impossible at the present time to get good potatoes at the prices quoted by the hon. gentleman. All the potatoes we can get are old potatoes, and the farmers in the Toronto district have not been growing them to any great extent. They have to import their potatoes mainly from New Brunswick, and I am glad to see them come from that province and as well from Alberta and the West; I prefer to see them come from these provinces rather than from the United States. So that it is absurd to talk about free trade in potatoes; the fact of the matter is that there is no market available in the United States for the potatoes grown in that country, to say nothing of our own. I repeat, the farmers of this country will agree with the minister in his tariff in so far as it seeks to protect this particular commodity. Now, of all our national purchases during the past year we obtained 69 per cent from the United States, selling them in return only 39 per cent of our own products. In view of that great discrepancy, I think that it is only the part of wisdom that the national policy of Canada should be maintained. Why should the United States be allowed, absolutely free and unchecked, to supply 69 per cent of the purchases of Canada when we can sell them only 39 per cent of our own goods? Why do we give them our market? We should preserve our own markets for the Canadian people. The same thing relates to butter. The farmers of the West, in Alberta and other places, require a home market for their butter. Alberta butter sells at 31 cents in the East. The price of New Zealand butter is 27 cents, and there is a duty imposed upon it of 4 cents. In my opinion the government should try to hold this market for the western farmers by increasing the duty from 4 to 8 or 10 cents.

I sympathize with a great deal that has been said about the West, and no one, I assure the House, would be more pleased than myself to see that great land succeed. I do not agree with the gloomy tone of some of the speeches regarding farming conditions in the West which were delivered in the course of the debate on the immigration policy of the government. No country in the world has such a magnificent record for wheat production as western Canada—the granary of the Empire. The fertility of its soil and the industry of its people are responsible for this great record. Every year hundreds of men go out west to help in the harvesting operations, which extend over a period of about three months. The majority of these harvesters then return eastward. Many of them have suggested to me that it would be a national benefit if either the federal or provincial au-

thorities would formulate a policy under which these harvesters could be provided by the farmers with proper housing accommodation and the farmers encouraged to engage in mixed farming so that they might find employment for these harvesters the year round. An hon. member from the Maritime provinces in this debate said quite recently that our western farmers would get much better results from mixed farming as a side line to grain growing.

Therefore it seems to me that it would be well worth while for the government to consider this suggestion and, if feasible, adopt it. Certainly no manufacturer who attempted to conduct his business by running it for only three months in every twelve could hope to be successful; and I think the same principle applies to the business of farming.

Every country in the world to-day is veering round from free trade to protection—even the Mother Country. England to-day is the dumping ground for the surplus production of the world, and as a result very large numbers of her workmen are suffering acutely from unemployment. For lack of protection British industries have been seriously crippled by German competition, and if it were not for the French invasion of the Ruhr, England to-day would be flooded with German goods. It was not the union of free trade and Cobdenism that gave England her greatest industrial expansion; it was the union of steel and coal. Happily England to-day is becoming somewhat of a protectionist country, and some of our free trade friends were very much surprised to learn a few days ago that she imposes a duty of 5 cents per pound on sugar. Quite recently a thoughtful writer expressed himself in these terms:

Victims of Free Trade

Photography saddens the hearts of British-loving Canadians with its representation of the agricultural laborers who are out on strike in Norfolk, England. The camera does not lie and the truth of photography paints these English agricultural laborers as they are. The strikers are of the old English yeoman stock. They are big of body, simple of heart. They are hard-working fathers, brothers and husbands who love England and ask no more than the right to live and die as toilers on the land of their birth. They are on strike for a guarantee that their toil will never be requited with a smaller wage than approximately $6 per week.

Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where free trade accumulates and men decay.

There is more truth than poetry in that couplet, Mr. Speaker. To-day the agricultural labourer in England is suffering from unemployment and poverty; a disappointing condition to be reduced to after his fine record in the war.

[Mr. Church.]

I am opposed to the amendment introduced by my Progressive friends because I believe in the principle of protection. I believe we should develop our home market for the benefit of our workmen and our manufacturers. There should be reciprocal treatment between the farmer and the manufacturer. The farmer is protected in relation to his wheat, potatoes, dairy products and so forth. Why should not the basic industries of our cities and towns be given equal protection? If the government could only discover two or three basic industries every year and give them adequate protection a great boon would be conferred on the country. I am glad to see that the present administration is giving encouragement to two or three important industries, and I believe the country will be all the better pleased with the budget on this account.

At a time when thousands of our skilled labourers are suffering from lack of employment and emigrating to the United States it is of vital importance that we should encourage our industries In the place of the skilled men we are bringing in unskilled labourers, whom we shall have to support to a certain extent until they get on their feet. Would it not be better for the three parties to remedy this anomalous condition by bending their united energies to the development of our basic industries and encourage the entry of immigrants who will develop our vast farming areas? The United States started as an agricultural country. Naturally the farmer there wanted a home market, and therefore the government encouraged industrial development. The Americans traded with each other and sang, "My Country' Tis of Thee".

In Canada we sing, "O Canada" and then weep over the procession of our sons as they leave their home land to find work in the States. The trouble is this country is filled with idealists who would like to make a living without working; others of a different kind are professors in our universities and some outside.

That we are capable of untold industrial development is apparent from the skill our workmen and indeed our women displayed in the manufacture of munitions of war, although they had had very little training in this particular work. This country can be developed industrially to as great an extent as any of the European countries if we pay the same wages as are current elsewhere. But it is not the intention of the government or

of the manufacturers to put our workmen in the same position as the workmen of Europe.

Take the case of wool. We have the facilities in this country for combing wool, and we can excel them all. But we have a minimum wage for the protection of our workmen, therefore we should protect the manufacturer and be able to keep our industries at home. Wool is a basic commodity, and we should do everything we can to put the wool industry on its feet, rather than burden it by heavy sales taxes. This industry is subject to what is known in the sales tax to a pyramid of five so far as the application of the sales tax is concerned. I say that some protection should be afforded to the wool industry. The same as hemp and other matters in the present tariff.

Everyone admits that we require more people in Canada, but thousands of skilled workmen are at present leaving this country to go to the United States where industries are protected. In other words, while Canada is paying immigrants and unskilled labour to come into the country by one door, people whom we shall have to aid until they get on their feet, the other door is open and large numbers of skilled workmen, persons who were developed at the expense of the country, are now going over to the United States. In the small town of Trenton on the north shore of lake Ontario it has been reported by one of the hydro inspectors that thirty householders have given him notice to cut off their direct current because they were leaving the town. If our industries were protected, such a thing as that would not happen. I believe the Minister of Finance is sympathetic along these lines, and I hope that when we go into committee on the budget resolutions he will extend the boon of protection to such a basic industry as that to which I have just been referring. We had a debate in the House some months ago in the course of which the Progressives urged that view very strongly. I concur in what was said on that occasion; I believe the Progressives have the right idea so far as that particular commodity is concerned.

Various reasons have been given for the exodus of these skilled workers to the United States. There are some hon. members in this House who blame the tariff for everything except the weather. In my opinion the tariff is not responsible for the departure of these workers from Canada, because practically the same condition of affairs prevails in England where they have free trade. Canada is a great agricultural country. Climate, after all is said and done, has something to do with this situation. We are to-day at the door of one of the greatest industrial countries in the world, the United States—a great young men's country—and entrance through that door promises success to our young men. High taxation has had something to do with these people leaving the country and unemployment, but there are many other economic reasons, and on the whole you cannot blame the tariff for it.

One of the main causes of the present depression is the chaotic condition of the world to-day. You cannot read any bank statement about finance, industry, trade or commerce without seeing how closely the economic problems of Canada are related to those of other countries, and that is one of the chief reasons for the depression—namely our economic connection with Europe and the rest of the world. Another reason for the existing depression is high taxation, the high prices of manufactured goods and of their distribution. Some hon. gentlemen on my left have said that the United States is a free trade country. It is not a free trade country; it is one of the most highly protective countries there is in the world to-day, and they are increasing this protection. There is the Fordney-McCumber bill, and if you go through the list of articles from "acid" to "zinc" you find that the rates of protection average from 20 to 35 per cent, and that on some commodities they go as high as 50 or 60 per cent. You notice that we cannot sell them any wheat, because if we try to do so we are met with a duty of 35 cents a bushel. We cannot sell them any cattle or woollen garments, on account of the prohibited duties. The same applies to cutlery. Situated as we are, then, how can we hope to succeed on a free trade policy? It is obvious that the tariff, therefore, should not be a political question.

A popular subject in this House and out of it is economy. But the government collect the revenue not merely because they want to collect it but because they need the money in order to finance the ordinary affairs of the country. The Finance Minister, who is a well known economist, has been doing his best to effect some economy, and he has succeeded in some ways. But it is one thing to preach economy and it is another thing to practise it. It is interesting in this connection to compare the conditions in Canada with those in the United States, Great Britain and France. We in Canada have a deficit for this year of $57,000,000. Great Britain has a surplus of £101,000,000, and the Finance committee of the French Senate have adopted the report of the chairman of the committee on the budget for the current year which balances the budget and shows an estimated surplus

of four billion francs. The United States also has reduced expenditure, in that respect copying the admirable example of France and the Mother Country. Hon. gentlemen to the left preach economy, and in the resolution they have presented in amendment there is a clause which deals with economy. One of the speakers, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft), the other day blamed the present government for not having practised economy. Let me point out to the Progressives that we have in Ontario a farmer government, the Drury government; how have they practised economy? One of the principal planks in the platform of the United Farmers of Ontario was that if they attained office there would be economy, there would be reduction of capital and maintenance expenditures and so on. But the fact is that the Farmer government in Ontario have increased the capital debt of the province from $97,000,000 to $247,000,000 in three years. When the Drury government came into power in the fall of 1919 the ordinary expenditures were $21,464,574. In 1922, after three years of administration, the maintenance charges for ordinary expenditure had increased to $37,442,985. In other words, even the farmers' administration did not practise what it preached in this particular respect.

I want to refer for a moment to the budget of the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin, British Chancellor of the Exchequer—whose budget and financial statement every country in the world would do well to imitate. The fact is that we have to look to the mother of parliaments for an example of how to conduct business on a business basis—in time of peace. In four years of peace the British government has reduced taxation by one-third and has cut ordinary expenditure by one-half. You remember that there was a committee presided over by Sir Eric Geddes for the purpose of cutting down estimates. In four years of peace Canada, on the other hand, has increased its revenue from taxation by one-tenth, and there has been a minor increase in expenditure. Great Britain has reduced its taxes; so has the United States; so has France. Great Britain has reduced expenditure; Canada and its provinces have increased expenditure. Great Britain has reduced her debt and annual interest charges, like the United States and France; Canada has increased the debt and the annual interest charges. The first clause in the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin's budget was a most sanguine and optimistic diagnosis of the nation's financial and commercial health. He was able to tell the country of the steady improvement in trade and commerce and to express hope for the future. He believed that the country was still experiencing a series of transition years but had passed the peak of depression. The first thing he did was to take sixpence off the income tax, which was reduced to 4s. 6d. per pound sterling. Then he reduced the corporation tax by one-half and made a reduction of one penny a pint on beer. The British budget promised a progressive and substantial decrease in high taxation. The surplus there this year was £36,000,000. Last year's surplus of £101,000,000 went towards the reduction of the national debt. Trade at home and abroad has improved so far as Great Britain is concerned and unemployment as a result has become less. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, like our own Finance Minister, was disappointed because he was not able to make greater reductions in taxation including levies on tea, sugar and similar commodities.

The Liberal and Labour parties in England have been clamouring for "the free breakfast table," and they have been taking some steps towards that in the Mother Country. Here luxuries are more lightly taxed but the necessaries of life are heavily taxed

We have not made the progress in this country towards the free breakfast table that one would like to see, and no one would like to see it better than the Finance Minister himself, I am sure. Coal, for instance, enters into the cost of the breakfast table in this country. It is required to prepare the food on the table. Coal has increased to $15.50 per ton in Canada. Bread, milk, tea, meat, bacon, eggs, butter, vegetables, almost everything has increased. Talk about prices being reduced, it is a wonder to me how the average toiler in the city lives at all owing to the shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer holds out hope also for a reduction in sugar. He recommends a reduction in postal charges, telephone rates and telephone calls, and the British government are considering a tax on betting. I am sorry that nothing has been done to reduce the postal rates in Canada. I believe that a large increase in business would flow from reducing the ordinary postage rate from three to two cents, and drop letters from two to one cent. I believe the increase of business that would flow from such a reduction would create a large surplus for the Post Office Department.

I am sorry too that we have not adopted the British principle recommended by the

Chancellor of the Exchequer, who stresses the importance of the utmost possible reduction of the national debt, because after all, there will be enough debt for posterity to pay when their time comes. Mr. Baldwin says:

> Nothing eased the finding of capital for industry more than the public policy of redeeming the public debt.

Why cannot we do this in Canada? The surplus, he says, comes from the best of all causes, namely, reduced expenditure, which I am sorry we have not been able to effect in Canada. He promises to bring about further economies next year, and then goes on to say that the huge yield from death duties, which we call succession duties in this country, for the next three years, is going to be applied solely to sinking fund purposes to reduce the national debt. For 1924 Great Britain will still be raising the huge sum of £700,000,000 in taxation. In conclusion, he deals with the reserve, and says that there is no rise in the purchasing power of the population but that the consumption of tea, tobacco and spirits is falling off and likely to go even lower. He says that it is useless to further reduce taxation at the cost of debt reduction, and I believe that what he says is financially sound and in accordance with the views of the most eminent financiers in England to-day, and Canada should adopt such a policy.

"Failure to reduce the debt means insolvency," says the Chancellor of the Exchequer. and he has the authority of eminent financiers for that. So there is little prospect of further relief for the taxpayer in the Motherland, and even in Canada, unless some new sources of revenue can be found. Here in this country we are going behind some $57,000,000, and next year it will be approximately $60,000,000 or $70,000,000, so some new sources of revenue will have to be found in this country also.

I want to refer to two other matters before I conclude. I am sorry there has not been some reduction in the income tax. In the city from which I come two income tax bills have been handed out this month. On the 30th of April everybody had to pay income tax to the federal government. Then on the 18th of May the city treasurer sent out an income tax bill which must be paid in one instalment, so the people of that city, many of whom are only of the middle class working people, will have a double-header income tax to pay this month in 18 days.

They will have to give a cheque for the full amount of the city tax bill, because it is payable in one instalment without any rebate, and then they will have to pay two and three instalments to the federal government in order to save the discount. There should be some co-ordination between the federal and municipal authorities in regard to the

9 p.m. collection of income tax. I understand that the total income tax collected this year will be about $72,000,000. I think it was stated at $60,000,000, but there was an under calculation of about $12,000,000. I think we should copy the example of England next year and do something towards reducing the income tax. I think there should be no federal income tax on incomes of less than four or five thousand dollars. I have seen school teachers in the city of Toronto struggling to make a living on a small salary, some of them getting only $2,000 after working for years, and then having to pay an income tax to the federal authorities and the city also. I am sorry to see that. I think the smaller salaries should be exempted from federal income tax anyway.

Now I come to the question of cigarettes. I was talking to some dealers in Toronto on this subject, and I recently saw a despatch from Toronto in local papers, dated the 14th of May last, to this effect:

> Prominent cigar and tobacco dealers here say the increase of one and a half per cent in the general sales tax will practically offset the reduction from 7½ to 6 per cent in excise duty.

Cigarettes are very heavily taxed, and since the war they are no longer the luxury they might be regarded before the war. They are now smoked by soldiers and all classes in this country, and in my opinion they have been taxed too much altogether. I understand that the tax is now six dollars per thousand in Canada, four dollars per thousand in Great Britain, and three and one-half per thousand in the United States.

Now I come to the question of sugar. In my opinion the whole of the reduction in sugar duties will go straight to New York. Why do I say that? I do not want to be unfair to the government, because I think the minister is endeavouring to do the best he can in the matter of sugar reductions. But Stanley Baldwin says so. Let me quote what the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin said in his budget about sugar. He declined to take off any of the duty on sugar. He left it untouched and explained his action by saying that he thought it highly improbable that the consumer would be the gainer by any reduction for more than a short time. A reduction in the tax would lead to an increased demand, which would raise the world price

and the money sacrificed by the exchequer would go straight into the pockets of producers and dealers. He goes on to say:

When it became obvious that the Cuban sugar crop was going to be far below the estimate, prices began to move up strongly week by week until on Tuesday last the price was 30s. 3d. per cwt. or three times more than in January, 1922. This rise was caused entirely because so far as could be seen there was actually going to be a shortage of sugar this year, and the slightest increase in demand might easily cause a panic and send up prices far beyond that.

That was the position, and it was well known in commercial circles. He had information that the increase of sowing in the continental countries of Europe stimulated by higher prices was as much as from 25 to 40 per cent so that as far as they could see by the turn of next year there should be cheaper world sugar and when that came it would be the time to reduce the duty. (Ministerial cheers). But if he were to reduce the duty in this budget the whole of that reduction would go straight to New York, and he was not going to do it. (Ministerial cheers). It would be a very easy thing for him to have proposed this reduction, and said in public that sugar was cheaper by the amount of the reduction of the duty. Let those members who might believe that to be true say it; but he did not believe it to be true, and therefore he was not going to say it. (Ministerial cheers).

Excise duties on tea and sugar put $200,000,000 per annum into the Old Country treasury. Every half-cent per pound taken off the Old Country sugar duties reduces the revenue by aproximately $25,000,000 per annum. The Old Country sugar duty is four and three-quarter cents per pound. The British Chancellor of the Exchequer refused to take the fraction of a cent per pound off the English sugar duties because Mr. Baldwin said: "The whole of that reduction will go straight to New York."

So when the Minister of Finance takes $2,500,000 or a half a cent a pound off the Canadian duty on sugar the whole of that reduction will go straight to New York and Stanley Baldwin says so.

The excise duties on tea and sugar in the Old Country amounted to $200,000,000 and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a reduction of half a cent a pound in the duty on sugar it would have taken off twenty-five millions from the breakfast table of the sugar consumers of that country. But the British Chancellor refused to make that reduction because he said the whole of it would go straight to New York. I believe the whole of the reduction of 2½ millions on the sugar duties which has been made under our budget will go straight to New York also.

Another matter which is much discussed in the cities and towns of the country, especially among the retail merchants, is the tax on receipts. The Finance Minister said that the British Chancellor has retained this tax and that he is going to retain it also. Some labour organizations in this country have characterized this tax as an imposition on the people. Owing to the development of the banking system in this country there are branch banks in every city and town. Conditions have changed from what they were twenty-five years ago. Formerly working people received their wages in bills; to-day they are paid by cheque. Most of the workers have a bank account in the district in which they live. They pay all their bills, their rent, their groceries, their food, and so on, by cheque. To-day if you go to a retail man and ask him to send you a receipt he will not do it. He will explain to you the reason for that and then you will not ask him to do it. The result is that this tax is being evaded and the government are losing in each case two cents on the postage. There was no loss under the old way of doing things because receipts were forwarded by mail and required a postage of two cents. To-day you can forward a cheque which requires a stamp of two cents on it up to $50 and by the Bills of Exchange Act in this country a cheque is the equivalent of a receipt. The dealer will explain to you now that your cheque is a receipt and he will not give you a written receipt in payment of your account because it will cost him two cents, and as many of these men have several thousand customers it would represent a very heavy tax on them. I am sorry an amendment has not been made in this regard because I consider that the stamp tax should operate on the same principle as the income tax. In the case of the latter the bigger the income the bigger the tax, but the receipt tax is not graduated in the same way. It should be on the same basis as the income tax if you desire to have a receipt tax of an equitable character. In my opinion in the case of both the receipt tax and the cheque tax exemption from these taxes should be given until an amount of $500 is reached. This would give the man of small salary a chance. At present he is taxed to death by the federal, provincial and municipal authorities. He and his family cannot go to a moving picture show without having to pay a provincial tax, an amusement tax under the guise of a war tax. I contend that the provincial amusement tax is illegal because by section 91 of the British North America Act, Militia and Defence matters are under the jurisdiction of the Dominion. If the legality of this tax were contested I think it would be found that the tax is ultra vires of the provincial legislature. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance has not contested that particular point. As I say, the men of moderate income are taxed to death and I am sorry that some relief has not been given to them in the budget through a modification of the tax on cheques and receipts.

I am glad to see the government giving direct tariff aid to such products as copper bars, hemp, wool and artificial silk in the manner in which they are, but I think the bounty insufficient in some cases especially in the case of hemp. It will be very difficult indeed to get the hemp industry on its feet unless the period of time is extended and the amount made a little larger. The hemp industry needs to be nursed very carefully in order to make a success. The farmers of the district where it is grown will have to be instructed in the best ways of cultivation, and it is going to take a long time to develop that industry. No doubt the reason for this action on the part of Canada is the failure of Russia as a source of supply. But the hemp industry is a peculiar one. It is affected by all classes of weather, and it is a problematic investment for the farmer. The same is not true of the copper bar industry because it is already well established. It is organized and is already functioning and there is likely to be a great deal of work to be done by the smelters. The copper bar industry does not depend upon weather conditions like the hemp industry. I commend the government for the good work they are doing with respect to these industries but I am sorry they did not extend the same measure of protection to wool. If the government wish to establish aid to a good basic industry—there is a combing mill at Trenton which could use a lot of raw material. The result would be we would have another addition to our basic industries and the allied industries which would grow up in connection with it would attract capital, provide employment for labour and give a market to the farmer. I would not advocate sending milk out of Canada to be made into butter and then brought back to the Dominion for home consumption. Yet this is what the government are compelling the farmer to do in the case of wool. That commodity is shipped out of Canada to be combed and then brought back into the Dominion for consumption because our legislation has not been framed with such wisdom as to look after the development of our natural resources. I hope some relief will be given in this direction when we go into committee.

I am sorry that no provision has been made in the budget for old age pensions. Unfortunately the war debt and the railway debt have made it impossible for many years to come to extend aid towards the improvement of the public health and the advancement of humanitarian work. In addition our soldiers and their dependents also have to be provided for. I think the matter of old age pensions should be taken up by the provinces and the municipalities and an agreement arrived at between them to afford relief in the shape of old age pensions similar to the relief now given in the province of Ontario in the form of mothers' pensions. In the case of mothers' pensions one-half the cost is borne by the municipality and one-half by the province, and it is one of the finest humanitarian works that I know of.

The railway situation in this country, Mr. Speaker, has been responsible for the great deficits in our finances. Were it not for the railway situation in Canada to-day we would have a good surplus and we would be facing an era of unparalleled prosperity. After granting $900,000,000 in direct and indirect aid to railways we are now met by an overdraft of $74,000,000. How this is arrived at I am unable to say. It is pretty nearly time parliament re-asserted itself with respect to our railways. If we are to have responsible government in this country we cannot allow the National Railway system to go on spending money in a capital way in the manner they are doing. There must be some control over the National Railway Board in respect to their capital commitments. The deficit in 1920 amounted to nearly $36,000,000. In 1921 the deficits on those railways was $16,000,000. In 1922 there was an operating surplus of $4,000,000 as against a deficit of $16,000,000 the year before. For this year the deficit is set down at $74,000,000. Wait until you see the deficit for next year. I am afraid it will greatly exceed $74,000,000. I hope the House will not pass the votes for railway expenditure without, at least, asking for details in connection with them.

It is time responsible government was restored in Canada, so far as the administration of the Canadian National Railways is concerned. The board should have a free hand in the actual administration of the road, but they should not spend money in a haphazard manner and should not be permitted to run up an overdraft of $74,000,000. In my opinion it was not necessary to go outside of Canada and appoint a president. We could have had a Canadian appointed to that position. President Beatty of the Canadian Pacific Railway is a Canadian and the chief engineer of that road is also a Canadian. The greatest engineers in the world constructed the Chippawa-Niagara plant. They are Canadians, they are graduates of Canadian universities, and I think there are a great many Canadians engaged in the management of the

other gigantic power works of Canada. I think we might have found a good Canadian to take hold of the Canadian National Railways. However, not satisfied with appointing an outsider as president we find that they have brought out Colonel N. H. Balfour, as shown in the following despatch:

> Montreal, May 15,—Colonel N. H. Balfour, formerly assistant to Sir Henry Thornton in the work of the Great Eastern Railway in England, arrived here to-day to join Sir Henry as one of his assistants in the management of the Canadian National Railways here. He is accompanied by A. J. Thomas, son of the well-known English parliamentarian, and also a former assistant of Sir Henry on the Great Eastern Railway.

I think it is pretty nearly time that we should find Canadinas to take such positions. If we are going to have any efficiency in the railway system of this country we have got to adopt the principle of promotion. In the management of the New York Central, in the administration of the Great Pennsylvania lines and the Baltimore and Ohio road, the presidents have announced that promotion will be the method in administering these railways. Furthermore in the United States, I may remind hon. members that brakemen have worked their way up to be railway presidents. We find that condition of affairs in the administration of the United States roads, and the system adopted in that country should be good enough for a road which went behind sixty or seventy millions last year. We should adopt the principle of promotion in the administration of our railways and should not have to go to other countries when so many of our own people are out of work and being laid off by the Nationals.

I believe in Canada for the Canadians. I believe in a national policy for coal and for food, and I believe in a national policy in the administration of our railway system as well as in the administration of our merchant marine, and I cannot understand why we should have to go to England to appoint a president of our railway. Of course, I speak with every respect for Sir Henry Thornton because he has had so far no criticism in Canada, and we hope there will be very little criticism and that he will be given a fair chance. But I am surprised at his recommending the sale of the twenty-seven smaller ships of the merchant marine. I believe that with the deepening of the Welland canal these ships will be necessary for our commerce, and in view of the inquiry which has been held into the rates on lake shipping, we should have held the smaller ships, so as to bring them into competition with the shipping combine on the Great Lakes and regulate this monopoly. I believe it is a mistake to put them up for sale at the present time. They have not had a fair trial or chance.

There was a combine in regard to lake rates, and the shipping interests fixed rates for themselves and for others. The merchant marine also sat in when the Atlantic combine was at work. I am sorry these ships are to be sold, because I believe many of them could be used to bring coal from Wales and from the Maritime provinces to the head of the lakes and also to carry grain down the St. Lawrence to the seaboard. At the present time a few of them are not of the proper draught, but with the deepening of the Welland canal, they will have the proper draught. I am sorry to see the head of the railway system of Canada make the recommendation which he did without proper inquiry or giving a fair trial to the merchant marine.

I believe in the principle enunciated by the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin that he should seek new sources of revenue from those not already taxed to make up the deficit. What about a tax on pulpwood exported from Canada? We exported to the United States in the year 1921 newsprint to the value of $62,820,000. A duty of 10 per cent ad valorem would produce the sum of $6,282,000. Then with reference to water powers, we exported 158,000 horse-power to the United States, to the value of $8,000,000. It was pointed out by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre) and the hon. member for St. Marys (Mr. Deslauriers) that that would be a source of revenue. Referring to the question of coal, the bituminous and anthracite coal brought into Canada amounted to $56,000,000. I believe if we had a rate for Alberta coal and Nova Scotia coal a large part of that $56,000,000 would remain in Canada, and be paid as wages to our Canadian people. The National Railways of Canada quoted a price of $9 per ton, train load, for transporting coal from Alberta. They evidently would rather charge the $9 prohibitive rate and do no business than quote a $6 rate and get the cream of the business. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had adopted such a principle in business and had never taken a chance they never would have been as successful as they are to-day. They took chances and they made experiments with the rates with the result that they captured the trade and made a success of private ownership. They also made sucessful investments in ocean, hotel, land and oil services. If the National Railways will only have the courage to bring down the products of Alberta to the central provinces

and use the merchant marine for that purpose, I believe a large volume of business will come and the deficit will be wiped out. I do not agree with the gloomy view taken by some hon. members in the speeches which have been made. Agricultural depression is not a local matter; it is a problem which exists all over the world.

Thomas Bradshaw, the veteran head of the Massey-Harris Company, Toronto, and formerly the ablest and best city treasurer Toronto ever had, gave evidence before the Agricultural committee in Ottawa. I believe there is an Agricultural committee in the United States investigating conditions of the farming industry. We have an Agricultural committee in England and we have a similar committee in Canada holding inquiries with a view to improving the condition of the farmers. I agree with Mr. Bradshaw, and I will quote from his evidence. He says before the House of Commons special committee on Agriculture:

> This committee has been investigating agricultural conditions in Canada with a view to discovering what, if any, steps can be taken to improve the position of the farmer, and in concluding this evidence, it may perhaps not be out of order to express just a few thoughts along these lines.
>
> Now, I returned from Europe not very long ago, and was over there for quite a little time, and therefore had an opportunity of finding out what the people were saying about Canada, how they were feeling.
>
> In the first place, it appears to me that it is most unfortunate that so much emphasis has been laid upon, and publicity given to the so-called agricultural depression in Canada. It seems to me that it has had a bad effect upon our own people, in putting them in a state of mind where pity rather than self-help occupies their attention; and it has greatly weakened Canada's position abroad. She does not now appear a desirable home to emigrants, as compared with Australia and South Africa which have been painting their own charms in no uncomplimentary way; her credit has been undermined, for who cares to deal with a nation apparently thought to be approaching bankruptcy; and her future jeopardized, since the seed of doubt once sown grows vigorously.
>
> I know this from actual experience, because while I have not been in the agricultural machinery business very long, I have been connected with the business of loaning money to the farmer since 1897, and I have been up and down the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, on the actual farms, talking to the farmers and making loans to them, and I am still associated with two or three companies making loans to western farmers, and I have had an opportunity of knowing just exactly how they are situated.
>
> As a matter of fact, agriculture at the present period is no more depressed than it has been at other times in the past, and, moreover, it is far from being a local condition. It is as widespread in the East as in the West; it affects the United States as well as Canada; it is a feature of agriculture in the eastern hemisphere as in the western. An "Agricultural Tribunal of Investigation" has been sitting in England and has just brought in its report upon agricultural conditions in Great Britain. In passing, it may be noted that it is evident from its report that artificial restoratives are few.
>
> By Mr. Caldwell:
>
> Q. What was their report, was it rosy?—A. No, it was not rosy, it was not good, but at the same time it was believed that the only way conditions could be improved was by what I think we have all got to do, and that is, we have to work hard, have patience, and have courage.

I find that the report of the Agricultural committee is backed up in a report along similar lines brought down in the United States by the Anderson committee of the senate and congress, a joint committee that had been investigating agricultural conditions in the United States. They have gone into the question thoroughly, having made a most extensive inquiry at Washington, through a joint agricultural committee of congress and senate, under the chairmanship of the Hon. Sidney Anderson, the member for Minnesota. They investigated the problem of rural credits, the question of rural depopulation, the matter of high prices, and so forth, and submitted an exhaustive report. In that report they reached the conclusion that there is not a single factor in the complex modern price structure which can be said to be primarily responsible for the spread between producers' and consumers' prices. The report goes on to state:

> The growth of cities is another factor in higher costs to their inhabitants. The congestion of traffic and physical difficulties that attach to city delivery are increased as population grows.

They find practically along the lines of the British committee that agricultural depression is world wide and can be little helped by legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my regret that in the budget which the minister has submitted to the House on this occasion he has deemed it fit to make reference to the question of reciprocity. After all is said and done, I do not believe that the people of this country believe in reciprocity. A vote was taken upon this question in the year 1911 when the public of Canada expressed its opinion in no uncertain voice, and if the Minister of Finance had left that recommendation out of his budget I think that the statement which he has given to the House and to the country on this occasion would have commended itself better to the people. The amendment moved by the Progressive party also refers to reciprocity with the United States as outlined in the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911 Reciprocity with the United States is impossible. The Harding administration are going to the country next year, and with the farmer bloc in the United States they have decided that free trade and reciprocity would be impos-

sible. I do not believe that it would commend itself to the judgment of the American people. We know what happened to the Taft administration. Reciprocity would carry just as many American states as President Taft carried at the election of 1912. Vermont and Utah were the only two states that voted for the author of the reciprocity offer. The presidential election results that defeated Taft were associated with congressional election results that would have destroyed reciprocity. There has been no mandate from the Canadian people, Mr. Speaker, for any overtures in the direction of reciprocity, and I do not believe that this reference in the budget will meet with the approval of the Canadian people.

Mr. W. S. REED (Frontenac): I need hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first occasion on which I shall have spoken in this House, and before I say anything else I want to contribute a word of commendation to what has been said regarding the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), with whom I would couple the name of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham). These two hon. gentlemen, practically throughout their business careers, have been more or less all the time before the public of Canada, and in my opinion they have certainly rendered this country a great service.

I would refer first of all to the rural mail system, not particularly by way of complaint, because I think it is generally recognized that existing conditions in Canada to-day will not permit of that complete service which the people would no doubt desire. There are a few connecting links in the county that sent me here which we should like to see completed as soon as financial conditions will permit. I want it to be understood, however, that I am not pleading for the county of Frontenac alone; the same privilege which I ask for that county I should be pleased to see extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific wherever it is needed.

I do not think I need dwell further on this subject, but I might say a word or two on the question of immigration, principally for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the House the state of things as they prevail near my home. I do not know the conditions as they are in the cities, but I can say that in the rural part of my riding there is not one man to every hundred acres, and with such a condition we cannot very well carry on the business of the country. I am glad therefore to hear the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) inform the House

of his intention to do something to improve this condition.

So far as public works are concerned, we know, of course that a great deal of money has to be spent in this department, and I think I speak for all hon. members when I say that we have called upon that department from every corner for assistance in regard to the works that have to be carried on in connection with harbours, wharves and so forth. But I think we have a minister who is capable of discharging the duties that are before him.

I want now to refer for a moment or two to the railway situation, but I shall not deal with that subject at any great length; it is needless for me to go over the ground that has been covered by the last speaker (Mr. Church). I believe that, with the present minister, and with the board as it is constituted to-day, this department of the public service will make good, and I think it is the duty of every Canadian to do what he can towards this end.

During the course of this debate we have heard a great deal about the national debt, and I think that those of us who have been following the trend of events know what is responsible for our obligations. I may be wrong, and if I am I am ready to be corrected; but I thought I heard it stated across the floor of the House that the interest alone was $140,000,000.

Now, from east to west there are many problems with which the Canadian people must grapple. We have heard a great deal about the wonderful natural resources of British Columbia, its great timber, its fish, and so forth; but I must confess that never having been either in the East or in the West, I am really ignorant of western conditions. In the course of the debates of this session we have noticed that the members from British Columbia, irrespective of their party affiliations, are all agreed on the gravity of the oriental question and the proper way to deal with it.

Now I come to Alberta. I am sorry that we do not hear any very good reports from the members representing that province regarding conditions in the rural sections. Some day I intend to take a trip to the West, but I do not care to go where conditions are so difficult. I hope they will improve. Nor are the conditions what we would expect them to be in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. When we recall the illimitable coal measures, the vast wheat fields, the great cattle ranches and the rich, natural resources of these western provinces, it is apparent that something must

be wrong when their economic condition is so unsatisfactory. We hope to hear better things of the West as a whole in the near future.

In the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec we find some of our most important urban centres and our principal industrial development. Consequently there is not the same dependence on agriculture as we find in the western provinces, and therefore the depressed condition of our basic industry has not reacted so severely on the people generally. Lastly, we have the Maritime provinces. Their distance from the central and western portions of the Dominion places them at a decided disadvantage commercially, and naturally we want to assist them in every possible way.

In all we are a family of nine provinces, each with its advantages and also corresponding disadvantages, and it should be the purpose of our administrative authorities to so legislate as to give an equal chance to all of us. Wise legislation will accomplish this purpose. But whatever may be done for our social and economic advancement, our paramount duty is to see that our rising generation are afforded such educational opportunities in our schools and colleges that they may take their place and in due time assist in the development of this great Dominion.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, those years of the Great War were the cause of a deep disturbance both in the economic and national life of our country. As we gradually emerge from the gloom of this never to be forgotten period of our history, we more vividly realize the extent of the spontaneous sacrifices made, resulting from the participation of this young country in the greatest world war of all times.

The Liberal party became heir, in December 1921, to a rather burdensome estate. Called upon to take charge of the administration of affairs in this country, the present government found itself facing an enormous public debt which the years following the war had but increased through considerable yearly loans so as to meet the ever increasing deficits. Moreover, our predecessors had further added to our obligations, the burden of state management of the National Railways which yearly showed large deficits. All the taxes that a country may be burdened with, our predecessors had imposed.

Yet, all the sources of revenue and all the heaviest levies bearing upon the Canadian subject, henceforth, taxed to the utmost limit, could not balance our budget. Briefly, this was the situation of our finances when the present government took hold of power in December, 1921.

Two things were absolutely necessary to the good administration of affairs in this country: a strict economy and moderation, that is to say a gradual return to pre-war conditions. I think the present government has practised economy and this accounts for the success of this administration which has already begun to greatly improve our financial situation by solving the problem by which we shall soon see the end of our deficits. We now fully hope, in the near future, to see the return of those prosperous years of the Laurier government.

The late government, during the years that followed armistice, up to the end of their term in office, had borrowed nearly $1,000,000,000. The interest alone of these war loans amounted to about $50,000,000. We cannot take into account the fiscal year of 1921-1922, as being the first fiscal year of the Liberal administration for the greater part of it was under the administration of our predecessors. The first fiscal term which could be attributed to the present government would therefore be that of 1922-1923. It is true that during that period the Minister of Finance admitted that he had been constrained to borrow the sum of $49,000,000, however, we have grounds to console ourselves to some extent, in the fact that this loan was not any greater, for it only makes up the amount required to pay off the interest on the loans made by our predecessors, from armistice day up to the time they were driven out of power. The present estimates attest a considerable decrease in expenditures and the management of our railways which are on the mend, allows us to hope that the patriotic efforts of those at the helm of the country will succeed in restoring our financial equilibrium. I have faith in the comforting forecasts of the Minister of Finance and I again state it is only through these principles of economy and cautiousness that the government may overcome the financial difficulties which have, up to date, seemed to us insurmountable Guided by these wise principles, the government has already made an effort to reduce the irksome burden of taxation. True to its programme, it has already brought on tariff changes in a downward revision of duties. I especially rejoice in seeing that, at this stage of the session, offers are made by the Liberal government to the United States toward a resumption of the negotiations for a trade convention such as we were intent on

securing in 1911. I think that had we not rejected the offer of our powerful neighbours, in 1911; had we ratified this advantageous trade convention for the exchange of agricultural products with the United States; Canada would certainly be more prosperous and would even be more united than it is to-day. This exchange of agricultural products with our neighbours would be to the advantage of both countries. Had we carried out this trade convention of 1911, I again state that we would now be better off than we are at present, however, since the Minister of Finance, in the eloquent speech he made the other day, declared that the wish of Canada was to carry out this trade convention with the United States, we do hope that our neighbours will not lend a deaf ear to our offer. If we, to-day, read the newspapers which reach us from across the 45th parallel, if we listen to those in authority in the United States who have expressed their views, we can say that the appeal made by the Minister of Finance will not be a vain one, and that to-morrow perhaps, we may, for the exchange of certain products, carry out this trade convention which will certainly be to the advantage of both countries, but especially to that of Canada, the pre-eminently agricultural country, which feels the want, in consequence of the development of its great natural resources, of engrossing the friendship of our neighbours and bringing about a trade treaty with them.

Canada has not its equal so far as its natural resources are concerned. Its farms, mines, forests, fisheries and industrial products forever increasing, place her henceforth in a position to seek advantageously trade relations with American countries, Europe and all the dominions of Great Britain. It is to the Liberal party's credit to have granted this British preference which increases the exchange of our products with those of the Mother Country, and which has been a great help in maintaining and developing, especially in our old provinces, one of our important agricultural industries: the dairy industry, destined to bring wealth to our farms in this part of Canada. It is again to our party's credit to have further increased this British preference and thus anticipated the wishes of the Canadian people. It is with the object of furthering our trade and industries, so necessary to the work of reconstruction, that our government is negotiating a trade convention with Australia. This government, moreover, has happily negotiated a new trade convention with both France and Italy. France of late years has been looking to our country; we are continuously present in her mind, and as the ancestor, she comes to us with the tender feeling evoked by long separation. Should not we, her descendants, united to her people by the ties of kinship, respond to such overtures from the old Motherland, and proclaim that we have sought her in the course of our national existence, with the sincerity which springs from true hearts and inspired by our historical motto "Je me souviens." France came to us in those never-to-be-forgotten days of June, 1921, when the Fayolle mission, composed of the most illustrious Frenchmen, landed on our soil to officially present to the government of Canada the venerated statue of France, by Rodin. This statue now rests here, in the capital of Canada, under the roof of this parliamentary building, and one may say that the image of the old Motherland shines brightly from the promontory of Ottawa, on all the horizons of the Dominion of Canada. Has she not since made, to the Canadian nation, the highly apreciated gift of 250 acres of land on Vimy ridge? This patch of French soil, made illustrious through the heroism of the sons of Canada during the Great War, now encloses the glorious remains of those who have fallen on the battlefields. The government will erect there a monument commemorative of the great deeds of its children. In the centuries to come, this sacred spot across the seas will for ever remind the sons of New France grown old of the grateful feelings of the older Motherland. After this event the souvenir of which is very dear to us, France still remembered us and we remembered her through this trade convention which Parliament has just ratified. This treaty would give new life to business and would help us to bear up with fortitude through this period of after-war by relieving the financial situation and helping us to carry over the enormous deficits of our National Railways.

One of the most important tasks to which the present members of the government must give their entire attention, is certainly the management of our National Railways. A gigantic enterprise which, last year, showed a deficit of $67,000,000, a deficit borne by the tax-payers of this country. However, by devoting their energies to the great task of managing a railway system which is the largest in the world, the government must rely on the public's good-will, their united effort and on the sympathy of all the citizens of this country.

I congratulate the Government for having appointed very able men to fill the important posts of directors of the National Railway Board. I especially congratulate them for

having placed at the head of the board, Sir Henry Thornton, a man of wide experience, an able man, one who possesses to a high degree the genius of administration, and who, I feel confident, will make a success of the important work in connection with the National Railways. With such men, backed by a public-spirited administration—which should give us the assurance of a fair trial being given to public ownership,—I am certain that our railways will become one of the most important items in the assets of the State and will constitute one of the most reliable means of contributing to the development of our country.

In a young country like Canada, with an unlimited stretch of land, natural resources of incomparable wealth, it is necessary that the railway should closely accompany and sometimes precede the important work of colonization. Take for example the prairie provinces. The immense plains of La Vérendrye remained unsettled as long as the railway had not encircled with its steel ribbon the matchless wheat fields. From the valleys of the Red river and the Assiniboine, the settler found his way to those rich lands that now grace the prosperous cities of Portage-la-Prairie, Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Calgary and Edmonton. Saskatchewan and Alberta rose in the middle West as if by enchantment, two provinces which sprang up some fifteen years ago, the happy result of agricultural settlement made possible by the railway. Further away, on the shores of the Pacific ocean, there exists a province, famous for the incomparable beauty of its scenery and the mildness of its climate, rich through its unrivalled national resources. "Splendor sine occasu" appears on its blazon. She finds this splendor in the development of agriculture through the colonization of her fertile valleys. The three transcontinental railways which cross the Rocky mountains are admirably adapted to the opening up of settlements and to the building of towns. Already wheat is begining to flow from Alberta to the port of Vancouver. In the East as in the West the transportation facilities are always the most powerful means of developing the economic resources of our country. In the eastern provinces, in our old province of Quebec, it is through the railways and the work accomplished by Laurier, namely the construction of his transcontinental that we have been able to witness the opening up of this beautiful and immense region of Abitibi. That territory would still be covered with virgin forests if we had not built this railway which was the means of spreading French civilization beyond the Laurentian mountains. It may be said in certain quarters that this is very unwise expenditure. I, however, think that it is absolutely necessary for a young country, and we, the political heirs of those who accomplished this so important task of the construction of the transcontinental, which permitted the rapid development of the Abitibi region, one of the best of the province of Quebec, we should the more appreciate the National Railways. Indeed, is it not the work of railways which has contributed the most to the extension of settlements? Is it not the railways which have contributed the most in settling and enlarging the magnificent county of Labelle? We may, perhaps, have more deficits for a few years, but we should not weaken in the task. So far as I am concerned, deficits do not frighten me, because I am convinced that later on we shall be proud of the great achievement accomplished by the railways. Thanks to them, Canada made progress and I again state, I do not fear the deficits, providing that our railways contribute to the expansion and prospertity of our country.

I therefore state that all the provinces of the Dominion must lend their most generous co-operation and most effective help to the government so that this important work of the management of our railways may become a financial success and at the same time a powerful lever to the development of the country through colonization. One cannot broach the subject of colonization without awakening in our mind the problem of the day, the recruiting of settlers, or in other words, immigration. Let me, Mr. Speaker, dwell for a few moments on two other necessary elements of colonization, namely, the lands fit for colonization and the assistance to be extended to the settler. The immigration problem comprises three distinct features. The first is to find land fit for cultivation; the second is to provide for the settler; and, the third is to find that settler who will make his home on such lands and will later become a good Canadian citizen. As regards settlers' lands, they are almost inexhaustible in this country, from ocean to ocean, and through all the nine provinces of the Dominion, one can find, for settling purposes, unlimited areas.

Speaking before the Canadian Club, at Winnipeg, on the importance of immigration in this country, Lord Shaw, last summer said: "Your incommensurable prairie provinces contain 200 million acres of arable land and up to the present time you have but one-tenth under cultivation." Could we not say as much for our eastern provinces? In the

old province of Quebec we are not lacking in arable lands since at present in all the valleys, right into the heart of the Laurentide mountains, we have any extent of lands fit for cultivation. At present, in our province, the area of arable land being farmed is but 3½ per cent. There are, according to statistics supplied to me, over 400,000 farms of 100 acres each surveyed and reported upon which await the pioneer. I do not intend to show by means of statistics the acreage of land fit for cultivation in the nine provinces. These two distinct divisions of our national soil, the East and West, are sufficient to bear out my contention.

The provincial governments come generously to the rescue of the settler when it is a question of land grants in the old eastern provinces, where the settler's hardihood is put to test by the difficulties encountered at the outset. He must cut an opening in the virgin forests and build his shanty. Nothing equals the self-willed tenacity of the pioneer, toiling heroically to extend civilization in the far-off territories where everything breathes of the forest. However, in the midst of his toils he may depend upon the good services of a government which makes of colonization its main work. The surveying of districts, the building of roads and bridges, the help given to school and agricultural matters, are the many sides of protection shown by a government friendly to the settler.

The Quebec government in granting large subsidies, have shown themselves to be the true patron of the settler. The work of the Dominion government is still being performed on a large scale to facilitate the settlement of the immigrant on their lands.

The recruiting of the settler which is the third feature in question, is certainly one of the most important parts of the problem and the one which offers the most difficulties. The various opinions expressed on the subject since the beginning of the session only tend to show that there is a considerable exodus of settlers in the West and especially in Alberta, which is continuously on the increase. To what can this emigration be attributed? To the economic crisis of the country, a crisis accentuated by two poor consecutive crops? To the readiness with which the settler hailing from the United States at the first setback encountered, returns to his native land? To the too extensive immigration of the first decade of this century? Whatever be the causes, the consequences are but transient and everything seems to point to a return to normal conditions, especially after the abundant crop of last year. If we are to place faith in the words of experienced western men, conditions have much improved and the farmer, to-day, may look with confidence to the future.

In Quebec our national increase, each year, exceeds the number of deaths by 45,000. Yet men well informed have contended that for the last eighty years, emigration has carried away yearly from 15,000 to 20,000 people. The buoyant spirit of our young men and the narrow circumstances of a portion of the people both make for the desertion which has been bleeding the country for nearly a century.

How should the recruiting be carried out? Shall it be by an appeal to the European nations so that they may cast on our shores the surplus of their population, thrust in our midst at the expense of the Canadian government? Are we to erect at the entrance of the ports of St. John, Halifax and Quebec, another statue of Liberty holding out a large mantle to receive in its folds all the wandering children of the earth? I do not think so. Let us first keep those who are with us, let us make our own people happy; we shall have but to select those who come from the outside.

One of the unquestionable advantages of the government's immigration policy is the settlement of immigrants in all the provinces of Canada. We were, up to the present time, in the habit of thinking that the prairie provinces were the only ones entitled to receive immigrants and settle them on western wheat lands. Now, the immigrant arriving among us through his initiative and that of the government, shall be able to settle in any part of Canada. Each province has its own advantages and disadvantages. A settler who comes to reside in Canada may have a certain temperament, special aptitudes, certain peculiarities which fit him for one province rather than for another. For instance, one coming from Belgium, France or Scandinavia might, perhaps, prefer to settle in some eastern province rather than the West, while others coming from western United States would naturally settle in the prairies. Nevertheless, all would become Canadian citizens and, hence, they would be equally entitled to the help and protection of the Immigration department. The Immigration Act, which affords an equal measure of protection to the immigrant in whatever province he settles, is fair and equitable. However, since in Quebec, the true evil is to be found not in the small number of settlers coming in, but rather in a regrettable exodus of our citizens across the 45th

parallel, I wish to say a few words in regard to the enactment relative to repatriation agencies which are helpful to the province of Quebec, and I would ask the government to make the repatriation regulations more effective, first of all for the purpose of retaining our people who have not yet become the prey of family troubles, and secondly, with a view to bringing back those who have already emigrated. I should like to see the government take all the steps necessary so that our peasant, this courageous and abstemious farmer, should feel himself sufficiently backed up by pecuniary help to hope not only to maintain himself in comfort, but become even more prosperous. Indeed, we must not lose sight of the fact that the large families which constitute a truly national wealth, demand of the head of the family greater resources. The establishment of repatriation agencies in regard to immigration is therefore another good feature of the government's new policy. Our people who at one time went across the 45th parallel never forgot their native country; many of them are awaiting a favourable opportunity to return to live and die among us. Let them know that their brothers in Canada are desirous of seeing them again and extending a warm welcome. The old province awaits them and has paved the way for their re-establishment. The government agents should be among them to let them know on our part that there is room for them in the old eastern provinces, as well as those in the West, and that everywhere their old fellow-citizens await them with open arms.

Mr. Speaker, the session is drawing to a close; I have followed the debates with attention mingled with some anxiety. My country, I had a glimpse of it, thanks to all those beautiful speeches of eminent men but of very contradictory opinions. As I saw it, it was going through a crisis wherein its future was at stake. The glorious hour has struck for us; we who form the party in power, if we know how to respond to the hopes of the people, the propitious moment to ensure the permanent welfare of this country of ours. It is in a period of such great upheavals that a nation, filled with apprehensions for the future, needs great men, wise statesmen who find the means of ensuring the safety of the nation's future. I feel confident that Providence who guides nations and has entrusted into our hands the government of the country, in this hour of national anxiety, will bestow on our leaders that wisdom which distinguishes great statesmen. I have faith, consequently, that this perilous hour for our country will, in our annals, redound to the honour of our party, and command the admiration of posterity.

Mr. JAMES STEEDSMAN (Souris): Mr. Speaker, while I desire to join heartily in the congratulations extended to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon the presentation of his seventeenth budget, I regret to say that I am unable to extend my congratulations to the members of my constituency and to the residents of the province from which I come, not only because the budget affords us little or no relief from the protective tariff and fails to keep pace with the feeble efforts of last year to take a step in the right direction, but because the government have now decided that efforts in that direction shall cease and we may look for little more reduction from them. Stability, and the assurance to the protected interests that they have nothing to fear in the future with regard to the tariff, will bring rejoicing in some quarters, but, Mr. Speaker, it will bring disappointment and discontent in other sections, especially in the West, where farming conditions are such as to demand immediate relief if we are not to lose many of the valuable settlers we have at the present time. We have been told to have faith, and faith is a fine thing; but it will not pay the taxes; it will not pay the interest on the mortgage, neither will it feed or clothe the children. To be told now by a government representing a party that has always declared in favour of lower tariff that nothing further in that direction need be expected is discouraging, to say the least.

Now, Sir, in regard to the serious condition of agriculture in Canada to-day, we know that the chief cause lies in the fact that the cost of living and the cost of production have not come down in proportion to the decrease in the prices of farm products. Of course that is not the only reason, but it is the only one I shall refer to in the discussion of this budget. That being so, it will be evident to all that the farmers are producing at a loss to-day, consequently they are going behind; their debts and their difficulties are increasing every day. What is more natural, therefore, than that we should look for a remedy or for a means of balancing our budget? In reviewing the situation we realize that the main cause of low prices for what we have to sell is the lack of purchasing power on the part of the nation to whom we sell our surplus, and as the export price usually controls the local market price the only remedy in that direction is to lower the cost of transportation, the cost of handling and distributing, to the lowest possible point consistent with

efficiency, and to eliminate all unfair profit-taking in the performance of those operations. In this respect I am free to admit that the government have already done something; the reinstatement of the Crowsnest pass rates and the passing of the wheat board legislation of last year at the urgent request of the people of western Canada was a step in the right direction. But much more remains to be done, and we will watch with great interest.

Mr. CARROLL: What does the hon. member think of the attitude of the legislature of Manitoba on that particular question? It is opposed to the Progressive attitude, I understand.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: I would like to point out to my hon. friend that if the farmers of Manitoba at the present time are in such a condition that they think they cannot wait for the operation of a wheat board, it is all the more reason why they should get relief in some other direction. That I understand is why the wheat board legislation did not pass the House in Manitoba. I say that we will watch with interest the outcome of the royal commission and of the special committee that has been appointed to inquire into lake transportation rates, the grain trade, and agricultural conditions generally.

We believe, too, that this government should come to the assistance of the provinces that they may be enabled to extend their rural credit and farm loan policy to the end that the farmers may be able to secure long term credit with cheaper interest rates, with which to pay off their mortgage indebtedness.

Then too, the prairie provinces should be given their natural resources. That has long been a matter of contention, and we think that now would be a very opportune time for the natural resources to be handed over to the provinces that they may get the benefit of such revenue as may be derived therefrom. That would mean that the municipalities in those provinces might be relieved to a very great extent from the tremendous burden of taxation under which they are labouring at the present time, that our school districts might be able to keep open the schools, many of which are closed at the present time, that we might be able to educate our children.

Now what about the cost of production? In looking over means of bringing down costs, what is more natural than that we should compare prices with those paid by our neighbours to the south of us? I do not intend to detain the House at the present time by making comparisons of prices. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft) the other evening quoted sufficient figures to convince this House that prices are considerably lower on the other side of the line. Living as I do within a few miles of the boundary line of North Dakota I am in a position to know that the prices he quoted are absolutely correct, and I could give many more instances as well. I know, too, that our neighbours over the line have always been able to buy the necessaries of life, the implements of production, lumber, building material and everything that goes into building up their homes much more cheaply than we could, and moreover they have always or, at all events, have usually been able to command a better price for the products that they had to sell, and their products are the same as ours. Our products have to compete with theirs in the open markets of the world. Is it any wonder that we come to parliament and ask that the duty be removed in order that we may get the benefit of lower prices and get our raw material as cheaply as our neighbours to the south?

It has been suggested by one hon. member, I think it was the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), that an educational campaign might be carried on among the manufacturers and industrial workers of eastern Canada to induce them to bring down their prices. Well, Mr. Speaker, we think that a more effective way would be to remove the tariff on these articles altogether, and then competition would take care of the prices. It is not particularly that we want to purchase American machinery, because I am sure that the average Canadian would prefer to buy Canadian machinery provided he could get equal quality for the same or very nearly the same price. But we believe that the Canadian manufacturer should be able to compete successfully with the American manufacturer in the home market when he can do it so successfully in the foreign market, especially those companies that have been organized for a great many years and have enjoyed the protection of the tariff during all the years of their existence. When we say, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of protection as a basis for fiscal policy in Canada is unsound, when we say that the condition of the primary industries is such as to demand immediate relief, we believe that there are many members sitting upon the government side of the House who will agree with us in that contention, but we are immediately faced with the problem of how to make up the loss in revenue. In that regard I would just like to say that the people of Canada could afford to pay twice the amount collected in customs revenue under almost any system of direct

taxation that the government might see fit to adopt and then be money in pocket. What with the duty, and the profits on duty pyramiding every time the goods are turned over, and the increased cost of goods of the home manufacturer, we believe that it would be quite possible for the people to bear that burden in the form of direct taxation.

Mr. CARROLL: Would the hon. member suggest what form the taxation should take?

Mr. STEEDSMAN: If my hon. friend will look at the amendment suggested by my hon. leader he will notice what form we suggest it should take. I say that almost any form of direct taxation would be better.

Mr. CARROLL: But if the hon. member wishes to be constructive in his suggestions I think he should inform the House the particular form of direct taxation he would suggest.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: An inheritance tax, for instance, a properly graduated income tax, for after all, Mr. Speaker, have not practically all taxes to be paid out of income? Where else can they come from? I hope my hon. friend is satisfied.

Mr. CARROLL: I would like the hon. member to be a little more specific. We have a graduated form of income tax now. How would he graduate it so as to fill up the void that would be left after the customs tax was taken off?

Mr. STEEDSMAN: I can only suggest to my hon. friend that he study the platform of the Progressive party—

Mr. CARROLL: That is a cure.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: —and study carefully the amendment which has been proposed by my hon. leader. In conclusion, I desire to say that I intend to vote for that amendment.

On motion of Mr. Kyte the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Graham the House adjourned at 10.23 p.m.

Thursday, May 17, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral officer a certificate of the election and return of Joseph Félix Descoteaux, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Nicolet.

Joseph Felix Descoteaux, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Nicolet, introduced by Hon. Jacques Bureau and Hon. Ernest Lapointe.

REPORT

Sixth report of the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.—Mr. McGiverin.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition, signed by W. J. Bartlett and 1,436 other residents of the lower mainland of British Columbia and Vancouver Island, asking that no further naturalization certificates be granted to Japanese, and also that such changes be made in the immigration laws as will prevent a further influx of Japanese to Canada.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Wednesday, May 16, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Robert Forke.

Mr. R. K. ANDERSON (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I find the most difficult part of making a speech in this House is to get started; and I notice that some members find it equally difficult to stop. The budget speech may be described as the chief event of the session. A great deal of interest is always taken in it not only by hon. members but by the people generally, for it deals with taxation and debt. Once you touch the pockets of the people you instantly arouse a good deal of criticism and opposition, and I do not think that any man in this House or outside knows more about that feature of a budget than the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

The present budget appears to me to be drafted not so much for the purpose of meeting the exigencies of the national situation as for its political effect. It is a colourless and featureless budget devoid of any outstanding characteristics. The hon. Minister of Finance last week presented his seventeenth budget, a record in our parliamentary history, and I compliment him on his long and useful service to the country. The hon. gentleman, previous to the election of 1896 was an

advocate of free trade or tariff for revenue, but during the following fifteen years while in power, he made no effort to implement his promises, and the people watched in vain for some signs that he remembered his promises. In 1911 he asked the approval of the country of a reciprocity pact with the United States, but the people would have none of it. That is a matter of history. But now, in 1923, after the country had spoken so emphatically on that question in 1911, he comes back with a resolution for the same purpose.

The hon. gentleman has been either a free trader or an advocate of a tariff for revenue all the time he was in opposition, but in power he has always been a protectionist. It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to know what are the reasons that cause this sudden change of front when he succeeds to office. What caused his change of front in 1896, and again in 1921? Are we to believe that the hon. Minister of Finance was not sincere in his demands for a tariff for revenue when he was in oppostiion? Was his change of front due to a fear on his part that such a policy would not be in the best interests of the country? Did he fear that such a policy would not be in the best interests of the party in which he occupies such a prominent position? During the Liberal regime of 1896 to 1911, a period of 15 years, the Liberal government reduced the average rate of tariff duties by the small amount of 79/100 of one per cent. That statement was made in this House a few years ago by the then member for Red Deer Dr. Clark. Dr. Clark evidently knew what he was talking about when he made that statement, because he was a member of the Liberal party. That was the full extent to which the Liberal party ventured into the charmed field of free trade. Evidently when they get into office it does not present a pleasing view to them; and it is less pleasing now, for since they came into office, instead of reducing the average tariff duties they increased them in the year 1922-23 by 74/100 of one per cent over what they were in 1921. This is a peculiar way to lower tariff duties, to get down to a tariff for revenue purposes only or to a free trade policy. I cannot say that I blame the Finance Minister for this. I believe in the principle of protection—a moderate protection, not a high protection—and believing in that I cannot blame the minister for not reducing the tariff duties. The figures upon which I base this statement are the following: In the first eleven months of 1921-22, ending February 28, 1922—I am taking the eleven months because at the time I made the calculation the figures for the whole year were not available—the amount of dutiable goods imported for home consumption was $422,309,490. The duty collected was $107,186,255, making an average rate of duty on all dutiable articles of 24·23 per cent. In the first eleven months of 1922-23, ending February 28, 1923, the amount of dutiable goods imported for home consumption was $475,583,587, on which the duty collected was $118,872,102, making an average duty of 24·97 per cent and showing an increase over 1921-22 of ·74 per cent. The total merchandise dutiable and free imported in the same period—and I am making the calculation on the basis of all articles imported, whether there was duty collected on them or not—amounted to $668,425,606 on which was collected for duty purposes $107,186,255, the amount which I have already mentioned, showing an average rate of duty on all goods of 16·34 per cent. For the eleven months period in 1922-23 there were imported $710,583,616 worth of goods dutiable and free, on which was collected $118,872,102, showing an average duty of 16·81 per cent, or ·34 per cent higher than it was in 1921. I am just bringing these facts to the attention of the House to show how far the Minister of Finance and the Liberal party have kept their promises to the people to reduce the duties on imported goods. Instead of reducing them, on the average they have raised them. I could give the figures for the whole year, having received them subsequent to making these calculations, but I think it is unnecessary to do so.

I may say that the Minister of Finance is now firmly entrenched in the National Policy of Sir John A. Macdonald. After seventeen years during which the Finance Minister was pledged to a tariff for revenue he comes down this year with the statement that he believes in the principle of protection and that the tariff of Sir John A. Macdonald of 1878 is good enough for him. In making the statement that he could not further reduce the tariff duties he practically accepted the principle of protection. The principle of protection is the real essence of the National Policy of 1878. That National Policy was introduced not with the idea of its standing always as a moderate or a high protective policy; It was introduced as a protective policy, and when the hon. Minister of Finance accepts that policy to-day he accepts in his financial affairs the principle of protection. Having posed all these years as being in favour of a tariff for revenue, in 1923 he changes by one touch of his magic

hand the high protective policy of Sir John A. Macdonald into a moderate tariff policy a policy which hon. gentlemen now on the government benches designated as a high protective tariff while in opposition. A tariff "in favour of the big interests," a tariff that "imposed intolerable burdens on the people," a tariff which he pledged himself and his party to do away with when elected to office, has been changed over night by his magic touch into a tariff for revenue.

The hon. Minister of Finance is not the only convert to the principle of protection I must compliment the right hon. leader of the Opposition on the efficiency he has shown in making converts, because it is largely due to him that these conversions have been taking place. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) only a few days ago in his statement expressed the opinion that the protective principle was all right. I understood him to say that a tariff for revenue was impossible without a certain measure of protection, that is, that there is an incidental measure of protcetion, in any tariff for revenue purposes. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has not thoroughly studied the question or he would not have made such a statement. It is not in accordance with the facts and with experience. The British Government only a couple of years ago collected over $600,000,000 in duties without giving any incidental protection. Those duties were placed upon articles which they did not produce at home.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is understood always.

Mr. ANDERSON: The hon. minister did not make that statement in his speech the other day.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Later in my remarks I did.

Mr. ANDERSON: There was nobody to protect. Nobody was producing the article, consequently no measure of incidental protection was given to the English people. Perhaps what the minister meant when he made that statement was that he could get away from the protective principle by having an excise duty on the articles which we produce. He could offset the protective principle in the tariff by putting on an excise duty equal to the import duty on the article in question, but I cannot see where or in what way that would reduce the cost of living to any people. The Minister of Finance in his budget speech last year said that he intended to make such adjustments in the tariff itself as would so far as possible reduce the cost of living, and he did last year make an attempt at that by reducing the protective duty on farm implements by two and one-half per cent. But in lieu of that he added a two per cent excise tax. The result was that the cost of the imported article remained practically the same and the home-made article was raised by two per cent. The farmer got absolutely no advantage from it. You cannot reduce the cost of living by an excise tax.

The hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Stewart) would appear to me to be a convert to the principle of protection. He said in his speech yesterday:

> I do not believe, and I have had nothing to convince me, that so heavy a rate of protection is required as is given to many of the industries existent in this country to-day.

The minister does not oppose the principle of protection; he is simply opposed to high protection, and thus protection is being kept in force apparently with the connivance of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization. The Minister of Finance in his want of confidence motion on the budget of 1921 made this statement:

> The tariff is a tax, and the aim of legislation should be to make taxation as light as circumstances will permit.

I do not dispute that statement. I think it should be the object of legislation to make the cost of living as light as possible. The Minister of Finance implemented that by stating he would make an effort to reduce the cost of living. Now, Mr. Speaker, the tariff is certainly a tax, and a tax on somebody; there may be some dispute at times as to who pays the tariff tax, but certainly there can be no dispute as to who pays an excise tax. An excise tax is a home tax. It is placed on the commodities in the country itself. There is nobody but the Canadian people to pay it. But when an article is imported into this country there may be cases in which the exporter of the article, that is the producer in a foreign country may pay all or part of the duty. Who pays the tax on articles that are dumped into this country at prices lower than the cost of production in the country of origin? It may not be the consumer in this country. Possibly it is the manufacturer or producer of the article in the foreign country. There may be some question about that, but there can be no question about who pays an excise tax.

With regard to the sales tax, no matter what can be said in regard to its being a means of increasing the revenue, it directly and immediately is reflected in an increased cost to the Canadian people of the articles on which the duty is placed. It has an im-

mediate effect. It does increase the price of that article. A larger amount of revenue is collected from the people, and the manufacturer or the dealer passes on the tax to the consumer. If he has a narrow margin of profit he must do that or go out of business. The sales tax can have no other effect but to increase the cost of living to every Canadian. So long as the need of taxation exists, so long as a large revenue is necessary to carry on the business of this country, a sales tax judiciously applied is a very efficient tax. I consider that it is a just tax because the average individual will pay the tax in proportion to his ability to purchase. The more wealthy he is the more he will purchase and the more taxation he will pay. I can have no objection to that tax.

There is, however, one feature about the present increase in the tax to six per cent to which I would refer. I would think that a tax at the fountain source is perhaps the best way of collecting it, and I commend the Minister of Finance for making the change. Last year instead of changing the application of the tax he increased it by fifty per cent. I want to show by some figures I have that that was immediately reflected in the returns of the Excise department, and in connection with these returns I want to emphasize the fact that as the tax was collected entirely from the Canadian people it must and did result in an increased cost of living. I remind the House that this tax came into force on the 23rd of May, 1922. The revenue from the sales tax for April, 1922, was $2,072,000. The average amount collected for the previous four months—I did not think it was fair to take only April, because it may have been smaller than the other months, so I took the average collections from the domestic sales tax for the months of January, February, March and April, 1922—was $3,126,000. Hon. gentlemen will notice that in May—and remember, the tax only came into force on the 23rd of May—there was a decided increase, in sales tax collections. Here are the figures:

Sales Tax Collections, Domestic Goods, May-December, 1922

Month—	Collections	Increase over average Jan.-April
May..	$3,829,000	$ 700,000
June..	3,900,000	800,000
July..	5,072,000	1,900,000
August..	5,558,000	2,400,000
September..	6,314,000	3,200,000
October..	6,692,000	3,500,000
November..	6,213,000	3,100,000
December..	6,113,000	3,000,000
Total..		$18,700,000

During those eight months the Finance Minister by his increase in the sales tax took from the pockets of the Canadian people $18,700,000 more than would have been taken by the old rate of duties, that is, if the average rate of $3,126,000 for the first four months of the year had been maintained. That is only from the domestic tax. But the sales tax was also placed on imported articles. The average return from the sales tax on imported articles for the first four months of 1922 was $1,485,000. This tax also went into force on the 23rd of May, 1922, and the increase in the months following were:

Sales Tax Collections, Imported Goods, May-December, 1922

Month—	Collections	Increase over average Jan.-April
May..	$1,771,000	$ 300,000
June..	2,376,000	900,000
July..	2,338,000	900,000
August..	2,634,000	1,200,000
September..	2,387,000	900,000
October..	2,533,000	1,100,000
November..	2,663,000	1,200,000
December..	2,471,000	1,000,000
Total..		$7,500,000

So we have increase of sales tax on domestic goods $18,700,000; increase of sales tax on imported goods $7,500,000, or a total of $26,200,000. This amount was taken from the people in excess of what they might have paid. The revenue was necessary; I am in no way criticizing the Minister of Finance for having asked the people to contribute it. I am only saying, that by increasing the sales tax in order to add to the revenue he was not adopting the most satisfactory way of reducing the cost of living. It had not the effect which he intended; as a matter of fact, the result was the opposite. The decision to levy the sales tax of 6 per cent at the source of production of the article is wise, I believe. There may be some difficulty in deciding just where is the fountain source of the finished articles, for what is the finished article to one manufacturer may be the raw material to another. I believe the Minister of Finance will experience considerable difficulty in coming to a conclusion as to where the tax should be levied. No doubt a committee will be appointed, or possibly the department will itself undertake to settle this matter, and I presume that regulations will be made to ensure that the tax shall not be collected more than once. That was the fault in connection with the previous tax of 4½ per cent, for I believe that in many instances it was collected several times, probably three or four times

over; at any rate, in certain instances it was as high as 15 or 20 per cent of the cost of the article. I hope that the minister will devise some means of preventing this repetition of payment in connection with the present 6 per cent tax.

In regard to the question of deciding upon the origin of a finished article, in the manner of clothing or of a cloth, for example, I do not know how the minister will settle the point as to who is the manufacturer. Will it be the tailor, the retail man who makes the clothes, or will it be the manufacturer who produces the cloth? These are difficulties which I have no doubt can be overcome, but I have certain criticism of the question.

Many manufacturers as well as men of business have stated that a turnover tax would be more satisfactory than the sales tax. It is possible that a turnover tax might be more advantageous, because the man who had large profits would pay a greater proportion of it. He would not be so apt to pass it on to the consumer; he could absorb it into his business. I think that this suggestion in regard to a turnover tax might well receive the consideration of the Minister of Finance in the future.

There is one particular article on which the sales tax was placed last year in regard to which some modification would be advisable. As I have previously stated, I am not a high protectionist, and I think there are some industries in this country which possibly are too highly protected. One of these, I think, is the automobile industry. This industry is making rapid strides in Canada and in the last year this country, a country of nine million people, exported half as many automobiles as did the United States, with a population of 110,000,000. This shows that the industry is flourishing in this country. There is a duty of 35 per cent on the imported car, and to that was added last year a sales tax of 10 per cent. I did not understand from the Minister of Finance whether he intended to abolish that tax or not; I think it has been reduced to 6 per cent; that at least is my understanding of the matter. When an automobile is introduced into this country a 5 per cent charge is made on it over the sales price in the United States; to that there is added 35 per cent of a duty collected in Canada; and on top of that was the 10 per cent sales tax, making something like 52 per cent of the cost price on the American side which was charged to the purchaser here. That is too great protection, and I think that the minister might have left off the 10 per cent sales tax on the imported car and brought the protection down to 25 per cent.

Now, the Minister of Finance has not only come over as a convert to the protective principle in our policy, but he has repudiated the whole Liberal platform of 1919. In his speech in the by-election at Windsor on February 27, he made this statement, speaking on the subject of the Liberal platform of 1919:

> That is not the policy on which I appealed to the country.

I only wish the Minister of Finance were in his place; I would ask him why he used the pronoun "I." I do not know whether he meant to imply that his personal policy was different from that of the Liberal party. However, he went on to say:

> And that policy was never endorsed by the Liberal party after it got into power.

Well, we know that it was not; that was undoubtedly a truism. The Liberal party never endorsed their policy after they got into power; they used it merely for the purpose of getting into power, and it was a dead letter after they assumed office. Now the Minister of Finance repudiates it altogether. He said that he never at any time promised to endorse it.

Now I come to the question of the finality of the minister's budget, regarding the tariff. There is some doubt as to whether the minister really intimated that we had reached bottom in the reductions in the tariff. Evidently the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) does not believe that we have, because in the course of his speech in this House the other day he made a very significant remark. I will quote his words:

> Who said this was the last word?—

Meaning the statement of the Minister of Finance that he had reached the final decision with regard to the reductions in the tariff.

> Who said this was the last word?. . . . Nobody said it was the last word. The Minister of Finance said distinctly there was no finality, that what parliament did to-day it might undo to-morrow.

Did the Minister of Finance leave a way for retreat from the position he has taken? Is the Minister of Agriculture right in his supposition that his colleague did not mean what he said? The words that the Minister of Finance used in his speech were these:

> Speaking broadly, it is possible to give the country a reasonable assurance of stability of tariff.

Now, I believe that the country has a right to accept that statement from the Minister of Finance and to assume that the question of tariff reductions has been settled. It has gone

out to the people of the country, particularly those engaged in industry, that the matter has been decided, and the effect of this assurance is to dispose these people to extend their plants and to go further into manufacturing industries.

Coming now to other phases of the budget, let us consider the statement of the Minister of Finance with reference to the necessity for economy. I think that economy in the government is absolutely necessary. The time has arrived, I think, when revenue might very easily meet expenditure. We should balance our budget and endeavour in addition to have a small surplus with which to start a sinking fund for the purpose of paying off the national debt. If we go on adding to the debt each year the interest charges will increase so that it will become an intolerable burden to the people. Why should we pass that burden on to future generations? We should stand up to our responsibilities and make every effort to meet them as we go along. But the Minister of Finance makes no effort to do this in the present budget; in fact, he gives us a statement to the very opposite effect, that next year it is possible the revenue will not meet current expenditure and that there will consequently be a further addition to the national debt. I have looked up the national debt of Canada for some years back and I find that in 1867 it was $75,000,000; in 1914, $335,000,000; in 1918, $1,191,000,000; in 1922, $2,422,000,000; in 1923, $2,471,000,000. That is the net debt of the Dominion, and it is still increasing; last year the Minister of Finance added $49,000,000 to it. I had the curosity to look into the current expenditures of previous years; I mean the ordinary expenditures of government, not capital expenditure. I think it is reasonable to take from the expenditures of the present year the amount that is paid in interest on the national debt, increase due to the war, that is, the debt incurred by the war, and that includes the amount paid for pensions and other expenditures in connection with the war. I have compiled the figures, putting the year 1923 on the same basis as 1913, when there was no war and had not been for some time. The war is now five years behind us. It is that far back in history, and it is time we were getting down to a pre-war level. Removing, as I have said, from the expenditure of 1923 the amount spent in pensions and the interest on the war debt, we find that the expenditures were as follows:

1913..	$112,059,000
1914..	127,384,000
1916..	$130,350,000

[Mr. Anderson.]

Hon. members will observe that these were pre-war years. Then take the following years:

1918..	$178,284,000
1920..	303,843,000
1923..	331,780,000

Taken on the basis which I have suggested —deduction of interest on war debt and pensions—hon. members will find that in 1913 the expenditure was $112,-059,000. Taking from the expenditure of 1922 the $158,928,000 paid in interest on the war debt, and pensions, we have left an expenditure of $76,000,000 in excess of the expenditures for 1913, for ordinary expenses of government; and over 1914 it was $61,669,000. While we spent in 1923, $61,089,000 more than in 1913—that is, the ordinary expenditures of government, without taking into consideration expenditure on capital account or for war, the expenditure of 1923 exceeds that of the war years by many millions. As follows:

Exceeding 1916 by $51,000,000.
Exceeding 1917 by $47,000,000.
Exceeding 1918 by $29,000,000.

We are not getting back to pre-war conditions as fast as we might. During the war there were many activities which are not in existence now. There were many civil servants in the Militia department and other departments that are not needed now. Their services have been dispensed with, and if they had not been dispensed with there would have been a very much greater balance against the present day expenditure. It is all very well for the minister—and I commend him for it—to call upon the people to economize in their private affairs, to get down to practical business by producing more, but the trouble is that the Finance Minister is not setting a good example. He preaches a good doctrine but does not practice it. I think that economy is vitally necessary at the present time in the conduct of affairs by the government. We should endeavour to make ends meet, and establish a sinking fund in order to reduce our debt. We should make an effort to reduce the interest charges year by year. We do not desire large surpluses, Mr. Speaker, but we ought to make the budget balance and provide a few millions for a sinking fund. I think that leadership is needed in the matter of economy, and the present Finance Minister is not giving us that leadership.

The budget speech embodies a resolution offering reciprocity to the United States. Now, we had a reciprocity pact with the United States once before—from 1854 to 1864. Immediately at the end of that period the

United States gave notice that they would abrogate that treaty. The treaty was made for a period of ten years, renewable if the contracting parties were agreeable. They abrogated the treaty immediately after the United States Civil War, giving as their reason that they needed a greater revenue, that they needed to restrict imports in order to bring their dollar up to par value, and also that they desired to cultivate industries in their own country and give employment to their own people. At that time, Mr. Speaker, we had made arrangements by which our transportation companies were running north and south in order to take care of the trade which went in those directions. Transportation will follow commerce and possibly commerce will follow transportation, but at any rate we had placed ourselves in such a position that we imported from the United States most of our manufactured commodities, and we looked to the United States for a market for the produce of our farms. The result was that after the Civil war the United States put up a tariff duty against us. We had no tariff duty against the United States, and the consequence was that after 1865 we had the greatest and most serious depression in trade this country has ever experienced. In 1876 it was so serious that parliament appointed a commission to inquire into the problem. And, looking up the history of that time, it seemed peculiar to me that the committee inquiring into those conditions went over to New York city, and sat there for a considerable time inquiring into the depression in trade conditions in the Dominion of Canada. At that time the treaty was abrogated, and a duty was placed against Canada largely at the instance of the agricultural interests of the United States. History is repeating itself. Although the United States was not interested in the Great War to the extent that we were, immediately after that war the agricultural interests of the United States demanded that they should have an increased tariff against the imports from the Dominion of Canada. That was acceded to by the United States government, and we have to-day as a result the Fordney Bill which practically prohibits many articles from this country going into the United States. The same conditions prevail now as existed then. The United States, if they were willing to listen to us in 1911 with regard to reciprocity, are not likely to listen to us at the present time, because there is that restraint upon the government, and the agriculturists of that country do not desire reciprocity with Canada. Even if we had a reciprocity agreement at the present time, what would be the result? Trade undoubtedly would begin to flow to the United States. Our transportation facilities might not be equal to the flow of that trade, and the consequence would be that we would have to change our present transportation system. For a number of years we have had no reciprocity treaty with the United States, and we have our transportation system travelling east and west. We have cultivated an interprovincial trade and also a world trade. I believe that the world market is the one to which we should look to-day, and that we should not confine ourselves entirely to the United States market. It is all right to trade with our neighbours. We are trading more with them than with any other part of the world. I wish to place on Hansard a few figures in connection with that matter. At the present time over 75 per cent of the trade of this country is done with the British Empire and the United States, and not quite 25 per cent of it done with the rest of the world. I have the figures of the imports for the years 1921, 1922, and 1923. They are as follows:

Percentage of Imports from

British Empire	United States	Other Countries
1921.. .. 21.45	1921.. .. 69.04	1921.. .. 9.51
1922.. .. 19.94	1922.. .. 68.6	1922.. .. 12
1923.. .. 22.3	1923.. .. 67.3	1923.. .. 10.4

This shows that of imports coming into Canada from these various sources, something over 60 per cent comes from the United States and only 10 per cent from foreign countries, exclusive of the British Empire, by which I mean England and her colonies. Of our total exports, our exports are as follows:

Percentage of export to

British Empire	United States	Other Countries
1921.. .. 32.77	1921.. .. 43.38	1921.. .. 24.35
1922.. .. 46.7	1922.. .. 39.1	1922.. .. 14.2
1923.. .. 47.2	1923.. .. 39.7	1923.. .. 14.1

If we take our total trade, that is imports and exports, the percentage is as follows:

Percentage of total trade

British Empire	United States	Other Countries
1921.. .. 27.3	1921.. .. 57	1921.. .. 15.7
1922.. .. 33.2	1922.. .. 54.3	1922.. .. 12.5
1923.. .. 35.7	1923.. .. 51.9	1923.. .. 12.9

This shows that we have been gradually adjusting our trade conditions in an easterly and westerly direction, trading more with the British Empire and less with the United States. I think that is the way our trade should go. I cannot see why we should particularly demand trade with the United States in the commodities produced by the western farmers. I cannot see the logic of trading with a country that is a competitor of ours in those commodities in the world's markets. They produce a surplus for export. If they want the wheat of the Canadian west

—and Canadian wheat is probably the best wheat that is grown—they want it for blending purposes. They do not need it for their home market because they have plenty of their own. It does not seem to me a logical way to start to improve our trade by trading with people who produce the same articlse which we do and in a greater quantity than we do and who are our chief competitors particularly in the markets of the British Empire.

Just a word or two with regard to immigration, which is an important subject at the present time. The other day I noticed an article by Sir Henry Thornton. Sir Henry Thornton speaks on many questions, and although possibly he may speak too often, yet his statements in this article are sound indeed. With regard to immigration he said:

Four salient points were emphasized with regard to the immigration problems of Canada by Sir Henry Thornton. . . . First, a capable Minister of Immigration who would co-ordinate all the efforts of the people, is needed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Which we have.

Mr. ANDERSON: I think he is quite right in that. I am not saying that the present Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) is not capable. I do not know whether Sir Henry Thornton had that in mind or not, whether he was hitting at the present Minister of Immigration.

Mr. GRAHAM: He was saying that he was good.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In a funny way.

Mr. ANDERSON: Sir Henry Thornton continued:

Coming to restrictions, Sir Henry said that no immigrants had been admitted unless they were physically and morally sound. Immigrants should be made to understand that they must respect the laws and customs of the country; in other words, neither Bolshevists nor Communists need apply. The financial position of the new immigrant must be such that he is in no danger of becoming a burden upon the community.

Again he said:

One thing is distinctly lacking, that is, some central co-ordinating official or personality who will insist on us focussing our undivided attention.

I think this is all sound, that is that there should be some means by which immigrants coming to this country can get first hand information from some head. I have no doubt the Minister of Immigration is in a position to give that, but he is not always available. The article continues:

Sir Henry advocated the community centre idea for immigrants, especially in the West.

With that statement I feel disposed to disagree. I think it has been proven in the West that the community idea is wrong, because it does not conduce to making immigrants from foreign countries into good Canadian citizens. They are inclined to live as they did in their own country. They have their own language and schools, and they are really a foreign country within the midst of ourselves. That idea is not a good one. The article continues:

He said that while no "calamity howler," the railway situation, as judged by statistics, was not any too favourable in Canada to-day.

He has got away from the immigration point. With regard to this question of immigration, I agree pretty thoroughly with what Sir Henry has said, but I noticed an article in the Ottawa Citizen of May 11 of this year. This is copied from one of the Winnipeg papers, it does not say which. This is an article quoted from Bishop Lloyd of the diocese of Saskatchewan. Bishop Lloyd had been in the Old Country on a visit, and he had been delivering lectures to people in that country, probably with regard to immigration. The article states:

British settlers want to come to Canada but they are afraid they will not be welcomed by government authorities here, according to Bishop G. Exton Lloyd, of the diocese of Saskatchewan.

Reports that new settlers are not desired in Canada are turning the current south to Australia and every ship to the Antipodes carries immigrants, Bishop Lloyd declared. The Australian government, backed by shipping companies, is straining every nerve to keep this tide turned south, he said.

That is something the government might well look into. It is certainly desirable that we should get increased population in this country. We need immigrants of the right class, and I would say that immigrants should be preferably of British stock and that they should be sound physically and sound mentally. Those are the chief desidera in an immigrant. They should also be willing to work, capable of working, and desirous of making a living for themselves. Whether they have a little capital or not when they come here, does not matter so much, if they are desirous of working and willing to go to work and make themselves self-sustaining. That is what matters most; it does not matter so much whether they are highly educated; but they should have a desire to make themselves efficient and of service to the country of their adoption.

4 p.m.

I also cut a little article from the Ottawa Citizen giving a despatch from Welland, Ontario. The article says:

That children of Russian and Polish parentage are being taught Bolshevistic doctrines, including the undermining of the churches and the worship of God, was told the Welland Ministerial Association this afternoon by Rev. Father Charles Barron, whose charges were supported by Father Searo Sinunski, priest of the local Russian church. Father Barron told of a

death threat made against one of his parishioners if the latter did not cease church attendance and send his children to the alleged Bolshevist school, and stated that he had information that a picture of the devil had been shown the children as representing God. He said the schools held two-hour sessions each day, after the close of the public schools, and that forty children attended one and sixteen the other. Both priests stated that similar schools existed in Thorold and St. Catharines, and Father Barron expressed his belief that a mortgage on one of this city had been paid off with Soviet money received from Winnipeg. The association will consider the allegations further at its next meeting.

I think that also demands investigation. My advice to the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) would be to ban Russian immigrants as a class until their nation regains its reason. Russia as a nation is insane to-day, and it is not wise that immigrants from that country should be allowed here as they are bound to be a source of evil and a disturbing influence.

I come now to the amendment presented to the budget by the hon. leader of the Progressive party. I think this amendment was dealt with in a very effective and very humourous manner by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) a couple of days ago. He said, "You would need an X-ray to see the difference between it and the budget." That may not be an altogether accurate description because the hon. gentleman certainly delivered himself with great abandon of fact and argument. He was very entertaining indeed, but not very convincing. This amendment is really dictated by the interests of the three prairie provinces. To my mind it is simply a political gesture, not intended to embarrass the government, but to impress the constituents of the Progressive members from the West that their representatives are using their best endeavours to further the principles of their party. It seems to me that the Progressive party might have taken the opportunity to move their platform as an amendment to the budget, but the hon. Minister of Agriculture explained that omission by stating that the Progressive party had toned down their platform of previous years and that it was not the same to-day as it was a few years ago. Coming from the West the hon. minister knows the mentality of the people there better than I do, although I do not see why there should be any difference between the respective mentalities of the eastern and the western man. But our Progressive friends were very careful to move an amendment which no members in this quarter of the House could vote for. In fact there was no intention on their part to secure any support from us. Because of its free trade proposals it would be impossible for any member of the Conservative party to vote for the amendment. However, hon. members to my left will be free to support the government when it comes to the budget vote itself, because we in this corner of the House will vote solidly against it. We cannot possibly support a budget that contains a standing offer of reciprocity.

With regard to the statements made by hon. members of the Progressive party regarding the depressing conditions under which the western farmers are said to be suffering, I have only a few words to add to what the Minister of Agriculture has already said. He stated that these complaints were political too. He knew this because he had done the same thing himself when a young man. He added that he was not doing it now because he had more wisdom. It was very amusing to hear him, and I admire the members of the Progressive party for the very good-natured manner in which they took his sallies. He certainly plastered them with ridicule; he did not merely lay it on with a brush but with a mop.

Mr. GARDINER: Which was the more ridiculous, the Progressive party or the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON: I think the House must decide that question; I do not care at the moment to give a decision. Like the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I am not the interpretation clause of the House. I hope my hon. friends to the left will not take it as being discourteous on my part, for it certainly is not so intended, when I attempt to show that the farmers of the prairie provinces financially are as well off as the farmers of the East. We are all suffering more or less from hard times and the people of Ontario are no exception, indeed it is a condition that prevails not only in the western provinces but in the eastern. I had the curiosity to look up a return showing the number of rural income taxpayers in Canada for 1922; these numbered 18,873. In the three prairie provinces, 11,656 rural citizens paid income tax, or 61·75 per cent of the total number, while the rest of Canada accounted for 7,217, or 38·25 per cent. The rural citizens of the three prairie provinces who were able to pay income tax were almost twice as many as those in the rest of Canada. Our western farmers are either better able to pay income tax, that is, they are enjoying larger incomes, or they may be more honest than their rural brothers in the other provinces. Of course, I cannot say as to that. I believe the government is making every possible effort to collect income tax from all who are liable, but I have no doubt many escape payment. Taking the rural income taxpayers in proportion to popu-

lation, I find the prairies provinces with a population of 1,252,753 show 1 in every 108 farmers; the rest of Canada with a rural population of 3,770,197 show 1 in every 523 farmers; Ontario with a rural population of 1,226,292 shows 1 in every 200 farmers. In other words in the three prairie provinces they had almost twice as many rural income taxpayers to the population as they had in the province of Ontario, and five times as many as in the rest of the Dominion. That surely is not an index of hard times; it shows that the farmers of the West have money. Taking the figures by provinces they are as follows:

In Saskatchewan, 6,560 in rural population of 538,522—1 in every 82 farmers.

In Manitoba, 3,458 in rural population of 348,651—1 in every 100 farmers.

In Alberta, 1,638 in rural population of 365,550—1 in every 223 farmers.

In Quebec, 150 in rural population of 1,038,128—1 in every 6,920 farmers.

In British Columbia 640 in rural population of 272,-020—1 in every 425 farmers.

Taking our bank shareholders I find on referring to Hansard that in the rural districts the prairie provinces contain 1,794 out of a total of 3,887 for the whole Dominion, leaving for the rest of Canada 2,093. This means that among the rural population of 1,252,753 in the three prairie provinces one farmer in every 698 is a bank shareholder, while in the rest of Canada with a rural population of 3,770,997 one farmer in every 1,802 is in this happy position, showing again that the rural people of the prairie provinces had more money than their rural friends in the other provinces for investment in bank shares.

Again, take the field crops. I will not go fully into this; it will suffice to say that Canada ranks second in production among the wheat producing countries of the world and third in area, the United States first in production and first in area; India third in production and second in area. The wheat production of the world amounted in 1922 to 3,012,293,000 bushels; the production of Canada was 391,425,000 bushels, and of the United States 310,123,000 bushels. Here is a table showing the value of field crops in the various provinces, including grain, vegetables, hay and sugar beets, and covering the years 1921 and 1922:

	1921	1922	Decrease
Quebec..	$219,000,000	$167,000,000	$52,000,000
Ontario	239,000,000	233,000,000	6,000,000
British Columbia.	20,000,000	18,000,000	2,000,000
Prince Edward Island	14,000,000	10,000,000	4,000,000
Nova Scotia.. ..	29,000,000	24,000,000	5,000,000
New Brunswick..	38,000,000	31,000,000	7,000,000
			$76,000,000

So that in those parts of Canada exclusive of the prairie provinces there was a decrease in the returns for 1922 from those of 1921, totalling $76,000,000. The following are the figures for the prairie provinces:

	1921	1922	Increase
Manitoba..	$ 72,000,000	$104,000,000	$32,000,000
Saskatchewan.. ..	215,000,000	299,000,000	84,000,000
Alberta	82,000,000	94,000,000	12,000,000
			$128,000,000

So that there was an increase in the prairie provinces for those years of $128,000,000 as against a decrease in the rest of Canada of $76,000,000, as I have shown. That does not indicate that there are any harder times in the prairie provinces than there are in the rest of Canada, and I fail to see what basis the Progressives have for the statements they have made in this House, statements which are not in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada and are certainly very detrimental to the West. The rest of Canada has always been friendly to the West. Only a few days ago some of the members of the Progressive party suggested to me that there was an unfriendly feeling between the East and the West. I cannot undertsand such a statement; there is nothing of the kind. It seems to me that the western members have thought so much on this question that they have failed to realize its significance.

There were other matters, Mr. Speaker, to which I might refer, but I shall not take occasion at this time to put any further figures on Hansard. I have only to say that I cannot vote for the amendment because it declares for free trade, neither can I vote for the budget on account of the reciprocity resolution which it contains. I am therefore under the necessity for voting against both.

Mr. R. J. WOODS (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, in offering a few remarks in connection with the budget I do not propose to charge the government with responsibility for all the ills at present prevailing in the Dominion of Canada in connection with industrial or agricultural or labour conditions. I am confident that it would be impossible for any government to discover a panacea for all those ills, but I am convinced that the government are responsible for the fiscal policy of the country; therefore I feel quite free to offer some criticisms in connection with the present budget.

To my mind the government of the day have had—possibly still have—a dual policy. I have had more or less to do with political contests on the back concessions and in the rural sections of Ontario for thirty years or

more, so that I am not entirely a stranger to political contests, to what has been advocated on the hustings, or to the legislation that has been enacted in connection with our fiscal policy. As I have viewed it during the last thirty years or more, the political parties have had a double policy, one for the time during which they sat on the opposition benches and the other while they sat on the government side. So that from that point of view in any case I am justified in offering some criticism of the minister's budget for the present year.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), in his address yesterday, told us that the government were moving in the direction of lower tariff. Well, in watching the history of the Liberal party for a considerable length of time I have been impressed by the fact that the motion has been very slow. According to the statements made, and according to what is put before the people in political campaigns, the party now in power have been moving in that direction for a great number of years. I have tried to view the situation honestly and fairly, but my observation is that the progress has been so slow that it has been almost impossible to detect a movement during the last thirty years so far as reduction of the customs tariff is concerned. So that if the government continues to move as slowly in the future as it has in the past. a lot of us boys who are sitting in the House at the present time will have passed out of existence so far as this world is concerned before there is any considerable reduction in the customs tariff.

There is one thing I want to commend the government for, and that is the proposal of a reciprocity agreement with the great nation to the south of us. That proposal has been objected to by some hon. members of this House. I think it was the member for East York (Mr. Harris) who suggested yesterday that the people of Canada were not in favour of entering into an agreement with the United States on trade matters, were not in favour of our standing at the door of the United States begging for an opportunity to carry on our trade. So far as my experience and knowledge goes of the rural people at least they are very, very anxious that such an agreement be brought about, for those of us engaged in agriculture know the benefits that we received while we had an open door into the country to the south of us for our natural products. So I want to congratulate the government upon this step and I hope that negotiations will proceed and the agreement be brought about as speedily as possible.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does not the hon. member admit that this is a step towards lower tariffs?

Mr. WOODS: I will possibly answer that question before I get through, though perhaps not just as directly as the hon. member would wish, but if he follows me closely I think he will find something that will answer his question.

To prove to this House the benefits that the agriculturists of this country at least received while we had access to that open market in the United States I am going to quote from the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. During the first ten months under the United States Emergency Tariff Canada's exports to the United States of the principal articles affected by the new duties fell, when compared with the corresponding period of the previous fiscal year, from $157,000,000 to $36,000,000. The principal items included in those totals are wheat and cattle. The value of wheat exports fell from $91,000,000 to $13,500,000, and the quantity from 42,000,000 bushels to 11,000,000 bushels. The value of cattle shipments for the same period fell from $21,000,000 to $3,000,000, or from 280,000 head to 143,000 head. So it is apparent that the agriculturists of this country received a wonderful advantage through that open door. It was a great benefit to them to have that open market, and it is our most natural market being right at our door to which to ship our cattle and other products free.

I want now to refer to the tax on cheques in respect to which legislation was brought down in this budget. Personally I am not favourable to that tax. When the Minister of Finance brought down his budget a year ago his first intimation was that cheques should be taxed two cents for each unit of fifty dollars to the full amount of the cheque, but later the tax was changed to a maximum of $2, so that on a cheque over $5,000 only the maximum of $2 was paid and the unit principle ceased. Personally I was not favourable to a maximum being set. The Finance Minister goes a step further in this budget and reduces the maximum from $2 to $1. In that respect this appears to me to be a rich man's budget. A great deal of the business done in our small towns and cities by small merchants, cattle dealers and so forth is done by cheque, and their cheques are usually small. Now they are compelled to pay two cents on every unit of $50 or less no matter how many cheques they issue, while the man doing a large volume of business and paying out hundreds of thousands of dollars pays

nothing on a cheque beyond a certain amount. His maximum tax on any cheque, no matter how large, is to be one dollar. I claim that that is very unfair, it works an injustice. I am not going to find fault with the two cent stamp on cheques, not by any means, I think that is a very nice way to raise revenue; but I say that in all fairness to the masses of the people who do business on a small scale and issue many cheques for comparatively small amounts, and who are taxed two cents on every unit of $50, the rich man who issues cheques for large sums of money should be taxed in exactly the same proportion and should pay two cents on every $50 no matter what the size of the cheque issued.

Now, I want to refer for a few moments to the tariff. We have heard occasionally about the high tariff on goods entering the United States. It is true that the United States has a very high tariff, and of course as a justification for keeping up the tariff here hon. gentlemen will sometimes point to the tariff wall on the other side of the line. But while that is true in the general, the United States government has taken cognizance of the needs of the agricultural interests of that country. They have looked well to the interests of the producer. The United States imposes no duty on farm implements of production entering that country, these implements go in there absolutely free. Wagons, threshing machines, cultivators, binders, mowers, reapers, ploughs, harrows, all farm implements enter the United States duty free. But on this side there is a duty of from 10 to 17½ per cent on wagons, 15 per cent on ploughs, cultivators and so forth, and 10 per cent on binders and mowers. It appears to me that if the United States government are so interested in the agriculturists of that country that they can give this advantage to the farmers who cultivate the soil and produce the grain and food that the masses of the people in that country require, the government of this country ought to be as deeply interested in the agriculturists of Canada and give them the same advantage in their work of production. I want to bring to my assistance in this debate, and just in this connection, a speech delivered by the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in the session of 1910-11. I expressed the opinion, when I first began to speak, that there was a dual policy on the part of this government, and it seems to me that in this respect the members of the present administration are not altogether alone; there are possibly some others who are practically in the same boat. If I remember rightly, at the time the right hon. gentleman delivered that speech a large deputation of farmers from the West had waited upon the government of that day and had insisted, I believe, practically on free trade in agricultural implements; at any rate, if they did not ask for absolute free trade in this line they demanded a great reduction. I am going to quote now some brief extracts from Hansard in which the right hon. gentleman's speech on that particular occasion is reported. You will find it at page 1915 of Hansard of 1910-11, volume 1. A resolution was introduced by the right hon. gentleman, and I quote it:

> That in the opinion of this House a substantial reduction in the import duties on agricultural implements is now due the agriculturists of Canada, and is in just accord with the true ends of the protective tariff.

Of course, I must give my right hon. friend credit for this, that he upheld at that time the same idea of protection. However, let me quote another extract from the same speech; it will be found at page 1917 of the same volume.

> They have allowed—

Referring to the government then in power.

> They have allowed, in the respect which I am discussing this afternoon, protection to run rampant, and they have for reasons that are only too obvious, become the slaves of those who helped them into power and who now maintain them there behind ramparts of gold.

In the face of such a statement as that coming from the right hon. the present leader of the Opposition, I think that the group of gentlemen who surround me here and who all advocate a reduction in the customs tariff in connection with agricultural implements, will surely enlist the sympathy and support of the right hon. gentleman. But I cannot help remarking that if the government in 1910 were standing behind ramparts of gold they are to-day still standing behind the same fortress; for as we are all aware, while the duty has been reduced, I think, on binders, which at that time paid 17½ per cent whereas to-day the duty is 10 per cent, the duty on ploughs is still 15 per cent, with similar rates on harrows and other necessaries of that description. So that there is not such a wonderful difference, after all, in that direction. But we must bear in mind this important fact, that implements in 1910 were slightly over half their present price, and in dollars and cents the protection which is afforded to-day on these implements is greater than it was at that time. The price is well nigh double what it was in 1910; and notwithstanding that there has been a slight reduction in the rate of duty, the actual amount in dollars and cents paid on these

implements coming from the other side is considerably more than it was in 1910.

Take boots and shoes as another example. If agricultural implements are of great importance to the farmers of Canada, it will not be denied that boots and shoes are an absolute necessity to all of the people throughout the Dominion; and if it is desirable to reduce the duty on agricultural implements, in my opinion the duty on boots and shoes should undoubtedly also be reduced. Boots and shoes to-day are going to the United States free of duty, while we are taxed in this country from 25 to 30 per cent for them.

Mr. McMASTER: Fifteen per cent British preference.

Mr. WOODS: I am referring to the general tariff; the duty is 25 to 30 per cent. But the United States admits boots and shoes absolutely free. Yet we are told that if the customs tariff were reduced the manufacturers of the country would suffer. It strikes me that, seeing that labour, according to evidence given before the Agricultural Conditions committee, is practically about the same—this being also very largely true of material—if the manufacturers of the United States can turn out agricultural implements and boots and shoes and throw them upon the world's markets in open competition with all other countries including Canada, the Canadian manufacturers of these same goods should be able to compete in the same markets with the producers to the south of us.

Mr. STANSELL: Would the hon. member say to what extent the boot and shoe manufacturers of Canada are exporting shoes to the United States at the present time?

Mr. WOODS: According to the evidence given before the Agricultural Conditions committee a few days ago, if my memory serves me,—and I think I have the facts here—a shoe manufacturer in his testimony practically stated that there were no exports of boots and shoes from Canada to the United States. But let us not forget this, that the boot and shoe manufacturers of Canada hold a monopoly of this industry in this country. When these goods from the United States are debarred by a duty of from 25 to 30 per cent the practical effect is to give the manufacturers in this country an absolute monopoly of the home market.

Mr. HOEY: While they have a larger market in the United States as well.

Mr. WOODS: Yes; they have free access to the United States market, so that if they have any surplus in Canada they can place it there. I am going to bring the House back again to another quotation from the speech by the right hon. leader of the Opposition delivered in, 1910, to be found on page 1,931 of Hansard of that year. He said:

> Now, sir, what are the manufacturers of agricultural implements enabled to do? They are able under this tariff to exact a higher price than they could exact if the tariff were lower.

And then a little further on, on page 1933, he said:

> They have not only given the manufacturers a grip on the whole home market, but practically given them a monopoly of it, and they have taxed the consumer in order to push the manufacturers and their industries successfully into the markets of the world.

Now I believe that statement of the right hon. member in 1910 is absolutely true, that the customs tariff of this country and the protection that the manufacturers have had for forty years have given the manufacturers a grip on the home markets of this country, and practically given them a monopoly of those markets and enabled them, as the right hon. gentleman has stated, to push their manufactured goods into the other markets of the world.

But what are the conditions in regard to agriculture? The farmers of this country have not a home market for the produce of the soil. True, there may be a few farmers living in close proximity to our large urban centres who will benefit by being in touch with the markets there because products can be brought to the city markets and sold to the consumers without passing through the hands of a middleman. In that regard the farmers of this country are benefited, but how many? Very few of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada are in the happy position that they can bring their products to those markets in the urban centres and sell them directly to the consumer, without passing them through the hands of the middlemen. The home markets are practically worthless to the farmers, because we have to put our surplus products on the markets of the world. According to the figures in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce last year, we exported, in vegetable and animal products, the products of the farm, $233,692,749 worth more than we imported. In the animal and vegetable products of the farm this country has exported goods to that amount more than have been imported of the same quality of goods. The producers of these goods have

no home market, speaking on broad lines for goods have to go to the open markets of the world. This boasted home market that the tariff has built up—and we have had many public addresses along that line—has been built up for the manufacturers

Then again we are referred to the revenue, and the fact is pointed out that we need a customs tariff for revenue. We know that considerable revenue is derived from the customs tariff, but it is quite possible that a lower tariff might bring equally as much revenue or possibly more. We see an example of that in the statement made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in regard to cigarettes in his budget speech. The duty on cigarettes was practically a prohibitive duty and the reduction of that duty was made in the hope that it might bring in more revenue. What is true in regard to that is certainly true in regard to other commodities. To my mind a revenue tariff works in the reverse way, because of the fact that it is too high, and we might possibly receive more revenue with a lower tariff, and it would impose less burden on the consuming public.

Now again I am going to refer to the speech of the right hon. member (Mr. Meighen) delivered in 1910, to verify the statement which I have made. At page 1,933 of the same Hansard he said:

> I say that to my mind this tariff is designed to benefit the revenues of other countries rather than the revenues of our own countries. As at present constituted this is not so much a tariff for the revenue of Canada as a tariff for the revenue of Spain, as a tariff for the revenue of Austria. . . . It is, Sir, a tariff for the revenue of Roumania, a tariff for the revenue of Russia, a tariff for the revenue of France rather than a tariff for the revenue of Canada.

That quotation verifies the statement I have just made in regard to the high tariff being to some extent prohibitive, and that a marked reduction in that tariff might be the means of bringing more revenue to this country than it does at the present time.

I wish to refer now to the tariff as being a means of centralizing the industries of the Dominion of Canada. I think the hon. member for North Waterloo, (Mr. Euler) in his speech some time ago, advised our friends from the West—if my memory serves me right, and I think it does—to start manufacturing industries all over the West.

Mr. EULER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODS: It would be a wonderful thing to start manufacturing industries all over the West and build up a home market. It has been proven conclusively, to my mind at least, that with our present population, and until it reaches to millions and millions more than we have at the present time, we have practically no home market for the agricultural products of this country.

Mr. EULER: I was also in favour of the policy of immigration—to let the people come in.

Mr. WOODS: I also hope we will get immigration. What has this done for the small manufacturer? I refer chiefly to Ontario, because I am not so much acquainted with the other provinces of the Dominion, so far as industries are concerned, but I have known something about the conditions in the province of Ontario for the last forty or fifty years. I am sure that I am correct when I state that 30 or 40 years ago scattered throughout Ontario in almost every little village there were one or two manufacturing establishments which supplied the great bulk of the needs of the people in those commodities. They were small foundries where men got their ploughs, their cultivators, their farm implements to a great extent, outside possibly of binders. They got their mowers. Personally I might state that the first mower we ever got on our farm I bought for $40 from a home manufacturer right at my own door. I cut wood in the bush and paid for it. We never had a more substantial mowing machine on our farm from that day to this, and we have had quite a number of them. That, however, is a thing of the past, because those small industries have been either swamped or bought out, I do not know which. There is no question that they have disappeared. We are at a loss, to a large extent, even in getting our repairs which we formerly got from those little manufacturing establishments that we had in our communities. They built our threshing machines, our horse-power machines, many of our farm implements, such as ploughs and so forth. Those establishments have now disappeared. In those days we could take our grist to the mill, have our wheat ground and our flour returned to us along with the by-products, bran and shorts. Those mills have all disappeared. We could take our oats to the mill and get our oatmeal back with us. Those mills too have all disappeared. The reason is that the manufacturers of this country have been so protected that they have built up gigantic industries in the great urban centres, and from the rural communities they have drawn the labourers, the farmers, many of our people who should be on the farms to-day, operating and cultivating the soil. Those people have been drawn

off to the great urban centres because of the centralization of the manufacturing industries of this country. I believe the protective tariff has a great deal to do with that condition in Ontario to-day.

But then we are told that where they have a greater volume of business, where they have larger machines, they can manufacture the implements so much more cheaply in those great factories than could be done in the small factories. I believe that is true; but who reaps the benefit of those cheap manufactured goods? Who are the beneficiaries? It is not the farmers back on the farm, but the manufacturers that receive the benefit by manufacturing more cheaply and at the same time holding up the price of their goods under the protective policy of this country. I am going to give an illustration of that. In the constituency which I have the honour to represent there is one small factory that has weathered the storm. It has not weathered the storm as regards manufacturing new implements to any extent; but it still carries on by manufacturing repairs for the implements in that community. I am going to give to the House figures that are absolutely correct. In 1921, that foundry in the constituency that I represent was selling ploughshares to the farmers at 50 cents apiece. It was sending them out over the community wherever people would send in an order for them, and while of course, there would be the freight, that would be a very small trifle for a ploughshare going a short distance by railway over the constituency. I asked that manufacturer what he was selling these ploughshares for, and he said: "I am selling them for 50 cents apiece and I am sending them out by the hundreds." At the very time that that small manufacturer was selling ploughshares at 50 cents apiece, our local dealers, who were agents for the large manufacturing companies of this country, were charging us from 90 cents to $1.20 for the same ploughshares. Who was receiving the benefit? If the small manufacturer could make ploughshares at 50 cents apiece, why could the manufacturers not make those ploughshares, send them out and sell them through their local agents for 65 or 70 cents apiece? It is the large manufacturers who have received the benefit of cheaper manufacture in the great centres, and this, I claim, is due to centralization largely brought about through the protection that is given to the manufacturers by the customs tariff.

I am going to refer to another matter that has been thrown in our face occasionally, and that is that when the Reciprocity agreement was before the people of the Dominion of Canada, the farmers turned it down. In my opinion, to a large extent we are guilty; but so far as my knowledge goes in connection with that particular campaign as it was carried on in the locality in which I live—and I think that would be a fair sample of what went on in the various localities in Ontario—I did not know of any Liberals in the past who were farmers turning against the Liberal party and going over and voting with the Conservatives. I knew of no Liberals who forsook the Liberal party because of the Reciprocity agreement.

Mr. McMASTER: Not real ones.

Mr. WOODS: So in regard to that, the farmers are not really guilty. If the farmers had turned over from the Conservative ranks and voted Liberal in strong numbers, we might have succeeded, and I am sorry that they did not. So far as I know they did not do so to any great extent in the rural sections. What was the result in the urban centres? What was the attitude of the Liberals in the great urban centres, the industrial Liberals of the Dominion of Canada, in connection with the Reciprocity agreement?

5 p.m.

Mr. McMASTER: The noble eighteen of Toronto.

Mr. WOODS: That was just what I was going to refer to. Eighteen Liberals signed a manifesto to oppose that Reciprocity agreement, and if my memory serves me aright, I think amongst that number was Sir Thomas White who was honoured with the position of Minister of Finance of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: By the Tories.

Mr. WOODS: But he turned over from Liberalism.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes.

Mr. WOODS: That is to my mind conclusive evidence that the manufacturers of this country are behind the government that will protect them. They are behind the government for class legislation. Although the Progressive group has been charged with coming into existence to seek class legislation for the farmers, this group came into existence because we had to fight class legislation in the Dominion of Canada. Many of us would have been tilling our land to-day if it had not been for the very fact that the farmers of this country had been burdened through class legislation in the interest of the manufactur-

ing industries. That is the reason why this group is here to-day. We are on the job, we are going to stay on the job, and we are going to fight for equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will my hon. friend aid us in starting that campaign by moving the permanent suspension of the Crowsnest rates?

Mr. WOODS: We will see how things are going to work out in the future. So far as my observation goes, our tariff legislation for the last thirty or forty years is the joint product of the Liberal and Conservative parties, and both parties are in the one boat as respects fiscal policy. In a word, which ever party happened to be in power never failed to receive support of the manufacturing interests, because quite naturally these interests always stand behind the party that stands for protection in this Dominion.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, before entering upon the observations which I intend to make on the budget proper, I should like to join in the congratulations which have been tendered by other members to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on the presentation of his seventeenth budget. And I do this for two reasons; first, because he has established a record that is unique in the management of the Finance department of Canada and, secondly, because he is held to-day, after twenty-five years of office beginning in 1896, in just as great regard by the people of Canada as ever. I further congratulate him because of the budget which he has brought down at this time. I do not suppose that my hon. friends opposite will agree with me, but I think the Minister of Finance has presented a budget which ought to meet with the general approval of the people of Canada. I do not suppose that he himself would claim that his budget is entirely perfect. It may be capable of improvement. Indeed, there may be one or two features of it with which I would not agree myself. But in a country such as we have, with its diversified interests, I realize, and I think all members should realize, that it is necessary to grant something to the spirit of compromise.

True, the budget has met with some criticism, but this criticism has not been very strong. I should like to approach the consideration of the budget in a broad way and from a national viewpoint. It has sometimes been said that Canada is a very difficult country to govern. I believe that to be true. We know the Maritime provinces came into confederation unwillingly; they felt they were losing their natural market in the United States, and for it they claimed they were not compensated by the market which they hoped to get in central Canada, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; and to-day many of their people find it difficult to make ends meet because of that disadvantage. Farther west we have the industrial provinces of Quebec and Ontario where, rightly or wrongly, the people feel that a moderate tariff is necessary for the preservation of their industries. Going still farther west we have the prairie provinces where again, rightly or wrongly, the people feel that no tariff at all or a very, very moderate tariff indeed is in their interests. And then across the Rocky mountains we have a mixed population whose ideas vary on the subject of the tariff. All of which, Mr. Speaker, merely goes to prove that if we are to have national unity we must each of us, though our interests vary, yield something for the common good. And that is why I support the budget.

I should like to deal for a moment with some of the criticism directed against the budget. So far as the criticisms of my hon. friend, the former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) are concerned, in my opinion they require very little reply. He had a very difficult duty to perform, and it is no reflection upon his ability to say that he found it extremely difficult to make an impression on this House favourable to his views. I believe that if he were perfectly frank he would say that the budget is a reasonably good one—not so good, of course, as a budget that he might present himself.

I presume that when the right hon. leader of the Opposition takes part in this debate he will as usual refer to breach of faith on the part of the Liberal party with respect to the tariff plank in the platform of 1919. That is usually his stock in trade, and I for one do not particularly blame him for taking any opportunity that may present itself in making out what I consider to be a poor case. Perhaps it may shock some members on this side of the House when I say that I have very little confidence in the making of platforms, anyway. I do not believe that a government or members elected to the responsibility of a seat in this House should necessarily be asked to accept what may be ill-digested planks in any platform imposed upon them by people who come from various parts of the country, and whose suggestions probably are as much dictated by political expediency as anything else; I do not believe that men who represent the public should be expected to carry out

such ill-considered behests on the floor of this House. So that speaking for myself, Sir, I would say frankly that in the public interest the platform of 1919 should not be permitted to shackle the government responsible to all the people, whether it be a matter of tariff or anything else.

Mr. GOULD: Would the hon. member inform me whether that expression of opinion was voiced by him in the hall where the platform of 1919 was framed?

Mr. EULER: I may tell my hon. friend that I was not present when the platform was framed and I never gave adherence to it afterward. Now, referring again to the criticisms of the hon. gentleman (Sir Henry Drayton) who leads the official Opposition to-day, I listened to him very carefully, and the burden of his song when he particularized somewhat seemed to me to be this: The government was taking steps to promote the artificial silk industry. If you are going to help the artificial silk industry why not promote the interests of the natural silk industry, he asked. Then he claimed the government was not properly taxing luxuries, and answered his own qusetion by saying: Perhaps this government proposes to help the artificial silk industry because artificial silk is the only kind of silk that the common people can afford to buy.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does not the hon. gentleman understand that, according to everything that has been said in certain quarters, protecting artificial silk would put a price on it, and therefore would add to the cost of what was at least an article of luxury?

Mr. EULER: I understood that he was saying that luxuries were not properly taxed; yet he was objecting to the process of making available to the common people an article that was just as good, perhaps, as the real silk but would not cost them quite so much.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And now coming in without that protective duty.

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend's solicitude for the lowly silk worm reminded me of a little rhyme I heard some years ago. Perhaps I may be permitted to paraphrase it—and I assure my hon. friend that I do so without any intention whatever of giving offence. It ran something like this:

> It wriggles in; it wriggles out,
> Leaving the hunter still in doubt
> Whether the worm that made the track
> Was going out or coming back.

I would like to discuss for a few moments the criticisms of the leader of the Progressive group. I felt when he was speaking that his objection to the budget was apologetic in its nature, and I was rather impressed by the fact—I think it is a fact—that the Progressive party itself did not really expect any very great change in the tariff at this session. They would have been very well satisfied, I believe—and I doubt whether any of them will contradict me now—if the hon. Finance Minister had not made what they considered an unfortunate statement with regard to the desirability of stability in the tariff. I am free to say, Mr. Speaker, that that statement of the Finance Minister was especially pleasing to me and should receive the favourable consideration of the House. I do not think he intended to convey the impression that the tariff was as unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Indeed, he stated very definitely that there was room for change as circumstances demanded. But surely, in the matter of the business interests of this country, whether you call them manufacturing interests or any other, it is advisable and for the general good that business men should know that there is reasonable likelihood that they may be allowed to carry on their affairs and extend their businesses without the constant apprehension that they are going to be interfered with by radical tariff changes. In fact—and I have no doubt that my Progressive friends are aware of this—no less a gentleman than Mr. Henry Wise Wood, of Alberta, a not inconsiderable figure in the party, has expressed his appreciation of the budget and stated that he is well satisfied with it.

We must not forget that a fiscal policy that is satisfactory to all Canadians cannot be framed without, perhaps, failing to give satisfaction to some of the diversified interests that we have in this Dominion.

I have a great deal of sympathy—and I hope my hon. friends will believe this—for the farmer of Canada, more particularly for the farmer of western Canada. I have that sympathy because I think every citizen ought to feel consideration for any other citizen or any other class of citizens who find it very hard to make both ends meet in these times. And I have a certain selfish consideration in the matter also, because I am free to admit that if the western farmer or any other farmer in Canada does not prosper, then the industries of the riding which I represent cannot prosper as they should. There are in my riding something like 150 to 165 manufacturing industries. Their market, or a great portion of it, is in western Canada, and they are very much interested in the progress and prosperity of the western farmers. The farmers themselves in

the district in which I live have just as great a concern in the prosperity of the industries of the city from which I come, because that city is in itself a very considerable market for their produce. But while it has been difficult for the farmer to make his way—and we all freely admit that—I think sometimes there is a disposition on the part of our friends opposite to feel that the manufacturers and the business men of Ontario and Quebec are making huge profits at their expense. Now, I know whereof I speak, and I may say to my friends opposite that many of the manufacturers in the city from which I come, as well as in many of the other industrial centres in the province of Ontario, have found it very difficult to get along during the last few years. The point of my remarks is this, that in this country of varied interests there must be something of a compromise. We must get something of the other man's point of view so that we shall not take an extreme view in any one direction. We may be partly right, but the other man is perhaps also partly right; in order to get together each of us must yield a little his own viewpoint.

In theory most men are free traders; in actual practice we all know that at the present moment free trade is not possible. Liberals and Conservatives usually draw fine distinctions on tariff matters; the Liberal sometimes speaks of tariff for revenue and the Conservative frankly advocates a tariff for protection. The attitude I have always taken with regard to that—I have taken it before in this House and I take it again to-day—is this: That as a matter of fact a tariff, whatever name you may give it, is protectionist in its effect. It makes no real difference whether the tariff is primarily a means for the purpose of raising revenue;—it will have a protective result. If you impose a duty upon the foreign manufacturer who brings his goods into this country, just to that extent do you impose a handicap on the foreign manufacturer and to that extent favour the manufacturer of your own country.

Mr. McMASTER: But you do not put the tax on the foreign manufacturer; you put it on your own consumer.

Mr. EULER: Well, it is just a question where you are going to draw the line as to what is the interest of the consumer. If you are going to make your tariff so low that your manufacturer cannot exist, or if you wipe it out altogether, I think you will soon find there is a corresponding effect upon the consumer as well—usually a workingman who is engaged in production and is also a consumer.

The leader of the Progressives complains that the government has not lived up to its 1919 platform, yet in his amendment he fails to state completely his own platform. Why does he not call for free trade with England as it was enunciated in his own platform some years ago—free trade with England within five years? I think the five years have elapsed; if he still believes in the principle as enunciated a few years ago he might just as well have called in his amendment for absolute free trade with England.

The budget calls for an increased preference to Britain, yet that does not meet with the approval of the hon. leader of the Progressives. The budget has a standing offer to the United States for reciprocity in farm products, yet he calls in his amendment for the old Reciprocity agreement of 1911, in face of the fact that many of his followers, many of the people of western Canada, especially in the province of Manitoba, failed to support the very reciprocity agreement that he asks for to-day.

Mr. HOEY: They are all converted now.

Mr. GOULD: That applied to the urban centres, not to the farmers.

Mr. EULER: I have the highest regard for the hon. leader of the Progressives—and I am sorry he is not in his seat to-day. I believe he is sincere in what he advocates, but I do not think that in his criticisms he has been quite fair to the government. He said the other day that this budget and this government have done nothing for the farmer. I wonder if he has forgotten what took place last session when this government restored the Crowsnest rates on grain and saved the farmers of western Canada $20,000,000 in freight rates.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): That is not in the budget.

Mr. EULER: My statement was that he had said this government had done nothing for the farmers.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): He was referring to the budget.

Mr. EULER: I think you will find on referring to Hansard that he said neither this government nor the budget had done anything for the farmers.

I would like to make a reference to the Crowsnest pass arrangement of last year. It is true, I believe, that the leader of the Progressive party himself as well as many of my Progressive friends, and I am not saying this with the intention of arousing any antag-

onism but simply to show that they have not acted fairly in the matter—there are notable exceptions, I am willing to admit—did go west and claimed, and claimed in Ottawa, that they forced the Liberal government to restore the Crowsnest rates on grain. Mr. Speaker, nothing can be further from the truth, and I leave it to the members of that special committee on railway rates to say whether it was not the Liberals on that committee that gave them support and helped to restore the Crowsnest pass agreement.

Mr. HOEY: The Liberals helped.

Mr. EULER: Yes, and if it had not been for the help of the Liberals my hon. friends would never have received that agreement. I will say this further: There were members on that committee, members from this side of the House, who in a sense worked against their own interests when they took that attitude on the Crowsnest agreement. If I may be pardoned a personal remark, I was a member of that committee. Among the commodities that were included in the old Crowsnest agreement was furniture. Now there are in the riding I represent something like twenty-five furniture manufacurers, and yet I was in favour of dropping the commodity of furniture from the agreement and restoring only the grain rates for the benefit of the western farmer. There was another member of that committee himself a manufacturer of furniture who very cheerfully sacrificed himself in that respect also.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the hon. gentleman and his co-member yet been able to get a statement from the government as to whether they will give the manufacturers those low rates this year?

Mr. EULER: I have not made any inquiry with regard to that, but I will say this: Notwithstanding that the rates on furniture and other commodities were not restored as they were on wheat, I have had absolutely no complaint from the furniture manufacturers of my town. In fact, I discussed the matter with some of them and they were quite willing to say, "The western farmer needs the assistance, and we will give him all the help we can. We are perfectly willing to wait until he gets in a better position."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That will be next year, won't it?

Mr. EULER: I cannot say. I am not entirely in the confidence of the government with regard to these matters. What I do say is this, that it showed that the attitude of the Liberal party and of those manufacturers was an admirable one and contrary to what we sometimes hear of the selfishness of manufacturers and the dereliction of the government with regard to the interests of the western farmer.

Mr. McMASTER: And showed the manufacturers' confidence in their member.

Mr. EULER: It is true that it was simply the granting of a just demand. But I will add that a fair and just acknowledgment that the Progressives had received the assistance of Liberals and of the government would have been more in place than a denial or a suppression of the fact that they received the assistance of which I have spoken.

Mr. BIRD: Can the hon. member give an instance of where any Progressive member made the statement he charges us with?

Mr. EULER: I could quote him the attitude and statement of a very prominent member of the party in that committee itself, who stated that the concession was forced from the Liberals.

Mr. HALBERT: Is the hon. member sure that he is quoting a member of the Progressive party?

Mr. EULER: Yes, I am quoting the leader of the Progressive group.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I am sure the hon. member wishes to be fair. My leader is not here, but I think my hon. friend will admit that the statement to which he has made reference was not made in a spirit of criticism at all, but more as a joke and was not in any sense seriously meant.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EULER: I really regret having had to make that statement. I had no intention of making it, but I was pressed for it by my hon. friends opposite.

Selfish tactics are usually attributed only to the two old parties. Well, Mr. Speaker, the two old parties have their faults, but I believe that the average of political morality and of real patriotism and the desire to serve their fellowmen is just as high in the two old parties as it is anywhere else. I for one, and I am saying this not with any malice at all, will say frankly that, to use an expression often used, I am just about tired of that "holier than thou" attitude taken by some members of this House. The Progressive member for Edmonton (Mr. Kellner) yesterday voiced the old stereotyped shibboleth that both parties took orders from the big interests, and that is why I am making

these remarks to-day. I resent that statement on the part of the hon. member. I do not believe it is true, and if I believed this government was taking orders from the big interests I would not support it.

Mr. BIRD: Does the hon. member make that statement on behalf of both parties?

Mr. EULER: I think I can make that denial on behalf of both parties.

Mr. BIRD: Does the hon. gentleman remember certain statements made to my right last year in regard to the influences that had returned the Liberal party to power?

Mr. EULER: I do not recall any particular statement.

Mr. BIRD: I could give two instances.

Mr. EULER: I should be sorry to believe that either of the old parties is susceptible to these influences as indicated in such a wholesale way by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Kellner). Speaking for myself I would say this: I believe that I represent the farmers, the workingmen, the manufacturers, the business men, men of all classes, just as fairly according to my own poor ability as any member on either side of this House. I never asked nor received from any central fund any contribution, and there are no strings, financial or otherwise, attached to me. I wonder whether the same can be said of every member of the group opposite.

Coming back now to a more pleasant subject, we from Ontario are usually charged with being high protectionists.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the hon. member a question? First of all I acknowledge the generous attitude he has taken, nor can I ever recall his taking any different attitude. But I ask him if he has any recollection of the speech of his own leader in the corresponding budget debate of 1921? I think the worst offender to receive his own castigation now is his leader of to-day.

Mr. EULER: I regret that the leader of the government is not here at the moment. I am quite sure he would be in a position to answer the hon. member's question. I am not.

I was going on to refer to the tariff. Those of us who come from the province of Ontario are very often charged with being high protectionists. I will say for myself, and I believe I can say this for almost every hon. member who comes from Ontario, most of whom come from industrial towns and cities, that we are not high protectionists. We are not elected as high protectionists. We believe, most of us, in a moderate tariff. Personally—I have said this frequently before—I believe in a tariff that is going to maintain our industries, not to maintain industries that are going to build up a monopoly and squeeze the last cent out of the consumer. But after all, I have a concern in the industries in the riding which I represent, and I for one could not vote for such a reduction of the tariff or an entire elimination of the tariff that to my knowledge might work certain injury not only to the manufacturers, but to the working men of the constituency I have the honour to represent. As a matter of fact, the farmers and the manufacturers have very much the same difficulty. They are brothers together; the difficulty of both alike is the lack of markets. The Canadian manufacturer would like a larger market, although to-day he is doing an export trade as great as that of all the products of the farm. But his difficulty is just what I have stated; he needs larger markets.

Mr. GOULD: In his statement about the manufacturers doing such a larger trade than the farmers, I think the hon. gentleman is saying something that is at least a bit strong.

Mr. EULER: I have the statement on good authority and if the hon. gentleman can give me figures to the contrary I am quite willing to accept them. But whether I am right or wrong in what I have just said, the fact remains, there is a common difficulty for the manufacturer and the farmer. They both want to extend their market; and I will say this for the manufacturers—and I can speak with some knowledge of the attitude of those in my own community, there being very many large industries in the city of Kitchener—that many of them are of this view, that if they were assured of a large market to the south, if they were assured of a reasonable permanency in demand in that market, they would be willing to compete with the United States manufacturers on a fair and even basis.

Mr. HOEY: They have such a market in boots and shoes.

Mr. EULER: That is one article on the American free list, but there is no certainty of permanency about it. And men with large business interests are not going to extend their enterprise and do business in a market of 110 or 120 million people, incurring great expenditures, unless there is reasonable assurance of permanency in that market. I for one say that there is no justification for opening our markets entirely to our neighbours to the south of us when they

persist in keeping up their high tariff against us; and I have no hesitation whatever in taking this position, that I will oppose serious reduction of the tariff just so long as the United States government maintains its tariff wall as it is doing now. I should think that this ought to appeal to the patriotism of some of my Progressive friends opposite. I know that some of the Progressives would say to-day, if they gave expression to what they feel, that they are not in favour of raising the Canadian tariff or cutting it down while the United Sates retains its own tariff against Canada.

The Progressive amendment calls for lower tariff, and, I think, consequent lower revenue.

Mr. McMASTER: Not necessarily.

Mr. EULER: I think so. The tariff we have now is a moderate one, and if you made it much lower the revenues would be very much smaller.

Mr. GOULD: What is the hon. gentleman's authority for his statement?

Mr. EULER: I say that the tariff is a moderate one.

Mr. GOULD: You believe that.

Mr. EULER: Yes, and it affords a reasonable protection from other countries; it is neither an exclusive nor a monopolistic tariff, and I do not believe that there are many of my Progressive friends who would argue that. Consequently, to reduce the tariff is to reduce to a great extent the revenues which we receive at present. We have to-day a deficit of almost $50,000,000 and if you reduced the tariff very much, I for one certainly believe that that deficit would be still larger. That is a serious situation to face. It is the duty of the Minister of Finance to adjust his finances in keeping with his expectations, and personally I do not blame him at the moment for declining to reduce the tariff at the risk of adding to the national debt. I also agree with the minister in not imposing new taxation in order to make the budget balance. Taxes are now high, and there are some forms of taxation I do not believe in. I believe that taxation is reasonably high now, and if it is true that the tremendous debt we are carrying to-day, and which entails such heavy taxation from year to year, was incurred for the preservation of our liberty and the liberty of the world, then I say it is fair that posterity should carry at least a portion of it.

Mr. McMASTER: Posterity can hardly be charged with responsibility for the war.

Mr. EULER: No, but it will share in the good results that may have been secured.

Mr. GRAHAM: "The sins of the fathers," you know.

Mr. EULER: Whatever may be the general opinion about that, I believe that under present circumstances, and in view of the condition of depression that now prevails, the Minister of Finance is quite justified in not increasing taxation. I think he may look forward with reasonable hope to the restoration of better business conditions and an improvement in the railway situation, and this being the case I do not think that higher taxation will be necessary next year or in the years to follow. I think that the position taken by the Ontario man and possibly by the resident of Quebec would under similar circumstances be taken by my hon. friends the Progressives. Most of them represent farming constituencies. Now, I do not suppose there is much essential difference between the United States farmer and the Canadian farmer. The Canadian farmer believes in a very low tariff, or practically in absolute free trade, because he thinks it would benefit him. The American farmer to-day is an ardent protectionist, because he is of the opinion that protection is going to work to his advantage. In short it all depends on whose ox is gored. I believe that my hon. friends opposite are actuated by altruistic motives, if I may use that term, just as much as any of us, but not a very great deal more. Charity begins at home.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What motives actuate the manufacturers?

Mr. EULER: Let me ask the hon. gentleman this: What were the motives of the Westerners when they asked for an exclusive wheat board, which was protection?

Mr. CAMPBELL: They wanted to eliminate the speculator.

Mr. EULER: I was not going to refer to this, but the hon. gentleman suggests the question. The leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke), in an address the other day on the Combines Act, expressed the opinion that combines ought to be curbed when they entailed higher prices for the consumer. Well, I think that this would have been exactly the result that would have been attained by the Wheat Board. The Westerner would expect higher prices for his wheat and if he got higher prices someone would have to pay—

Mr. CAMPBELL: Not at the expense of the consumer.

Mr. EULER: —unless we accept the pretext that there is some man who comes in between the producer and the consumer and takes the intermediate profit.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): That is not a pretext.

Mr. EULER: The Westerner believes in free trade because he thinks it is to his advantage. He may be right or he may be wrong. The Easterner believes equally in protection, if you like to call it protection, or at least in a moderate tariff. He, too, may be right or wrong. It just comes back again to my old argument; it all goes to show that all of us, no matter what we may believe is good for ourselves or for the country, should, if we have divergent views, try to compromise and to reconcile those views as far as possible.

Mr. EVANS: Is it not a fact that the Canadian manufacturer believes in free trade too when it comes to raw materials for his purposes?

Mr. EULER: I do not know what the attitude of the manufacturers may be, but I would say that so far as is possible, all along the line, the Canadian manufacturer ought to get his raw materials free.

Mr. EVANS: Would you not concede the same thing to the agriculturists?

Mr. EULER: Is the hon. member referring to raw materials?

Mr. EVANS: Yes.

Mr. HOEY: He means instruments of prodution.

Mr. EVANS: Well, that is our raw material.

Mr. EULER: That is rather a novel way of putting it; I never thought of it in that way before.

Mr. PRITCHARD: What about printing presses?

Mr. EULER: They do not come free.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What about fertilizer?

Mr. EULER: I protest; I cannot answer all these questions at once, and I must pray that I be allowed to proceed. I am convinced that the tariff question is magnified out of all proportion. As the member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) stated the other day, there are other important matters that are worthy of the consideration of parliament and of the Progressive party.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. BIRD: Would the hon. gentleman enlarge upon his definition of a moderate tariff? Wherein does it differ from the tariff of my hon. friends to my right?

Mr. EULER: Again I must protest at the number of questions that are being flung at me; I really desire to conclude before six o'clock if my good friends will allow me to do so. If the hon. gentleman desires to discuss the tariff or any other question with me on any other occasion I should be glad to take it up with him. Now, the government has a duty to perform to all citizens of this Dominion, and it cannot heed the demands of any particular occupational group at the expense of all the others. For that reason, and because I believe the budget is an honest attempt to afford a fair average of justice to all classes of the community, while having regard to the financial necessities of the country, I am going to support it.

The leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) believes the loss of revenue should be made up from the taxing of unearned income and taxes on luxuries. I confess I have a good deal of sympathy with that suggestion, but I fear that, as a definite source of large revenue, a tax on unearned incomes would not be so successful as he imagines. I also agree with what the leader of the Progressives said with regard to economy, and I think what he said with regard to the Civil Service is worthy the consideration of the government. I believe all civil servants ought to be well paid, but I do not think we ought to have any larger number in the service than is absolutely necessary.

I was going to speak briefly on the subject of taxes, entirely apart from the tariff. I think that during the next generation governments in general throughout the civilized world, especially those who took part in the war, will meet defeat more frequently than in the past, for the simple reason that people resent taxation, all of which is a reason why the theory of taxation should be carefully studied and a logical, reasonable system of taxation worked out, in this country as well as in other countries. People never take kindly to taxes in any country, and that is another reason why, both politically and in other ways, it would be wise to make the imposition of taxation just as light and as little irritating as possible.

I take mild issue with the government in the matter of taxation. I never believed from the beginning, under the Union government, in the imposition of taxes such as the stamp tax, and, more recently, the tax on receipts, and many of the irritating excise

taxes which we have had in the past. I believe we can develop something that is a good deal more simple and just as logical as the taxes that we have now. I see no real connection between the liability for a tax and the justice of placing a tax, on cheques for example. The mere fact that a man is paying out a sum of money by cheque is no reason why he should pay a tax. He may have had to borrow in order to pay the money and yet he is taxed. If there is any logic in it, I think the tax should be paid by the man who receives the money, rather than the man who pays it.

But I base my argument in that regard on the difficulties in connection with collecting the tax, and the unnecessary irritation that it causes to the public. I was going to make this suggestion—and I have made it before—that ultimately the government might very well confine the tax-raising operations to three chief sources. First, the tariff, and the amount of taxes to be gathered in that way is limited. Then we should have an income tax, and obtain as much as is fair and right from those who can afford to pay. That is also limited. There will still be a large balance which will be required, which ought to be and must be collected from the ordinary man of the country. That will be a general tax that will be averaged, and will be collected from all classes, because we already have provided for taking taxes from the man who has a large income through the income tax. As to that I believe—although I know there are a great many objections to it—that in the end governments will come to a simplified form of a turn-over or sales tax. I am quite sure some of my Progressive friends will find fault with that, but I believe that in the end it will be found the most equitable and certainly the cheapest form of taxation to collect. We should get down finally to the three basic methods of taxation, the tariff, the income tax, and the turn-over or sales tax.

I admit there is a great deal to be said against the sales or turn-over tax. But that is the case with all taxes. The tax that has just been imposed in the way of a sales tax is open to the objection that there will be pyramiding all the way down the line, and the consumer will pay more than the amount of the tax. I know that is the argument. Perhaps, with careful thought we can develop something that will meet the situation. And consideration should be given to the endeavour to prevent overlapping of the taxation that we have in this country to-day. As to the income tax, in Ontario a man must pay to the federal government and also to the municipal government. In Manitoba I note that the government has imposed a provincial income tax. It seems to me it would be the part of wisdom for the federal, the municipal and the provincial authorities to get together and map out their spheres of taxation, so that they will not overlap.

In conclusion I wish to say a few words on a subject in which I am always very much interested. That is the matter of the National Railways and the public ownership of railways. There was a time—two or three years ago, perhaps longer—when I believed in public ownership, and I was one of the very few who were in favour of national ownership of railways on principle. The railways, it has been said by the right hon. leader of the Opposition and others, and quite rightly so, were taken over because they had to be taken over. They were bankrupt. But so far as I was concerned, I favoured that action on principle. Now we have lost very heavily on our railways in the past year. We have however, I am glad to say, improved our position by something like $12,000,000, and the improvement to-day is very rapid. At present the business of the National Railways is increasing by leaps and bounds, and I believe one of the reasons is that the people of the country are realizing that the railways are their own, and they are patronizing them, knowing that every dollar they put in the coffers of the national railways goes to help to decrease the deficits which otherwise they would have to help to pay in taxes. I venture to say that in a period of less than five years the National Railways will pay not only their operating charges but their fixed charges as well. In the meantime the people of Canada are getting a great benefit as a result of national ownership of railways. They are receiving a service such as they never received before, and that remark applies to the Canadian Pacific as well as the Canadian National Railway. Courtesy and efficiency have become the essential policy of the two great systems as a matter of necessity in the struggle for business.

I would like to make one suggestion to the government in connection with the railways, and I make it with modesty, knowing also that the suggestion is not a new one. Among the charges standing against the National Railways are large sums which are the results of deficits and of advances made by the Dominion government and upon which involve heavy fixed charges, and increase the deficits from year to year. We may fairly say that the original roads comprising the National Railways were in a state of bankruptcy.

We are now re-organizing these roads. In private business when re-organization of a bankrupt business is carried out the old losses and fictitious assets do not find a place in the new capitalization, but the business is capitalized at its real value and it starts off with a clean sheet as a new enterprise, free of the incubus of the old debts and losses. I think that is sound business. That practice might well be followed by the National Railways. A fair valuation of the whole system should be made, and I know this has been advocated by the former leader of the Progressives, with whom I agree in a good many ways. A fair valuation of the whole system should be made. I think the amount now standing against the National Railways in one way or another is something in excess of one billion eight hundred million dollars. I do not know that is exact. It is difficult to dig the figures out of the report. The railways should be expected to pay fixed charges upon securities representing only the total of the real value as would be done in any private business. The interest could not be evaded on securities held by the public as individuals, but the amount held by the latter is less than the actual value of the road. The balance of the indebtedness is in the form of advances made by the government of Canada or securities taken over with the old roads.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What would be the basis of my hon. friend's re-valuation—replacement or earning power?

Mr. EULER: I was coming to that. I should say that the basis of re-valuation should not be the cost of replacement, because if the roads were to be rebuilt, they would not be rebuilt as they are now. There is too much duplication. But I would say, if it were possible, re-valuation should be arrived at on the basis of a thoroughly good system that would serve the same purpose as the system that we have now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member mean the replacement value of a thoroughly good system?

Mr. EULER: Yes, what it might cost to build a new system that would serve the purpose of the combination of systems that we now have. I would write off the difference between the actual value so ascertained and the amount of indebtedness which is now charged against the railroads, upon a large portion of which we require to pay fixed charges, although those fixed charges are based on fictitious assets. I take that position because the money was lost, we have nothing to show for it, and we might as well write it off and not have the fictitious assets as a perpetual handicap upon the road. This action would not reduce our losses in actuality, of course; but it would reduce the enormous aggregate of fixed charges which the roads are expected to earn, and which figure so largely in the annual deficit. If this were done it would be an encouragement to the board of directors. Not only would it encourage the management who would not be continually confronted with the task of trying to make earnings on an over-capitalization, but it would put the National Railways on more of an equality with their great competitor, the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe also if that were done, it would be only a short time until our National Railways would be on a sound financial basis. The profit and loss account would soon show a balance on the credit side, which could then be applied to a reduction of rates which is so much desired.

Some weeks ago the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) suggested that these losses and fictitious assets, as I have called them, should be carried along with the idea that, in future years as the roads became more prosperous, we would be able to draw dividends, if we want to call them such, on these amounts. I am not disposed to agree with that, because I do not believe it would be businesslike to carry on the books, assets which are not real assets. If after a time we find that the rates do show profits over and above operating costs and fixed charges, under the plan that I propose, it becomes merely a matter of policy whether these profits shall be applied to wipe out the old losses or whether they should be applied to a reduction of rates. Frankly, I think they should be applied to a reduction of rates because the real theory and purpose of public ownership is not the making of profits, but the giving of the best possible service at cost.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the government lay on the Table to-morrow a statement of how the revenue for last year was made up? I find it is not in the budget speech. I should like a statement showing the ingredients of the revenue for the antecedent year. There were other particulars omitted from the speech which are usually included also, but I will not ask for them at present. I should like them also.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss the budget I wish to extend my hearty congratulations to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who on this occasion is delivering his seventeenth budget. He has rendered very valuable and faithful services to this country, services extending over very many years, and I can pay him no greater compliment than to say that to-day he possesses the esteem of the people from one end of Canada to the other.

It has been pleasing to us in this quarter of the House to note that our friends who now occupy the government benches are at last coming round to the view that we must have a certain amount of protection and that under present conditions, with other countries raising high tariff walls, it would be unfair to Canada to cut down our tariff, particularly when it would be so hard to obtain revenue from other sources to make up for any loss caused by a revision downwards.

We have to take into consideration, too, the competition that our manufacturers would have to meet in the event of our lowering the tariff on certain articles that we now manufacture. We have not only competition from the United States, where they manufacture in such large volume that they are able to put their goods on the market at a cheaper rate than we can compete with, but we have another source of competition that has not had much attention paid to it in past years, although I think now we are beginning to wake up to the danger. I refer to competition from the hundreds of millions of people on the other side of the Pacific with cheap water transportation to our shores. We find Japan is branching out in many lines of manufacture, and in a very short time, in fact even to-day, with her splendid steamship service across the Pacific she is able to place her merchandise on our markets at lower prices in some cases than we can quote ourselves.

I am very pleased indeed to note that the government proposes to give a bonus for the manufacture of certain lines of copper. This will beneficially affect one of the big smelters in British Columbia. I know that smelter very well. It lies at the foot of the hills from the well-known mines at Rossland, and below the smelter again lies the little town of Trail with a population of several hundred, dependent entirely on the copper works about. This little town would go out of existence were it not for the Trail smelter. Therefore, as I say, I am very pleased to note that the government has agreed to give some assistance to this smelter to enable it to meet outside competition.

I propose now, Mr. Speaker, to touch more particularly on certain points in relation to agriculture and shall only refer incidentally to the budget as I proceed. But before leaving the budget itself I must refer to the very interesting amendment brought down by our friends to the left. It is interesting from the fact that they have taken certain planks from the Liberal platform of 1919 and incorporated them in an amendment to a Liberal budget in 1923. Undoubtedly it is rather unique in that respect. They have also included certain clauses that they knew beforehand how the Conservatives would vote on, and in that way they have brought in what might be termed a safety amendment. When we first heard that an amendment to the budget was to be brought down we thought we could look forward to a little excitement when the vote was taken, but after hearing the terms of the amendment I have come to the conclusion that there will be just as much excitement when the division comes as there would be in waving a red flag at a dead bull. However, towards the end of this debate it will be very interesting to hear from the government benches, because we expect they will then pay a public farewell to their platform of 1919.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Order.

Mr. TOLMIE: As we look over the agricultural situation in Canada and throughout the world we find that the markets on which we have been depending for a number of years and on which our agriculture was very largely built up, are very much disorganized. Some of them are entirely out of existence; others are much more limited than they were before. This condition, of course, has a serious effect upon agriculture in this country. Some of our farmers are meeting with reverses in regard to the disposal of their product; owing to climatic conditions, bad crops and so forth some of them are losing heart and, I think, leaving the country. But this is not the first depression we have had in Canada; we have had even worse depressions than this in former years and we have lived through them all. I feel quite satisfied that with the spirit of the Canadian people behind us we will survive the present one.

We must not, however, criticize the farmer too severely. In fact, no one is in a position to criticize the farmer unless he has himself experienced some of the ups and downs of agriculture. Those of us who were brought up in the country, particularly in the wooded

sections, know what it is to rough it on the farm, to go out and do half a day's work on a plate of porridge—and I may say in that connection that my father came from Inverness, Scotland. At the same time I do not feel that we are going to get anywhere by blindly complaining of our condition. It appears to me that the most practical thing to do under the circumstances is to make a careful survey of the situation and then to select those lines of agriculture that will give to us the quickest and best promise of success. In doing this I think at the very beginning we can score rather severely that particular line of farming known as single crop farming. In fact, where it depends on the production of one line of grain in some sections of the country, it develops into very little more than a gamble with the weather. But the man who gambles on the single crop is rather at a disadvantage compared with the man who gambles in other lines, because he is limited to only one bet a year. If he wins that bet he probably winters in California; if he does not win it he stays at home and tells us that the country is no good. Now, it is admitted—and judging from the debate that has taken place already it is generally accepted in this country—that our most reliable line of agriculture is that of mixed farming with live stock as a basis. This is the safer plan even for the man who wishes to specialize in a particular line; if he at least keeps a certain amount of live stock for a nucleus he can radiate from this centre as far as he likes, and the chances are, if the live stock markets are in any sort of reasonable condition, that the results of his work in that direction will carry him through many of the hard places in connection with the single crop on which he has concentrated much of his attention.

There never was a time in Canada when it was so necessary to carry on a system of good farming as it is to-day. When prices are high we may practise hit and miss farming to a certain extent and meet with fair success, but under conditions like those which prevail at present, with prices low and costs high, it is necessary to apply the very best methods if we are to succeed.

There is another thing that is very important, too, and that is the plugging up of the leaks to the best of our ability. Produce all we can at home, make the farms self-sustaining, and at the same time send nothing to market but what is of the best quality possible, in the best condition, and marketed at the proper time. In that way we can make a very substantial saving. Let us glance for a moment at the situation with regard to marketing and the quality and condition of the stock sold in the markets of this country, and then form an opinion whether the farmer is at the present time making the best of his opportunities. Last year we sold 600,000 head of cattle through our inspected abattoirs, and it is estimated that owing to poor quality, poor condition and small size the farmers of this country dropped $30,000,000. A comparison of the prices will be rather interesting. We find in the first place that instead of the marketing of these cattle being extended over the greater part of the year, most of them are rushed to the market during the fall and early winter months, with the result that the market is glutted and the packer is almost beside himself to know what to do with the stock. At one time a few years ago, during the war, when there was a great demand for bone meal on the other side of the water and the Argentine competition did not exist, we could sell this cheap trash to fairly good advantage. But just now that market is gone, owing largely to the Argentine competition. I will quote a few prices just to give you an idea of the spread. The average low and high prices in the Toronto market during the years from 1918 to 1922 inclusive, were as follows:

	Low Average	High Average
1918..	$5 54	$15 12
1919..	5 02	15 35
1920..	3 93	15 80
1921..	1 63	9 83
1922..	1 22	8 67

This shows that there is a tremendous spread between the price of the animal that is desired by the packer and the butcher and the animal that is sent to market in a low condition, of a scrubby nature, and lacking in size. You will readily see that in the last three years the men who handled that kind of cattle never made any money at all.

There is another very striking feature of these figures. Even during the bad years the man who produced a steer of good quality received either a first class price or a very fair one. This clearly indicates that there is no advantage in breeding the scrub animal, so that the farmer who pursues that policy must come to the conclusion either to change his methods or to change his business. I would emphasize, then, the tremendous loss that has been occasioned to this country, first, in lack of weight in our stock, and then in lack of a good price—that is, the existence of a low price for the cattle, running, as I have indicated, into many millions of dollars—a dead loss to the farmer. Here is a situation

where the farmer must absolutely help himself. While he can receive a certain amount of assistance from the government, the actual result depends very largely on whether or not the individual is going to change his methods.

Another branch of the live stock industry, and one of the most reliable, I think, is that of dairying. Dairying is one of our most stable industries; even to-day, in those cases where cheapness of production is well taken care of and good breeding has been attended to so that the herds contain animals of fairly high quality, a very reasonable profit is returned to the farmer. But again the result depends very largely on the farmer himself. I will show you that we are losing every year an amount estimated at $200,000,000 owing to the poor quality of the dairy cows in Canada. We have 3,500,000 dairy cows in this country that average about 3,500 pounds of milk each per year, while we have single cows in Canada that yield as high as 33,000 pounds in a year, or a little over eight times as much as the average yield. The farmer who maintains scrub cows has to keep a stable that will hold eight cows instead of one. He has to feed eight cows, clean out the places for eight cows, milk eight cows, and after he gets through with it all there is very little profit in it for him. The man who maintains a better herd—and some of our herds average as high as 14,000 pounds of milk per cow for the whole herd—does not talk about hard times, while the man who maintains a scrub herd is always doing so.

One of the greatest jokes in connection with the agricultural business, if there are any such—my experience is that it is always pretty hard work—is to hear a man complain about the failure to take the duty off agricultural implements while at the same time he is trying to make a living out of a 4,000 pound cow. It is an utter impossibility. If he would just take care of his herd, get the proper kind of cows and breed them up, improve their quality, I do not think the duty at present existing on agricultural implements would interfere with him very much. It has been found at some of our experiment stations that as the yield of the cow increases, the cost of production goes down up to a point of 18,076 pounds per year, and in those cases where the milk was of a fairly high quality the cost still kept lowering. But where the butter fat content is rather low we find that above that figure the cost of production is a little higher, but at the same time still quite profitable.

While the improvement of herds may be looked upon by some as something that can only be accomplished by a rich man, I may say that at the Nappan experiment station down in the Maritime provinces an experiment was conducted of taking a number of scrub cows from neighbouring farmers and placing them on the farm, and just by good feeding alone the product was increased by fifty per cent. Then by proper breeding methods the output of the offspring of these cows was increased fifty per cent again, showing that there is a proposition within easy reach of any farmer, and one where good results can be accomplished by a combination of proper breeding and feeding. The farmer who still maintains a scrub herd and has not yet tried to improve its condition should not be downhearted. I know of my own personal knowledge many cases where farmers have commenced with scrub cows and after a few years have been able to reach over 12,000, 13,000 and 14,000 pounds of milk per cow, and in addition to that 550 pounds of butter fat per cow, showing that this is within easy reach of any farmer who has the energy and perseverance to try. Of course, this was not done by making speeches. It was done by being willing to work, to learn and improve. These men I particularly speak of took every possible opportunity to improve themselves, improve their knowledge of dairying by visiting experiment stations, exhibitions and the best herds in the country, and I am quite sure that anyone who will display the same intelligence and energy as they did will have very satisfactory results.

Our dairy industry last year was worth about $240,000,000 to this country. Our export market is that of Great Britain. We send some dairy products to the United States, but Great Britain, I think, is the more important market of the two. We have been having rather bad results over there during the last year or two owing to the fact that our butter is not coming up to the demands of the British market. As you may know, in that market we have to meet very strong competition from Denmark, Holland and also New Zealand. The Britisher complains that our butter is too heavily salted. Some people say that the salt is put in to meet the taste of the people in Canada, while others explain that salt sells for two cents a pound and butter for forty or fifty cents a pound. The Britisher also complains that our butter is uneven in colour, that its flavouring is not first-class, and that it is also defective in keeping qualities. To illustrate that I may say that our butter sells in Great Britain from

ten to twenty shillings per hundredweight below the butter of Denmark and New Zealand. It is estimated that the loss on this alone in 1922 amounted to no less than half a million dollars. Last year a well known western creamery sent to Great Britain a consignment of butter of very good quality, with the result that it sold for over five shillings a hundredweight higher than other Canadian butter that was over on that market at that time. This is pointed to as a result of the system of grading of dairy butter that some of the western provinces have carried on during the past few years. There is no reason why we should not get our goods on the British market in first-class condition. This will depend largely on the grading of our cream and butter, but we must also supply it in sufficient quantity to interest the people on the other side of the water. The Britisher quite naturally does not want a certain consignment this week, and then no butter of the same kind next week. There must be a continuous stream, even in quality, first-class in every way, and made with a view to meeting the demands of that particular market. Here is an opportunity for improving matters for the Canadian farmer and assisting him to a very great extent in connection with his outlet for dairy products, which must always be on the other side of the water or in some other country as we produce more than we absolutely require for our own needs. However, it must be remembered that nobody can make first-class butter out of poor cream or badly kept cream. and in that particular the farmer himself can render very valuable assistance.

Let us glance for a moment at the hog and export bacon industry. Perhaps no line of live stock has suffered so much from in-and-out farming, that is to say, the farmer has gone into the hog business when prices were high and dropped out of it when prices were low, and very often by that system he has missed the high prices and failed to get the advantages the other man has secured who has stayed steadily in the business. At the Central experimental farm at Ottawa it has been clearly demonstrated that on land valued at $125 an acre, where regular wages were paid, where they did not have the benefit of family help, hogs paid every year during the war and since that time. But during that very period there were men out in certain sections of Canada where grain was a little cheaper than here who were going out of the hog business because they said hogs did not pay.

Let us see whether the farmer has made the most of his opportunities in connection with the hog industry. Our markets to-day are suffering very severely owing to the fact that the farmer fails to send to those markets hogs of the proper type and proper weight. This not only injures the farmer himself but the packer also. It very seriously interferes with his work, and particularly in his effort to secure a fair share of the British market. There are eight packing plants doing business in Ontario, and at these plants forty-five per cent of the hogs marketed are what are known as out-weights. The ideal weight for a hog to furnish a Wiltshire side for the British market will run from 160 to 210 pounds live weight. These hogs that are not of the right type seriously interfere with the sale of our goods on the other side of the water. To illustrate, let me say that recently at a sale of Canadian Wiltshire sides held in England the desirable weights brought from 101s. to 102s. per hundredweight of 112 pounds, while out-weights that did not conform with the requirements brought only 94s. And still the farmer continues to market these out-weights even in face of the fact that there is a difference of one or two cents a pound on the live hogs as they are taken into the abattoir.

There were 2,000,000 hogs slaughtered in our plants in the year 1922. Of these, 40 per cent, or 800,000 were required for export; and in the grading of these 800,000, only 13 per cent were classed as selected bacon type. If all the selects had been exported they would have supplied only about 32·5 per cent of the packers' requirements, with the result that the packer is now compelled to buy many of the out-weights and fat types to meet the market demands. What effect has this on him? This is simply one of the reasons why Danish bacon, with the uniform supply from that country, will sell in the British market at 117 shillings per hundredweight, while the best Canadian bacon sells at between 102 and 105 shillings and on the average only 96 shillings per hundredweight. It has been clearly shown that our best hogs are equal in every way to the Danish product, and the cure given by our packers in this country is altogether on a par with that given to the product of the European packing houses. By way of illustration I might quote the following from a letter received from a gentleman a short time ago who spent some time in England. He says:

> One day last week I tested Canadian bacon against Irish and Danish, without knowing the position of the three. By long odds everyone was in favour of one kind, which turned out to be Canadian; and yet we have to take many shillings a hundred-weight less for our product.

What is the reason for this? The explanation is simply that, as I have pointed out,

our supply is uneven both in quality and in weight. There appears to be no excuse for our not being able to produce a good quality in Canada. We have a great variety of grains which I think are equal for these purposes to any grown in the world. In the United States they produce their hogs largely on a corn diet, with the result as shown in the figures which I will give to the House bearing on the question, comparing the prices received for American Wiltshire sides as against Canadian Wiltshires. The American Wiltshires brought 90 shillings per hundredweight, while the best Canadian product sold at 105 shillings; and the average American product brought 80 shillings as against the average Canadian 96 shillings. The American, in addition to feeding his hogs on corn, raises what is known as the thick fat hog, which goes largely to lard. This is a type that the Englishman is not very fond of. He got a surfeit of it during the war and I am afraid it will take some time before he recovers from his experience with American pork.

A comparison of the prices at Chicago with those obtaining in Toronto during the year ending March 31, 1923, shows that the smallest difference beween the Chicago and the Toronto price was in favour of the Toronto price to the extent of $1.45. That was during the month of October. The higher price in favour of Toronto in the month of July was $3.97 while the average for the twelve months was $3.16, showing that the Canadian farmer marketing his product in Toronto and the other markets that contribute thereto, obtains a higher price than if he had his hogs in Chicago when hogs are sold there. This is largely due to the demand for his particular type of hog, as I have shown; and with the feed at the disposal of the Canadian breeder and feeder, he is able to send pork to market in a firmer condition than can the man who has to depend entirely on corn.

Let me say however that while we are competing in the British market with the Dane, while we produce our own feeds at home, the Dane has to depend to a great extent on feeds exported from other countries. In view of this fact, surely we should be able to compete with him if we pay particular attention to the article we send abroad and see to it that it is uniform and of the kind demanded. While the type of hog produced in Canada, the price of which is controlled by the export market, fetches the prices I have quoted, there is to be taken into consideration this fact that the producers of hogs in Canada enjoy a certain form of protection. According to our health of animals regulations it is illegal to import hogs from the United States for slaughtering purposes, or indeed, for that matter, for any purpose at all, unless they are quarantined for thirty days at the boundary line. With such a regulation in force, it would not pay anyone to import hogs, unless for breeding purposes and of high value, and incur the expenses connected with this quarantine. This therefore is a form of protection. It was not intended as such, but in fact it is protection and that is one reason for the price the Canadian producer enjoys in the home market.

Another interesting point I might mention. We might compare the prices of grain grown in this country and used for hog feed, such as barley, corn, bran and shorts, with the hog prices received during the war. Last year we find the ratio between the prices of feed and of hogs more favourable than in 1914 or at any time during the war, which shows that the opportunities of the producer of pork at the present time are better than they have been for ten years. However, careful feeding is absolutely necessary. Recently out of a shipment of some 2,500 head of hogs sent to one of our abattoirs, 400 carcases were classed as "softs" owing to improper feeding. There is a great scarcity of hogs of the proper type of weight and finish. To obtain these hogs more attention must be paid to breeding and feeding operations. The market will increase and our product will equal the Danish product if we send the kind of material which is called for in London and at other points in Great Britain where our products are used. We need to exercise great care in the selection of breeding stock with a view to securing the proper type. We must also market our product at the right time. One of the failings of the Canadian breeder is that he sends mixed lots of hogs to the market, some of which conform with the requirements, securing the highest prices, others being too heavy, having been kept too long, and others, again, too light, not having been fed long enough. This is another instance in which the farmer must help himself. Neither the government nor anyone else can help him in this regard if he does not take the initiative. With regard to this Canadian market, I have no doubt of the possibility of our being able to secure our full share. There is no question about that. The conditions are favourable, but if the farmers show indifference

with regard to the type of hog they produce, we may easily find ourselves among the tail-enders in the British market.

There is another line of live stock which I think should be doing very much better than it has done in the past in Canada. It is one in regard to which we are very much behind other agricultural countries, not only of the British Empire but in the world at large. I refer to the production of sheep and wool. The number of sheep in Canada to-day does not exceed three or three and a quarter million head as compared with twenty seven millions in Great Britain, forty millions in the United States and eighty millions in Australia. This has been due largely to the fact that while the market in Canada has been of an unstable nature, prices varying up and down, there has been no encouragement for men to go into this business. This particular industry, I think, should receive every assistance possible. We have been allowing Great Britain to ship her wool over to Italy and Germany, where it is combed and returned and then shipped into Canada free of duty. This product is known as "tops." We find also that the Japanese are now going into the wool combing business quite extensively, and their goods are coming here free and competing with ours, which is a very unfair competition indeed. I am informed however that there has been in existence for some time a tariff of 15 per cent on combed tops coming into Canada. This 15 per cent has never been enforced and I would urge upon the minister that it be put into effect at the earliest possible date so that our wool combers in this country may secure the protection that they require to build up their industry.

I would even go further than that and give bonuses for the handling of wool in this country until we get the industry on a proper footing. There is something certainly very seriously wrong with an industry when in a huge country like Canada, with vast areas of land, suitable for the raising of sheep, our sheep population amounts to only about three and a half million, particularly in view of the fact, as I pointed out, that you cannot blame it on protection, as far as combed wool is concerned. I would like to draw this matter to the attention of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) whom I had not noticed in his seat until this moment. I said that we were bringing wool combings into this country absolutely free at the present time, in spite of the fact that we have a tariff of 15 per cent against that class of goods, which has never been enforced, and I am pressing on the House the necessity of enforcing that tariff at the earliest possible date so as to assist in placing our sheep industry on a proper and substantial footing. It is quite possible for us to produce the highest quality of wool in Canada, capable of manufacturing up to 64s. quality. From that up to 70s. and 80s. we have to import our wool, but it is possible for us to produce the higher grades necessary for the manufacture of that particular quality. We also have competition from Australia, which is sending combed wool in here without any duty, while in that country the government bonuses wool combing to the extent of 5 or 6 cents per pound. Here the Canadian producer of sheep and the Canadian wool comber have to face during part of the summer, the competition of the bonused wool trade of the greatest sheep-growing country in the world. In addition to that the Australian wool comber is able to buy wool from the hide wool stock accumulated by the Australian government during the war, at cost price and this is another disadvantage which the Canadian wool comber has to contend with. I sincerely hope the government will give this question their closest attention.

There has also been a reduction in woollen cloth from Great Britain, and in this connection I may say that we should I think be able to build up a few of these important industries the building up of which means assistance and help to our natural products, such as wool, and many other articles. Let us get our home manufacture of woollen goods at least securely on its feet, and let the wool market become a reliable one, and you will find the sheep population of Canada increasing in very great numbers. The sheep is a useful animal, useful on almost every farm, and one that will live largely on waste material in the summer months. It is a very good animal for keeping down weeds and it furnishes a supply of manure at almost any time of the year. Here is the farmer making the best of his opportunities in the production of lambs. The lamb is a side line of the sheep industry which is very important and one that is very remunerative where carried on in the proper way. We find in Canada that the farmer markets about 70 per cent of his male lamb flocks with the result that there is a great loss in the summer on that particular account. To give you an idea of the size of this market, in the first three months of the year over 28,000 ewes and lambs were marketed in the Toronto market. The lamb market has changed to a great extent. Within recent years lamb feeding has been taken up and the lambs are fed

on the waste material of the wheat grower, known as screenings; and fed properly on that material. Large feeding plants have been established at Calgary, Fort William and other points. With the supply of winter lamb from the feeding plants, it has not been so necessary for the farmer to fill the cold storage plant during the fall of the year. He finds the fresh killed lamb during the winter months will not pay, and that the nursing lamb will not sell so well in the winter when there is fresh lamb to be obtained. Where lamb is produced under first class conditions, some of it is exported to the United States and first-class prices are procured, and in some cases even a premium is paid over the price which would be secured for an American lamb. Here again the farmer is suffering a severe loss by indifference. This is something which depends upon himself and which he can remedy with very little cost to himself and in that way secure a very much better market for his product. I have pointed out a few of the leaks in agriculture and I have attempted to show that a great deal of the success in the stoppage of the leaks will depend on the individual himself.

Mr. KNOX: I have been listening very attentively to the hon. member and before he leaves the live stock end of it I would like him to go into a little more detail in regard to one point. He stated that the farmers lost some $30,000,000 last year through not keeping the proper class of stock. I would like to know how he arrived at that figure?

Mr. TOLMIE: It is estimated that the number of animals that went through our packing houses was 600,000 odd. It is based on a calculation made by some of the experts in the Department of Agriculture during the time I was minister in 1919. In 1919 and 1920 there had been exported through our inspected slaughter houses 1,126,000 head of cattle, and less than 10 per cent of these cattle were either good enough in condition or good enough in quality or heavy enough in weight to be exported to Great Britain to compete with the products of other countries. At that time the loss was estimated at some $40,000,000, and this is based on the same figures. I cannot give details, but it was all worked out in proportion. I pointed out that success depends very much on individual effort, that the farmer must be more self-dependent, that while the government can assist him in a general way he must help himself and be ready to co-operate. There is one line however, among others in which the government can render very valuable services in my opinion, and that is the field of research, particularly in connection with our animal contagious diseases, those that are classed as contagious diseases under our act, and also those that are not classed or scheduled in the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. The two diseases which cause the most loss are tuberculosis and hog cholera. I pointed out some time ago a very marked increase in our inspected abattoirs in tuberculosis, both in cattle and in hogs, having reached the point of nearly 22 per cent on the inspected carcases, those carcases going through our inspected abattoirs where exact returns are kept.

Another disease causing tremendous loss in cattle is infective abortion, a disease affecting horses, sheep and swine. Then there is another disease called the "joint ill," in the foal, one of the most destructive diseases which affects animals. When they become infected with this disease, they die in a very short time.

There is another field for research and that is in regard to internal parasites, which according to the estimates in the United States, has cost that country hundreds of millions per year. In 1921-22 we paid in compensation for tuberculosis $639,530 and in 1922-23 the sum reached nearly $1,000,000. This does not include the losses on the abattoirs and also on the farms from affected carcases, which losses would run into many more millions, in my opinion. In the face of this, we are spending only $30,000 a year on research work, and much of this expenditure is required for the manufacture of tuberculin and other such agents for the diagnosing of disease. It is quite possible for an animal to be quite healthy in appearance on the outside, and there is no physical way in which to make a diagnosis so as to decide effectively whether it is affected with tuberculosis or not. We use tuberculin which is applied in three ways: To the eye, or into the pores of the skin, or under the skin. By that means and by taking temperatures, watching swellings and so on, we are able to diagnose very effectively whether an animal is affected with tuberculosis or not. We have one serious obstacle in the way, and that is that we cannot separate an animal that is badly affected and that would be a spreader of disease amongst other live stock, from an animal that is only slightly affected and that probably, under ordinary conditions, will make a recovery. This is the point. At present we are compelled, when we get that reaction in our tests, to destroy all those animals. If we could discover in our research work a

reagent that would differentiate between an animal that was slightly affected and one that was badly affected, we would make a very substantial saving to the country.

Another feature that offers us great promise is in immunization from tuberculosis. Certain experiments along those lines have been carried on which have given very fair promise, and by proper research work we should be able to discover some serum or bacillus or other biological product which would give us great assistance in that direction. My claim is this, that it does not seem practical to be paying out hundreds of thousands of dollars for compensation without spending much money on research work. We should follow out this research work to the very end of the road and spend any reasonable amount. I can well understand that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) has a great deal of difficulty in securing sufficient money to carry on his work, and I speak feelingly on this subject, because I have been in that position myself. The country, however, will gradually improve and get on its feet, and as opportunity offers, this is a particular branch of our live stock work that should be carried out to the fullest possible extent so far as money will permit.

Another point in connection with research in the direction of bovine tuberculosis is the tremendous field of human tuberculosis which is closely allied to it. It is now generally accepted everywhere that the bovine bacillus is communicable to man, and the discovery of an immunizator, or a discovery in some other direction that would help to overcome this scourge in cattle, would prove of tremendous value to man. We are very fortunate in Canada in having in Doctor Watson, Chief Bacteriologist of the Health of Animals branch, a man of exceptional ability. As an illustration of that, let me point out that only a few years ago in southwestern Saskatchewan and Alberta, we had amongst horses a disease know as glanders. Dr. Watson was placed in charge of the outbreak there; a quarantine station was established at Lethbridge, Alberta, and he was able, while there carrying on his experiments, to discover a blood test by which he could diagnose the disease before any clinical symptoms were shown. When he discovered this test, the amount of compensation paid that year for horses destroyed amounted to $46,000, and I think not more than five or six years had elapsed when the compensation amounted to $75. The next year it was wiped out altogether in Canada. They have been carrying on some experimental work at the Pathological station in Hull in connection with the production of a protective or immunizing serum against glanders. While the experiments were being carried on, a farmer in Manitoba became infected with glanders from a glandered horse. Fortunately a doctor from that province was visiting Ottawa and heard about the immunizing serum discovered by Doctor Watson. He secured some of it, and by the time the serum reached Manitoba, the doctor attending the farmer was also infected with the disease. I know of no other case on record—some hon. members who are doctors will correct me if I am wrong—where glanders in the human body has ever been cured. By the use of this serum, however, I am informed, both the doctor and the farmer are now attending to their business in the usual way, and only a few weeks have elapsed. What I claim is this, that we should cultivate and encourage in every possible way a man of such exceptional ability along the line of research and an appropriation of only $50,000 to be given him would be quite sufficient and could be added to from time to time as the work developed. In that particular connection, it would be advisable under those conditions to have Doctor Watson devote the whole of his time to this special work.

Another line of the greatest importance and, perhaps, the greatest obstacle to the success of the agriculturist in this country is that of distribution, owing largely to our tremendous distances in Canada and also to the high cost of transportation. It is pretty difficult to find a solution for the problem of what we should aim to secure in that particular line; but a little investigation will bring us relief, and that is to secure cheaper transportation for the farmer, an equalization of freight rates, and then to allow trade to flow in its natural channels regardless of our big cities trying to draw trade in their direction.

9 p.m.

I might draw the attention of the House to the development of trade on the Pacific coast where I am fortunate enough to live. The trade from the Pacific coast across to the Atlantic is now something over a billion or two billion dollars a year. The Panama canal has certainly made a great difference as regards transportation from western to eastern Canada. We should take advantage of all those things because it is most important that the primary producer, the farmer, should secure as large a proportion of the profit from his output as he possibly can. In this particular connection, agriculture is of such great importance to the Dominion of Canada that if we could place this industry squarely on its feet and make it profitable to the farmer,

almost everything else would take care of itself.

In the development of our markets, a great deal can be done. According to statistics, we market about 80 per cent of our goods at home, either for consumption or for remanufacture for export. Our principal export markets are those of the United States and Great Britain. The United States, as we all know, is quite close to our border; it is easy to reach at low cost; but it has the disadvantage of having a very high tariff. Somehow or another there are 110,000,000 people on the other side of the line who believe in protection, with the result that we find our goods going into that country are very much handicapped by a heavy tariff. Great Britain then is the market that is the most desirable one, although situated at some further distance from our shores. Still it is willing to pay excellent prices and it is one which should be cultivated with the greatest possible attention. During my visit to Great Britain in 1921, I went through a number of the markets. There I found the Britisher anxious to buy our goods, provided they were of good quality, uniform and of sufficient volume to interest him. He was quite willing to pay us just as much as he had to pay to anybody else, but absolutely no more, and you cannot blame him for taking that stand. Another great field is being opened up for us across the Pacific where hundreds of millions of people desire our goods, and this market should be developed to the greatest possible extent.

Another feature that might receive encouragement is that of co-operative selling amongst farmers. Co-operation would enable the farmer to get his goods to market in much better condition, and by being able to load in carload lots, he would secure lower freight rates and be able to market to better advantage.

Long time-credits might also receive attention. In fact this means of helping the farmer is receiving considerable attention now, from what I have heard in the Banking committee and in the committee investigating agricultural conditions. The ordinary banker, while quite satisfactory for the farmer who is on his feet, cannot be expected to make long-term loans. That is not his business. Some other organization must be developed for this particular purpose of making long term loans at the lowest possible rate. However, there is one thing to be pointed out in this connection, and that is that the farmer who has been unable to make ends meet owing to being on a poor farm or following bad methods cannot look for very much help from borrowed money, whether he obtains it at a low or a high rate of interest. To succeed he must either change on to another farm or adopt proper farming methods.

There is another matter which is of the greatest importance agriculturally, and that is the education of our farmers as far as it is possible to go in the way of encouraging them to adopt better methods of farming. We are doing this now through our fairs, our agricultural press and the splendid system of experimental farms throughout the Dominion. I think we have one of the best systems of experimental farms to be found anywhere in the world. When I was across the water I visited some institutions of this character in Great Britain, but they did not have anything over there superior to our Central experimental farm.

Immigration, too, must receive attention. I believe in bringing in immigrants of the right kind, but I would close the door against Asiatics. As I come from British Columbia no one will want me to give reasons for their exclusion. It is sufficient to say that the Asiatic cannot assimilate with us and has a standard of living which makes it impossible for us to compete with him. But in bringing in immigrants we must secure those who will give promise of making good in this country. And when they get here we should not leave them alone, we should give them every assistance and through various institutions see that they derive full benefit from our assistance. I am not one of those who believe in bringing in immigrants indiscriminately and dumping them on the land. I believe in a vigorous immigration policy, but before we attempt to place any large number of immigrants on the land we should begin to put our own house in order. We can hardly expect the immigrant to remain with us if his neighbours tell him they are not making a dollar out of their farming; such a doleful tale will make him anxious to cross the line into the United States. I think the farmer in many instances has just cause of complaint in large sections of our country owing to conditions that have prevailed during recent years. Therefore I think we should improve conditions and particularly develop his market, because there is no better method of helping a farmer than the assurance that after he has his goods produced he can sell them at a profit.

I think there is much to be done by the farmer and the city man getting closer together and having a better understanding of each other. We do not know enough of each other. We should join each other's organizations. The city man should take an interest in the local

fairs and in whatever is being done by the farmers in his particular neighbourhood; on the other hand, the farmer should take a reciprocal interest in the city man's activities. It is only in this way that they can render a great deal of assistance to each other.

I feel that this is no time for pessimism. I was born out on the Pacific coast and never saw a railroad train or a street car until I was over fifteen years of age, and then I had to go to Oregon to see them. In those days we had to journey to San Francisco—800 miles south—to get a train for Toronto or Ottawa. We depended on saddle horses and teams to travel about the country. But it is all humbug to get pessimistic in a country like this, a country greater in area than the United States, possessing vast resources, and with only nine million people. Probably we have the greatest wealth per capita of any country in the world. And certainly no country that went through the whole war is in a better position to-day than Canada.

Some of our settlers in coming here should not expect all the comforts that they enjoyed in the beautiful old lands of England or Scotland—I do not include Ireland because it is not restful enough over there. The splendid markets close at hand, the beautifully paved roads, the nice hedges, the blooming pubs at every crossroads—these conveniences cannot be expected in Canada; this country is too new. We are bound to rough it. This generation and even the next are pioneers compared with the people of Great Britain, and it will take several generations before we get our farms in the same first-class shape as the farmers are used to in the Old Land—properly under-drained, with good buildings and every convenience. But while we have to endure hardships they are as nothing in comparison with the hardships of the old pioneers, who had to carry on their farms a long way from a railroad with bad roads, no telephones, no telegraphs, no rural mail delivery—in fact they only got a mail at their village once in a while—and with implements of the crudest kind. For instance, they had to mow their grass and cut their grain with a scythe around the stumps and bind it with straw. And not one of them ever thought of mounting any of those stumps and making a speech, simply because there was no one to listen to him. The markets, too, were in very bad shape at that particular time. Let me give you an illustration. When I determined to make these few remarks I wrote to a friend of mine out on the Pacific coast. I knew he had been brought up in Bruce county and therefore I expected a good deal from him. I was not disappointed. Here is what he has to say of his early life on the farm:

> Of one thing I can assure you, these pioneers were not spoiled by too much paternalism on the part of the government. One of the principal reasons that new settlers fail to make good now is that they expect too much of the government and rely on their own efforts too little.
>
> There surely should be no poor or hungry people in Canada with its millions of acres of vacant land waiting to be cultivated. Our great problem is to get people on the land and keep them there.
>
> We were a family of 13, including my parents, on an average Ontario bush farm. We had plenty of food and clothing, which we produced ourselves, but no money. I have helped my father butcher a dozen fine pea fed hogs and when he hauled them frozen to market, was only offered 2½c. per pound for them and part of that to be taken out in trade. I have carried a heavy basket of geese to town with my dear mother, who carried a heavier one, and was glad to get 9c. per pound in trade for them. All our neighbors had similar experiences. With the exception of money, most of the things we needed were produced at home. There was very little discontent. It was fashionable to marry early, have large families and depend on ourselves.
>
> I venture to think that these conditions produced a better citizenship than are produced to-day by all the spoon feeding done by federal, provincial and municipal governments.

In comparison with those conditions—and I know that description is from a man who is telling the absolute truth—I feel that some of those who are complaining so bitterly and so loudly to-day are merely a sort of ginger pop edition of those old pioneers—plenty of gas and no kick.

It may be said, Mr. Speaker, that our prospects for development are practically unlimited, and in submitting the following summary to the House for the benefit of our agriculturists I am not presuming to advise them; these are merely a few comments Anyway those to whom we offer advice always enjoy this advantage: They do not have to take it if they do not want it. This is my summary. We should:

1. Facilitate and encourage production and better methods of farming by the medium of education, demonstration and illustration.

2. Encourage a system of mixed farming with live stock as a basis.

3. Increase and encourage better feeding, finishing and marketing of live stock.

4. Develop our export trade.

5. Expand our marketing policy in every possible way and place our goods on the market of such quailty and in such condition as to enable us to meet successfully any competition that might offer and to secure the best prices.

6. Improve and extend our facilities for handling perishable products.

7. Carefully conserve the health of our live stock and maintain the high reputation we now enjoy in this connection.

8. Assist in the development of special lines of production which have not yet thoroughly become established.

9. Encourage co-operation and co-operative selling.

10. Improve transportation facilities for handling our products.

11. Investigate the possibility of securing cheaper money for our farmers so as to enable them to increase their products.

12. Encourage the manufacture of home products and in that way encourage the farmer.

A policy of this kind, I feel, is absolutely safe and should bring nothing but good results. We cannot hope to meet our present obligations by economy alone; although the practice of economy should be carefully followed—intelligent expenditure where good and prompt results are assured should be indulged in. I am a firm believer in Canada and Canada's future. After visiting many parts of the English speaking world I have been even more strongly impressed with our wonderful opportunities, there should be no pessimism, in my opinion, in the bosoms of true Canadians. With an intelligent handling of the situation, with the splendid Canadian spirit behind us, there can be only one result, Mr. Speaker, if we work together, and that is, success.

Mr. W. J. LOVIE (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my congratulations to our worthy Finance Minister (Mr Fielding) on the occasion of his bringing down his seventeenth budget. The occasion is a very unusual one; and I would also congratulate the government on the fact that they have with them a gentleman whose parliamentary career has been so long and so distinguished. The Finance Minister is the "grand old man" of Canadian politics, and we all wish that he may long be spared to give the government of this country the benefit of his advice and assistance. We may well say of him, as was said of one of old, "As thy days, so shall thy strength be."

I would like also to offer congratulations to the government upon the fact that the British embargo upon Canadian cattle has been removed. That is something that those of us who have been engaged in agriculture in Canada have been looking forward to for a number of years. It is now over thirty years since the embargo was placed upon Canadian cattle by Great Britain. I know from personal experience, having been in Scotland twenty-one years ago, that the farmers in that country were looking anxiously for the removal of the embargo because they wished to be able to get stockers from Canada. As to who was instrumental in bringing about the removal of the embargo, we do not know. Whether it was Mr. Duncan Marshall, the Hon. Manning Doherty, the late government or the present government, we do not know, and we do not care; we will give any of them credit for it if they were responsible for it. The one thing that we are glad of is that we now have this market in Great Britain for our cattle. Particularly during the last two or three years Canada has needed that market very badly. There was a good market for Canadian cattle during the time of the war when we had free access to the markets to the south of us, but since the Fordney tariff took effect it seems as if a cyclone had struck the western Canadian cattle raisers. Although we have a market now in Great Britain, we must realize that the United States market would be of much greater value to us because it is much nearer and the freight rates involved would be much less. There is considerable difference between the prices in the United States market and in the Winnipeg market for instance; it would be of great advantage to us if we could get the price obtained by the farmer to the south of us. I have taken two prices for the purposes of comparison. On the first of March, 1923—and I take this date because I obtained the prices when the debate on immigration was in progress; I thought I might use the figures then, but it was not necessary—the Breeders' Gazette of Chicago and the Manitoba Free Press, Winnipeg, showed that choice steers were on that day quoted in Chicago at from $10.00 to $10.50, and in Winnipeg at $5.75, so that the price in the United States was almost double the price in Canada. We have not access to that market, but we have access to the British market. I have here a recent press clipping concerning a shipment of Canadian cattle that landed in Dundee. These cattle were sold on the British market at an average of £32 5s. each, or $13.80 per hundredweight. Now, that is a very good price, as we look for prices in this country. One of the steers in this shipment weighed 1,850 pounds, something that is very unusual.

The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), in his able address, mentioned the fact that the cattle in the Canadian West were not heavy enough to secure a good price. I believe he is absolutely right as regards the British market; for that market we can grow cattle to any size we like. But it

has been my personal experience during the last two years that heavy cattle were at a discount in the local market in Manitoba. We were not able to keep steers until they were three years old; if we did there would be a cut of a cent a pound on them. In other words, the local market would not pay full price for anything over twelve hundred pounds, and you cannot raise steers up to three years old and stall-feed them without having them go up to fourteen or fifteen hundred pounds. But as I say, the Old Country market should be able to absorb our cattle no matter what their weight might be.

A good many of the Old Country men are kicking, not about the quality of the Canadian cattle that are going over, but about the fact that they are not stockers although they are shipped as such. Really finished cattle are being shipped as stockers, whereas these men wish to take stockers from two-and-a-half to three years old, finish them over there, and sell them as British beef. There is an unlimited amount of cattle in this western country and any number of them could be raised if there was an assurance of an available market. I have under my hand an editorial from the Winnipeg Free Press of a recent date which states that there are in Alberta to-day 1,653,000 head of cattle, in Manitoba, 740,740; in Saskatchewan, 1,602.000, and that hundreds, yes, thousands more could be raised, because pasture is good, cheap and plentiful; and that the British buyer could take an unlimited quantity of them. The western provinces have been hampered because of an insufficient market during the last couple of years for their live stock, but we are happy to say that there seems to be some sign of a better market for the future.

Now, I am not going to say very much about the budget; I am going to deal more particularly with agricultural conditions. The hon. member for Victoria City is opposed to oriental immigration because he comes from British Columbia, and one would naturally expect that. Well, I come from the prairie provinces, and naturally I am opposed to protection. Protection means that the farmer is working under a double standard, one standard to sell his goods by and another to purchase by. If the prairie provinces were not blessed with such fertile soil, such abundant sunshine and such favourable weather conditions, if it were not naturally a good country, the farmers could not possibly succeed under that condition of a double standard. We sell in competition with the world, our market is on the other side of the Atlantic. We grow the finest wheat grown anywhere in the world except in part of the United States and part of Russia. On the other hand, we purchase in what is known as the dearest country to live in. But an end must come to all things, and the farmers of the West are getting very hard up simply because they are not able to make a living under what is known as the double standard. So naturally a protectionist budget such as is now brought down is not going to get much support from the Progressive members. There is in Saskatchewan a Liberal government, and I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press giving what Premier Dunning of Saskatchewan says about the present tariff brought down in this parliament by the Minister of Finance. He says:

> The 1919 national platform indicates the basis of tariff stability, which is the goal of Liberalism and no finance minister has the right to change at will the tariff policy enunciated by the most representative gathering of Liberals ever held in Canada. The previous budget and the present one, while not fulfilling our hopes of tariff reduction might, nevertheless, be acceptable under present conditions as a moderate step in the direction laid down by the National Convention, but I do not know a western Liberal who will consent to the government discarding for the future the tariff chart placed in the hands of the Liberal leader in 1919.

Mr. Dunning is very much opposed to this budget because it is not in line with the tariff plank of the Liberal platform of 1919. I have here an extract from a speech delivered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that great old Liberal chieftain, in Winnipeg just after the Liberal Convention of 1893. That is going back quite a little bit, but here is something that I can absolutely subscribe to. Speaking of the Liberal party he declared that he stood for freedom. He said:

> I denounce the policy of protection as bondage, yea, bondage. I refer to bondage in the same manner as American slavery was bondage, not in the same degree perhaps, but in the same manner. In the same manner the people of Canada, the inhabitants of Winnipeg particularly are toiling for a master who takes away not every cent of profit but a very large proportion of your earnings for which you sweat and toil.

That is Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection.

We hear a good deal about a revenue tariff. A question was asked about it in this House this afternoon. Well, a revenue tariff seems very easy to explain. It is said that you cannot have a tariff without the protective feature in it. If you have a tariff on goods that are manufactured in the country, and there is also an excise duty on these goods collected by the Dominion government, there is no protection at all in such a tariff. A definition of a tariff for revenue will be

found at page 2361 of the 1922 Hansard. This was given by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Kyte), and is in my opinion about as good a definition of a tariff for revenue as it is possible to find. I am happy to say that we in the western provinces are not alone in asking for a tariff for revenue, for we find members from the lower provinces who know the disadvantages of protection just as much as we do willing to assist us, I believe, in having the protective feature of the tariff wiped out. Of course, we know that the revenue has to be raised. We do not object to paying taxes; we do not object to paying heavy taxes; but we wish to see them go into the Dominion treasury. We do not want to pay taxes to any protected manufacturer. We want the manufacturer to stand absolutely on his own feet.

We heard a good deal during the immigration debate about the condition of agriculture in western Canada. We heard from Alberta and from Saskatchewan. I am going to tell you now what Mr. Samuel Larcombe said at the convention of the Agricultural societies held in Winnipeg in January, 1922. If you do not know who Mr. Larcombe is I may say that he is an Englishman who has been farming in Birtle, Manitoba, a good many years. He has brought fame and renown to himself and Canada through the prizes he has taken for first-class grain of all kinds and garden products not only in Canada but in the United States. He is known wherever good grain is raised in America. He was president of the convention of Agricultural societies, and this is what he had to say of the wheat crop of 1921:

> There were a few men made money in 1921 if they got their wheat on the market very early in the season, but if the crop of 1921 had been sold and the receipts pooled it would not have paid more than fifty per cent of the cost of production.

The depression was not felt that particular fall because you will remember that was following the year when the wheat board was in existence and there was about fifty cents on every bushel of the 1920 crop coming in in 1921, which helped make up for the deficiency. But what did we find in the fall of 1922? We had one of the biggest crops there had been in western Canada for a long time. Canada looks for a market for her wheat in the Old Country, and I have here an extract from the Financial Post giving figures for the different countries to which Canada has been in the habit of shipping wheat, showing the per capita consumption of wheat for the years 1909 to 1913 and from 1914 to 1918:

Country—	Per Capita 1909-13	1914-18
Austria-Hungary	4.41	....
Belgium	8.53	....
France	9.12	7.81
Germany	3.35	....
India (British)	1.23	1.21
Italy	6.82	6.65
Japan	.57	.53
Netherlands	4.47	3.54
United Kingdom	6.14	6.08
United States	5.68	5.93

You will see that the United Kingdom and the United States have stayed very much on the same consumption level, but these other countries have fallen off very much in the amount of wheat they are taking, and consequently there is no market there.

I have here an account from the Financial Post of how the farmer's profits have decreased on the products he has to sell. In 1914 what the farmer had to sell represented an amount of 140.9. There was an increase of 30.6 in the price of what he sells; animals and meats, 18; dairy products an increase of 52.4. In groceries we find an increase of 70.1; boots and shoes an increase of 52, and in implements an increase of 123.5. On the whole the farmer receives an average of only 10.5 more for his products than in 1914 and he has to pay for his essential commodities 112 per cent more, so you will see that what he is selling now is down to a pre-war basis and that what he has to buy is on an average 112.3 per cent higher. That is the reason why he is so very hard up at the present time. Here is a short extract from the Financial Post on the farmer's profits:

> Anyone in close touch with western farmers knows they feel they have been unjustly treated over this year's crop.

That is the crop of 1922.

> It was the largest in volume ever harvested in western Canada and every one who touched it secured his usual profit, from the railway which hauled it from the country elevator, to the merchant who sold the flour—every one but the man who produced it. The most pressing need in this country is a method of making agriculture profitable. The vacant land can be settled, but it will be of little national value if it cannot be made to stay settled, and while the problem of the rural depletion is not entirely an economic one, it is partly that, perhaps very largely that, At least, rural life will not be satisfactory until it is profitable.

Farmer members have been trying to drive home that doctrine in this House, but it needs emphasis elsewhere, that the great necessity to-day is some method whereby agriculture can be made profitable. We are advised a good deal to go into mixed farming. That may be all right, but many hon. gentlemen who talk that way do not know what conditions are in the West. Hard wheat is a crop that can be raised in very few countries; it is

native to western Canada. I have seen white fife brought from England and in two seasons if not in one it will become as hard as either marquis or red fife. You cannot grow any other variety of wheat in that part of this country; the grain becomes hard, and being hard it is very valuable. It is wanted in Great Britain for blending with other wheats, but of course the Britisher will not pay any more for his wheat than he has to, and consequently the question of keeping down the cost of production is what we have to study.

I would read another extract, taken from the Presbyterian Witness of May 10, 1923:

> The economic factor is dividing East and West. The soil of the prairies this year yielded crops half a billion of dollars in value, a little more than the value of the field crops of the rest of Canada. The yield of the forests, the fisheries and the mines of all Canada is about 50 millions less than that of the soil of western Canada. And yet of this enormous wealth—an almost incredibly large percentage—has gone East to discharge obligations to railways, banks, loan companies, manufacturers and wholesalers of farm machinery and other commodities. Very little remains with the farmers of the West. They see this enormous stream of wheat and stock pouring to the East and they wonder why their own comfort and well-being are so little improved.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) speaking two days ago said in the course of his able address that the farmers must work and save; they must practise economy. The hon. member did not say, but it is very often said, and the statement was made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) himself and has been repeated this evening, that the farmers must go into mixed farming. That point is stressed considerably. Well, I want to tell this House that in my district mixed farming has been practised for the last forty years, and last fall men were shipping all their cattle away because they considered it was no use keeping them any longer, for they made nothing out of them. If I might do so I might read a letter that appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 17, signed by one J. Scott. He says:

> What you say agrees with my experience of eleven years on a western farm, which I left because it was not a business proposition during the whole of that time. I put about $9,000 in it, and never made any interest on my investment or wages for myself, wife or three eldest children, who all worked. I had to compete with the local contractors for help during the brief periods I required it, and paid, including board, from $70 to $120 per month, which is more than the eastern manufacturer pays; and he does not have to be crowded out and eaten out of his house by his factory hands. I never bought a car and I sacrificed in shelter, food and clothing; I lived down to it like a peasant, in a determined effort to make it go, working 10 hours in winter and 12 to 17 hours a day at other times. I found it all to no purpose. I merely did better than 90 per cent of my neighbors, who have been on the verge of bankruptcy for the last two years. All I earned was being taken, and for the last five years $500 each year more. I raised wheat, cattle, hogs and cream, the finest products for human consumption, and they were all being supplied to the world at large for less than I could raise them, without interest and without pay for myself and family.
>
> I have a good farm, good soil. I like the life and can stand the climate in winter. I made strenuous efforts to stay, but owing to man-made conditions, I had to sell out and came to this city to compete with the unemployed, and I do not fancy city life for myself or my children.

[Mr. Lovie.]

In a speech on the immigration problem delivered a month ago by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), that hon. gentleman, as lawyers are well able to do, criticized the farmers to a considerable extent in regard to the number of cars owned by them throughout Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Judging by the way the hon. member spoke one would come to the conclusion that a car was something that a farmer absolutely should not own. While the hon. gentleman was speaking on this subject a certain circumstance came to my mind. A farmer and his wife who live not more than five miles from my farm were among the first in the district to get a car. Needless to say, it was a Ford; it was not a sedan such as we see running about in Ottawa. The reason this man got this car was simply that he could not afford to do without it. He and his wife, besides working the farm, milked ten cows, and they shipped a can of cream twice a week. They were ten miles from the station, and this man said that if he had to go to town with a horse and rig it would take him half a day twice a week, which would mean a whole day every week. His wife and he could go in at five o'clock, catch the train and get back in time for supper, thus saving a half day each trip. Now, a car was an absolute necessity to this man in his business; I do not think anyone would deny this. Farmers have been criticized also for having gone into debt for cars. Possibly it was not the wisest thing for them to do, and I am not going to defend them; nor am I going to say that they were always without justification. When you sow a crop you do not know whether you are going to have a bountiful harvest, or whether your crop will be struck by drouth, hail, frost, grasshoppers, or something else. You have no guarantee of anything.

But it is interesting, in reference to this question about automobiles, to consider the way in which a car can be purchased in Ottawa. We know that Ottawa is largely kept up by the Civil Service. Civil servants are paid by the government; therefore their money is absolutely sure notwithstanding hail, rust or anything else which is liable to strike the farmer's crop. A high-class car can be

purchased in Ottawa and if citizens can buy expensive cars, I cannot see why farmers should be criticized for purchasing a cheaper car in the same way. A $50 cash payment will secure a first class car, with $250 in promissory note or notes, the balance by way of mortgage on the car and also on the home if the purchaser has a home. The mortgage is handled by companies who specialize in this business, and fire insurance premiums, in some instances up to $125 per annum on the car, must be paid by the purchaser. Now, if a farmer went into a deal like that he would be considered crazy, and I do not think he would be able to throw off such a burden. Yet we are criticized for doing in a very moderate way what other people are doing in this regard.

I desire to refer to a certain question raised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and if I am out of order the Speaker will so inform me. The other day that hon. gentleman asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) why he had not brought down a bill dealing with the question of mill feeds, which the minister had promised earlier in the session. I am sorry the minister is not in his seat to-night, but he will see this reference in Hansard. Now, this bill is very important. The minister, speaking from his place this session, said that the milling companies claimed the absolute right to put into mill feeds, that is bran and shorts, any seeds that were in the wheat when they purchased it and that such a thing as pure bran and shorts could not be got anyway, unless you paid a very high price. The bran and shorts from the milling companies have rather a bad name. Last fall, in conjunction with one or two others, I endeavoured to get a carload of bran from a milling company. We could have obtained it from the Ogilvie Milling Company —any milling company handles the same class of goods—but because we could not get bran that was anything like the bran we get from the country mills, the deal did not go through, and we did not make the purchase. We had an idea that the Pure Food Acts would prevent the adulteration of bran and shorts, and we wanted this particular carload for horse feed. The minister said the milling companies claimed the right to put back into the bran any rubbish that was in the wheat, but they should have no such right. They do not pay for rubbish because wherever grain is sold it is subject to dockage, and the farmer pays freight on the dockage to the head of the lakes. The milling companies have no right to put that rubbish into mill feeds. I would be very glad if the minister would bring down a bill which would compel these milling companies to handle pure mill feeds, because the shorts they handle are pretty nearly poison for young pigs and the young pigs do not care to eat them.

I am going to touch on freight rates. Do hon. members know that last year we had quite a reduction in freight rates, occasioned by the bringing into effect of the Crowsnest pass agreement as regards grain and flour? One hon. member to-day mentioned the fact of a furniture dealer who, when the Crowsnest pass committee was sitting, took the side of the Progressives so strongly that he, being a furniture dealer in Ontario, voted for the Crowsnest pass agreement going into effect. I did not belong to that committee, but I can well remember being told that when this particular furniture dealer looked at the proposition he said: "My sales of furniture are in western Canada, and unless the western farmer has money left after paying expenses he has no money to pay me for my furniture." Consequently, he would naturally take the stand that the Crowsnest pass agreement should be made effective. We know that the freight on all western products has been very high. It is one of the handicaps of the prairie provinces that there are 1,000 miles of rock and no man's land between Winnipeg and eastern Canada, and a long distance to the eastern seaboard. Sir William Van Horne, when he was president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, enunciated a proposition. I do not know whether he carried it into effect, but I am going to pass it on to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) because he is really the head of the National Railways. Sir William Van Horne's proposition was this: Carry the lumber for settlers' houses and stables, also fuel at cost, and the grain settlers produced at a little over cost. Then the people could expect in that case that a good freight figure could be placed upon merchandise.

In the West, both as regards settling on farms and stock raising, one of the greatest handicaps is the very high price of lumber. It is a long way to bring lumber from British Columbia, and certainly lumber and coal should be carried at about cost. The trouble is that the policy for the last two years has been to charge all the traffic will bear, and in fact last year, before the reduction in the rates, it was more than the traffic would bear, because instances were put before the people where the railway company had refused to bill out carloads of Alberta oats unless the freight

was prepaid, for fear there would not be enough money from the sale of the oats in Fort William to pay the freight on the carload.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) said that farmers, instead of stressing the tariff, should look after freight rates. There is something else besides freight rates to be considered. They should look after the classification of freight rates. To show hon. members how it works out, I am going to take them a little bit from home, and cite an instance which took place, not 100 miles from Los Angeles. There was a little village in which the only products were cattle, firewood and charcoal. Now on cattle the freight per carload for less than 100 miles was $8. This was explained in this way: The cattle could be driven into the city, consequently if the freight was put up too high, or higher than the amount which it cost them to drive in, the railway would not get the traffic. But upon firewood, for the same distance the rate was $24 per car. There was a man working there cutting firewood and loading it, and he figured that if he would make the wood into charcoal instead of shipping the wood he would be ahead, and so he tried to make it into charcoal and ship it. But while he had been planning that he would put it into charcoal the railway company were planning as well and they immediately advanced the rate to $42 for the charcoal. He made $1.60 a day cutting firewood and he could make $1.60 a day making charcoal. Now the freight is a matter which it is worth while looking after. I hope the minister will do something to relieve us from the difficulties in regard to transfer of cars of freight from one company to another. It is not many years ago you could ship freight on the Canadian National railway, and send it right through, whether it was going on the Canadian National or Canadian Pacific, by paying a transfer fee of $5 and getting a through rate. But since the freight rates have been advanced that privilege has been cut off. If you bill the freight on the Canadian National and ship it part way on that road and part way on the Canadian Pacific or vice versa, you have to pay two local freights, and it makes it absolutely prohibitive. This is something the Minister of Railways should certainly give his attention to, because if one railway will right this matter the other will have to follow suit and considering that the people of Canada own one of the large railways, it is right they should give the people a square deal.

Then express rates need looking after as well. I am sorry that I have to give you a personal experience, but I want to explain to you what I mean when I speak of these express companies taking the money out of the people's pocket when carrying their goods. Last fall I had occasion to get a 2-inch coupling weighing about a pound. It was worth 30 cents in Winnipeg. However, I asked the merchant to send it C.O.D. because he would be sure to get his money. It had to be carried 85 miles on the railway, the express rate was 45 cents, and the C.O.D. for sending back the money was 25 cents. That made 70 cents for the carriage of this article worth 30 cents. Express rates are absolutely prohibitive.

Then labour costs are handicapping the western farmer very badly, not exactly the wages of the men engaged in agriculture, because they are not paid any too much, but the wages of the men engaged in manufacturing and the wages of the skilled artisans who are doing the work for the farmer. They are out of line absolutely with the price the farmer can get for his produce. If any one of us who are farming wanted to engage the services of a man with only a trowel, to pile up one brick on top of another, we would have to pay $10 a day and board. But take the other case. Suppose we went with a plough and four horses to work for him. He would allow us $3 a day for the man, $1 per day for each horse, and nothing for the plough, and consequently the labourer or artisan would receive $10 a day and the farmer would simply get $7 which is the rate of pay for man and team work.

This is taking away too much of the farmer's profits altogether. I will give an example of how this works out. I take this from the Breeders' Gazette, a paper that stands absolutely for the rights of the farmer in the United States. This matter was taken up only about six months ago by the editor of the Breeders' Gazette, Mr. Alvin Sanders. He mentioned the case of a brakeman who was working on a short run about 25 miles out of Chicago and back again, one train a day. This coloured brakeman was getting $250 a month. Close to this short line of railway were men working on the farms at $25 a month. Why the difference? These men who were furnishing the freight to keep that railway alive were working for $25 a month, whereas the brakeman on the railway was drawing $250 a month. Such wages are absolutely out of line and they will have to be cut.

Another matter that we must take into consideration is that the labourer cannot work for small wages because the cost of living is

so high, and the reason for that high cost is the protective tariff. The tariff must be reduced in order to give the labouring man an opportunity to purchase the necessaries of life at something like the price at which the farmer sells his product, not the price which the workingman has to pay at present. The distribution system in this country is absolutely out of line somehow or another, and the men and women who are selling their labour have to pay absolutely too high prices for the necessaries of life. Last fall the price for choice beef on the hoof in southern Manitoba was something like 4 cents per pound. I sold steers for something like that price. If I had kept my steers over winter, I would have been docked in price because they would have weighed nearly 1,500 pounds apiece, so I sold them in the fall. That beef was worth on the hoof 8 cents per pound, and the hide and the offal would pay for the killing. That beef should have been sold at about 10 cents per pound, but I am quite prepared to say that the labouring man in Winnipeg paid nearly 30 cents per pound for it and for other things accordingly. Such prices are altogether out of line. Let me cite a short quotation from the Breeders' Gazette, because that is a paper that stands up for the rights of the farmer in the United States. The article states:

> We have kicked with all the power at our command against the freight rates that have eaten up farmers and stockmen of various communities. We have kicked time and again at the unwillingness of labour to accept its due share in the great deflation. We have kicked against the price the farmer has had to pay for nearly everything he has to buy, and at the low prices he has been forced to accept for many of his products. We have kicked against the price we have to pay for a baked potato in Chicago restaurants when the Idaho beauties are rotting by the acre in the ground in which they were grown. We have kicked against the Jew clothier being permitted to sell at profiteering prices half-cotton and shoddy goods as virgin wool, and we are not through kicking yet, by any manner of means—whenever and wherever we can see an opening to accomplish something for the common good.

That is what the Progressive party are trying to do in this House.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) a matter in connection with the stamp tax on cheques. We know a tax of 2 cents was put on cheques as a war measure a few years ago; but last year when the budget was first brought down, that tax was raised so that it was 2 cents for every $50, or 4 cents per $100, without any limit. Before the budget debate was over, the Minister of Finance announced that he was going to allow the stamp tax to be 2 cents for every $50 up to $5,000, but that then it was going to stop. That looked to everyone very much as if the Minister of Finance were catering to the big interests, to those who do big business and pay money in large amounts. This year the stamp tax has been reduced. It is still 2 cents for every $50, but it stops at $2,500, and $1 is the maximum tax. That means simply that the tax on cheques is costing the common people .8 per cent. As a rule cheques issued by ordinary, common, everyday people would average about $25, so that they are paying .8 per cent for the privilege of issuing a cheque. On the other hand, cheques of corporations would average about $5,000, and in that case they are going to pay about .2 per cent. Thus in the one case, in the case of the wealthy corporation, .2 per cent is being paid, whereas in the case of the ordinary, everyday people, they are paying .8 per cent for the privilege of stamping their cheques. In other words, the business people are paying less than the working people. This stamp tax is rather a hardship from the fact that it was found by those who were dealing with large corporations in the city of Winnipeg last year, for instance, farmers selling cars of grain, that they always had to pay the price of that tax on cheques. This was brought to my notice even before the grain began to move, from the fact that live stock shippers ran up against that proposition in Winnipeg. One man especially who drew out $15,000 of his own money and went out to Alberta to buy cattle, found that he had to stamp his cheques before he drew out that $15,000 in Winnipeg. As he could not carry that money throughout Alberta around the different ranches, he had to put it into a bank in Alberta, and he issued cheques on that in payment of the stock he bought. That was twice he had to stamp his cheques. When he took his cattle to Winnipeg he was again charged for the stamps on the cheques by those to whom he sold the cattle. There was great dissatisfaction on account of this proposition, and I for one wrote to the Department of Finance to see if that could not be remedied. The Minister of Finance at that time was in Europe and the answer did not come from him; the answer from the department was to the effect that the law was fixed that all cheques had to be stamped, but the Finance Department did not care who stamped the cheques.

Protection has been in force for over forty years, and it is generally said that if you disturb protection, you are going to disturb existing conditions. I have no doubt that those who have benefited by protection are going to fight against the withdrawal of that privilege, because it certainly is a privilege. I can well remember a gentleman who came

from Scotland a few years ago. He was a chartered accountant, and when he came to Canada and went into business, he found to his great surprise that such a thing as cost auditing was not known in Canada. Certainly it was not known. If you have a protective tariff, you do not need to care what the cost is. You cannot help getting sufficient money for your produce when you are behind a protective tariff, and those men who are assisted by the protective tariff are certainly going to fight to keep that in force. This reminds me of a gentleman I know who was giving an address in a schoolhouse, where you hear a good deal about economics, and gentlemen in schoolhouses throughout the prairies can talk just as good economics as one hears in this House at any time. This gentleman had been in the live stock industry quite a long time, and he said about protection what he had found from his experience, namely, that the bigger a calf got, the more cows he could suck and the harder he was to wean, and that is the way protection works out.

10 p.m.

About two nights ago when the hon. member for Lennox and Addington (Mr. Sexsmith) was speaking, a question came across the floor of the House. I do not know who put it; I think it was the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan); but it was a question about the Hudson Bay railway. I do not know whether this question was put in a sneering way or not. That, however, does not matter. I am going to say something about the Hudson Bay railway. If anyone looks at the map of Canada and views that great big inland sea that comes right into the heart of the continent of North America, if he can conscientiously say that that great ocean highway was placed there by the Creator for no reason at all, I differ with him entirely. The great Liberal chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, used to say that the nineteenth century was the United States' growing time, but the twentieth century was going to be the growing time for Canada. It is reasonable to imagine that the population of the United States is going to grow during the next fifty years as much as it has grown during the past half a century, and therefore she will be looking for an outlet for her surplus population long before the expiration of another fifty years. Fifty years is quite a long time in the life of an individual, but it is very short in the life of a nation. If the United States has to find more room for her surplus population where is she going to turn her eyes but to Canada? I have vision enought to realize that before fifty years have elapsed not only will there be twenty million people in Canada but fifty million, and every seaport, including Vancouver, Prince Rupert, Port Nelson, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, will be used to their full capacity.

To those who doubt whether the Hudson Bay railway is going to be profitable—and I know there are a good many doubters, more especially from eastern Canada—I should like to put up this proposition: If you are doubtful about the Hudson Bay railway and the route through the Straits being a workable proposition, just get behind us in our efforts to have the British preference increased to 100 per cent of the general tariff, and so bring all commodities which would then come from England duty free into the western country through the Hudson Bay route. I venture to say that if you do that the route will be in use six months in every year as soon as the railway is completed. The ships engaged on this route would then be able to carry cargoes both ways. One of the objections now urged against the feasibility of this route is that ships cannot get return cargoes. But if the British preference was extended to 100 per cent, every ship would be loaded to capacity both ways.

Now, how can we improve world conditions? I have already mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the nations of Europe on account of their poverty arising from after-war conditions were not able to purchase the products which we have to sell. There is no gainsaying this statement; it is a fact. I should like to put up a proposition in this connection. The government cannot deal with it, but I am going to put it before the country. It is something which those interested will have to take in hand. I refer to an all-round cancellation of war debts, beginning with the United States. Now, whether we are agreeable to this proposition or not, I honestly believe that time will come when it will have to be taken in hand. The United States has nearly all the money of the world to-day, and consequently the other nations cannot purchase her commodities from lack of money, and she as a nation does not want to take goods from other nations in exchange for fear of causing unemployment at home. Consequently she is handicapped. If the other nations of the world had more money and the United States had less, why, certainly trade would be in a better condition all round. Failing the realization of that proposition, Mr. Speaker, there is still another

proposition that I should like to put forward. It is not nearly as complicated and may therefore appeal to this House. In pursuance of my intention I shall place before the House an extract from The Times of February 23, 1923, being part of an address delivered by Sir George Lawson Johnston in the city of London on the preceding day. I am not going to quote his address in full, but in order that hon. members may get the sense of what I am about to quote I shall have to read a greater portion of the address than I would otherwise do. Dealing with the burden of the American debt as it affects Great Britain he said:

> Apparently the repayment of the war debt to America was to be an important factor in their taxation for the next sixty years.
>
> When he saw them last February he had just returned from the States, and he mentioned to them how seriously our debt position had been worsened owing to Congress having by law fixed the period of repayment and the interest. Unfortunately, bankers, financiers, and others had talked so much about the capital and interest aspect of this debt, as if it were purely a business transaction, that a business atmosphere, instead of that associated with a debt of honour—on which nobody expects interest—had been created. As the business mind predominates on the other side of the Atlantic, once the matter had been fixed in the American mind as a business deal, it became impossible for our negotiators, no matter how capable, to save the position. The most serious factor in the matter as now arranged is that we must pay capital and interest in United States dollars. It was generally admitted that the improvement in exchange from the British sovereign point of view during the last year was not so much on account of an improved trade balance as on account of American purchases of British securities. Such securities, if interest bearing, must eventually mean still further sums going from this country to the United States. There could be little doubt that efforts to pay America by direct remittance would turn exchange against us and seriously increase the number of pounds we should have to pay per annum, and, unfortunately, it would be just during our worst period of depression and bad trade that we should have to pay most pounds to buy the dollars.
>
> A Dollar Reserve in Canada
>
> He would like to put forward a suggestion which might assist in this matter. It was that we should build up in Canada a reserve towards the payment of the American debt. The Canadian and United States dollars were not likely to vary seriously in value, therefore any fund we could build up in the Dominion would be comparatively free from exchange fluctuations. Canada was capable of being developed at a much more rapid pace than the present capital and man power at its disposal could develop it. Our government could now borrow at a lower rate than it had been able to do for a good many years. If it could obtain grants of land from Canada, it could utilize, say, one hundred million pounds in developing wheat areas, and probably certain industries in that Dominion; and this work, in conjunction with some considerable emigration scheme of selected unemployed, should develop in Canada a reproductive asset that would, after a while, annually supply dollars towards the payment to the States. Furthermore, every bushel of wheat bought from Canada instead of from the States would help to keep our exchange better with the latter.
>
> We might thus accelerate the pace at which Canada was growing strong, and, at the same time, build up an asset that would much reduce the burden of the American debt, and probably, in the process, some of the money we provided would purchase from our manufacturers agricultural implements and other machinery, etc.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the British nation always keeps in mind that it must sell as well as purchase. We need also to keep that in mind.

> His own experience in Canada convinced him that any such scheme to be successful would have to be planned and brought forward by Canadians to meet their own views as regards the directions in which development should take place. If it was put forward at present they could feel, at any rate, that Canadian conditions would be understood by a British Premier who was born in Canada, and a Colonial Secretary who had recently served as Governor-General.

I am putting forward that proposition because I think there is a great deal in it. Canada certainly needs more capital and more people to develop her natural resources. And, Sir, although I am going to vote against the budget because it is a protectionist budget, at the same time I may say that, although I was not born in Canada, I am a Canadian at heart and wish the country well, for it has done well by me.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, I rise for only one purpose. I do not intend to discuss the budget because I am afraid that if I were to advance some arguments in its favour they would probably be merely a repetition of those that have already been brought forward during this debate, and, besides, I shall have an opportunity of discussing the different aspects of the budget itself when the resolutions are dealt with in committee. My purpose in rising—and I shall crave the indulgence of the House for but a few moments—is to deal with the income tax. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel I am perfectly in order in discussing this matter at this stage. The income tax is an important item of the budget bill because the state derives from it a part of its revenue, and it is a part of the burden of taxation asked by the Sovereign from the Commons.

The second reason why I believe I am in order is because the Minister of Finance in his speech made the following remark:

> In the observations I have made to-day it will be noticed that I am not touching the income tax. If there be necessary changes in this respect, they will be dealt with later in a separate bill.

It is therefore with the intention of making suggestions in this regard that I am on my feet. The income tax is a levy on profits arising from property, investments, professions,

trades and offices. The cardinal principle of the income tax is that a man should be taxed only on the basis of his net income, but none should escape the tax, because if he does it is to the detriment of the other taxpayers. Having this principle in mind, may I be permitted to direct the attention of the House and of the minister to certain changes which I believe would be fair, just and equitable to all?

I have several times brought before the House the suggestion that a change be made in the matter of the exemption on account of children. When I spoke on this matter on the 21st of March last it was my intention to develop three points; first, the raising of the exemption on account of children; second, the unfairness of the ruling of the taxation department regarding those who had been married under the regime of community of property, and, third, the desirability of making a differentiation between earned and unearned income in the matter of taxation. The short time at my disposal when I presented my resolution permitted me to discuss only the first point, namely, the increasing of the exemption on account of each child from $300 to $500 and the providing of total exemption for the father of five children. The rules of the House permitted me only to ask the government to consider the advisability of making the change. The resolution was well received by the Minister of Finance and was carried unanimously. I had hoped, I may say, that these changes would have been embodied in the budget. I admit that I was disappointed, but not at all discouraged, because last year when I spoke on the same matter the change was not incorporated in the budget but at the close of the session the Minister of Finance brought in a bill under which he raised the exemption from $200 to $300 for each child. Therefore, I still have hope that a similar agreeable surprise is in store this session for the father of large families. Such an amendment, I am sure, would only be fair and wise.

I am not going to weary the House, Mr. Speaker, with the arguments that I brought forward on the 21st of March and in previous sessions regarding this matter. Let me simply summarize them. I am advocating this change, first, because large families should be encouraged, because it is the most natural, the most efficient and the sanest way of increasing the population. My second reason is that the sum of $300 is ridiculously low when one has in mind the amount required for the upkeep of a child. My third reason is that the high cost of the upkeep of children is the principal cause of voluntary sterility and race suicide in this country. My fourth reason is that they have similar legislation in France, in England and in the United States, where in each case, the exemptions and allowances in respect of large families are greater than they are in Canada. I gave all these figures when I proposed my resolution on the 21st of March. I may also add that since presenting the resolution I have been flooded with petitions endorsing it. I have laid on the table of the House petitions containing over 15,000 names asking for this change.

An Hon. MEMBER: How many families?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Fifteen thousand families, probably 75,000 children at least. The signatures were only those of fathers of families. The only argument I have heard against that proposal is that such a change would result in a decrease of revenue. I will take care of that argument later in the course of my remarks.

The second point I wish to discuss is the unjust enactment or ruling of the taxation department regarding those who are married under the regime of community of property. This regime, I believe, exists only in the province of Quebec. Under our civil code persons can be married under the regime of community of property or under the regime of separation of property. If they are married without contract they fall under the regime of community of property. Now, subsection 3 of section 4 of the Income Tax Act passed in 1917, reads as follows:

> Any persons carrying on business in partnership shall be liable for the income tax only in their individual capacity.

Discussion arose as to whether this section covered the case of a husband and wife married under the regime of community of property and whether they could separate their incomes for taxation purposes. Most of the legal authorities admitted that this was the right point of view, namely, that they could separate their incomes for taxation purposes. But in 1919 an amendment was passed and the law now reads as follows:

> Subsection 3 of section 4 of the said act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:
>
> Any persons carrying on business in partnership shall be liable for the income tax only in their individual capacity; provided, however, that a husband and wife carrying on business together shall be deemed to be partners for any purpose under this Act.

The result is that a couple married under the regime of separation as to property pay much less than a couple married under the regime of community of property. Let me illustrate by an example. We will take two

couples without children whose income is $6,000. The first couple, we will say, are married under the regime of community of property; the husband has a salary of $3,000 and the wife has an income of $3,000. They are exempted up to only $2,000, leaving $4,000 on which they pay 4 per cent, or $160. The second couple are married under the regime of separation as to property; the husband earns a salary of $3,000, and his wife has an income of $3,000 the same as the first couple. The husband has an exemption of $2,000, and the wife also has an exemption of $2,000. Therefore they only pay a tax on $2,000, or only the sum of $80, while the other couple married under the regime of community of property pay the sum of $160. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that ruling is absolutely unjust and unfair, and I hope that the Minister of Finance on consideration will make a change in the law in order to put these two couples, whether married under the regime of community of property or separation, on the same plane for taxation purposes.

The third question which I desire to bring before the House is the differentiation between earned and unearned income for the purpose of taxation. I have had a resolution on the order paper regarding this matter for some time, but unfortunately it was not reached, and I therefore take this opportunity of discussing it now.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this differentiation exists in England and in order that this distinction may be thoroughly understood I will give the definition in the English law regarding earned and unearned income:

> The expression "earned income" means—
>
> Profits of office.—Any income arising in respect of any office or employment of profit held by the individual.
>
> Pensions.—Income in respect of any pension, superannuation, or other allowance, deferred pay, or compensation for loss of office given in respect of the past services of the individual or of the husband or parent of the individual in any office or employment of profit, whether the individual or husband or parent of the individual shall have contributed to such pension, superannuation allowance, or deferred pay or not.
>
> Property emoluments of office.—Any income from any property which is attached to or forms part of the emoluments of any office or employment of profit held by the individual.
>
> Any income derived from farms.
>
> Any income derived from a profession or trade.

There are some further particulars which are not so important. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is very commendable. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the man who derives his income from his own work, from his trade or profession, should not be asked to pay as high an income tax as the one who derives it from money that he has invested or from money that he has inherited from his family.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: When the individual who works and earns his salary spends that salary, he spends his own capital, and when he dies, if he has made just enough during his lifetime to enable him to support his wife and children, they are left without a cent, while in the case of the other man who has a large income from an inheritance or from money that he has succeeded in putting aside, when he dies his wife and children are left with both capital and income. If the man who works and earns his income suddenly becomes sick and cannot work, in many instances he cannot draw any income. In many cases he has no money and it means privation and hardship for his wife and children. Suppose, for instance, that a man earns by his work $3,000, representing a capital of $50,000. He spends that for the maintenance of his family. As I said before, he would leave nothing when he dies. But if he has an income of $3,000 derived from an inheritance or accumulated capital and spends that income during his lifetime, when he dies his family is left with both the income and capital. Hon. gentlemen can easily visualize the difference.

I would suggest three rates of taxation: First, the highest rate on incomes derived from inheritance; second, a higher rate than the third but not as high as the first one, on incomes derived from accumulated capital; and thirdly, the lowest rate on incomes derived from the labour of the people.

Reverting to my first point and the objection brought forward that increasing the exemption for children would mean a great decrease in revenue, I meet this objection first in a general way by asserting that the beneficial results of the enactment in encouraging large families would amply compensate for the loss of revenue. Then I also suggest a means of getting more revenue from another source and at the same time removing what is in my opinion, at least, an injustice which exists under the present law. As the law now stands, an individual does not pay any income tax on dividends received from companies or persons taxable under the act, even if those dividends should be as high as ten, fifteen or twenty per cent. The reason alleged for such exemption is that the tax should not be paid twice, and that as the company has already paid the tax the stockholder should not be called upon to pay it again. That may be true, but I contend, Mr. Speaker, that if the company has made enough profits to pay a tax and on top of that declare

a dividend of 15 or 20 per cent the stockholder who receives that dividend, which is a personal revenue like a salary or income, should also be taxed. Why on earth should he not be taxed?

Do hon. members realize how many wealthy individuals with incomes ranging from $10,000 to $100,000 do not pay any tax on these incomes if they are derived from dividends from corporations? Allow me to give another example to illustrate the point. Let us suppose a person, whom we will call John, earns a salary of $5,000 by his daily work. He is married and has three children. He is first exempted up to $2,000, and then he is allowed an exemption of $900 for the three children, leaving a balance of $2,100 on which he has to pay a tax of 4 per cent, or $84. As I said before, when he dies his wife and children are probably left without any money because he had to spend all his salary during his life time to support them. Now we will suppose a second man, whom we will call James. He has $100,000 of capital invested in companies paying dividends from which he derives an income of $7,000. He does not pay one cent of income tax. When he dies his wife inherits that capital of $100,000 and continues to receive that income upon it of $7,000.

Mr. MARLER: How does my hon. friend work that out?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: If a person has $100,000 invested in corporations, which pay the income tax and then distribute a dividend of 7 per cent; the individual who gets the income of $7,000 from this investment does not pay a single cent of income tax upon it.

Mr. MARLER: In other words, no normal tax is collected from him.

Mr. McMASTER: The normal tax is collected at the source?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Yes, but if the company has made enough profit to pay that normal tax and, besides that, to pay 10 or 15 per cent of a dividend I do not see why a tax should not be collected from the individual. I may say that I am not particularly fond of the tax on corporations. In very many cases it is collected from persons who would not have to pay if they had invested their money in property instead. Take a small shareholder who has invested, say, $15,000 or $20,000. Out of this he does not make an income of $2,000. If he is unmarried he is exempted only $1,000, if married $2,000, and he must pay an income tax to the government; because the company takes from the profits of the invested money of that person a certain share to pay the tax. If he had invested that money in mortgages or in property he would not have to pay income tax. However, I believe that it would be advisable for the Minister of Finance to consider this matter very thoroughly because I am of the opinion that some change could be made. As matters stand now the clerk, the medium salaried man, the professional man, the small merchant, cannot escape the law; but those who are best able to pay are provided with all kinds of means to obtain exemption for the whole or the greater part of their incomes.

Mr. BOYS: I should be glad if the hon. gentleman would allow me a question. Let us assume that a man has worked hard, whether on the farm or in business, and reaches the age of 65 or 70. Let us take a farmer who has got a couple of hundred acres, with buildings and everything up-to-date and all clear; he sells his property for $20,000 and moves into town, retired. On the other hand consider the case of a bank manager or a railway president with a salary of $50,000. Would you exempt the latter and tax the former?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: If the income of the farmer is high enough to come within the provisions of the law then it should be taxed. But what I say is that the man who earns his salary should pay less than the one who derives his income first of all from inheritance and in the second place from even accumulated capital.

Mr. BOYS: Would you show special consideration to the bank manager or the railway president who gets $50,000.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My hon. friend is stating extreme cases.

Mr. BOYS: No.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am dealing with common every day cases. I believe that the farmer who has accumulated $20,000—

Mr. GOULD: There is not any such.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —is scarce in this country; and furthermore he would not get an income of $2,000 out of such a farm and he would not have to pay any income tax.

Mr. BOYS: I was dealing with the principle. If the principle is right in one case it should be right in all cases. There are a great many farmers, I am glad to know, and I am sure my hon. friend agrees with me, who have estates worth $20,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: With a $2,000 income?

Mr. MARLER: I think the hon. member (Mr. Archambault) is differentiating between class A income and class B income. He is pointing out that class A income is earned and should be taxed less than B income which is inherited or accumulated.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Yes.

Mr. MARLER: I think the point is exceedingly well taken.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am very glad indeed to have the approval of my hon. friend. Now, I do not wish the House to misunderstand my suggestion; I do not want to have the minister impose a penalty on thrift or on successful business achievement. My contention is not that capital should be attacked in any sense, because I believe that where there is no capital and no big business there is no work and consequently there are hard times. But I also believe on the other hand that a fair re-apportionment and re-adjustment of the income tax would bring about a friendlier spirit between the wealthy, who are willing to be fair, and the less fortunate who would then realize that they are not victimized or overburdened. As I said in rising, my only purpose was to discuss some aspects of the income tax. I believe I have put my case as well as I can before the House and the minister, and I hope that he will take into consideration the few principles that I have dealt with and embody them into the bill which he will bring before the House later on the income tax.

Mr. J. W. FINDLAY (South Bruce): The hour is late, and I have to catch a train in about two minutes, but as I look at the clock I realize that we are under what we call daylight saving, and I still have a few minutes to spare. I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker, but that the situation in which I am placed at the present moment might be made use of by the whips of the different groups in this House on certain occasions. For instance, the next time the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is going to address this House, it might be well for the chief whip of the government party to see that he is situated somewhat as I am at the present time. It might be well for the Conservative whip to see to it that when the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) are billed to speak, they too have a pressing engagement somewhere shortly after they start. The shepherd of our own flock might, perhaps, work out this idea on the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) or, perhaps, better still the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould).

I listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure the day before yesterday to the address given by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) and I always enjoy listening to him. His genial, humorous manner appeals to me, but I had some small degree of sympathy for him. I felt he was in somewhat of an awkward situation. He told the House this budget under discussion was satisfactory to him because of the fact that the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) could not find much fault with it. It appeared strange to me that almost the only argument which the Liberals presented in support of this budget was the fact that the chief critic of the Conservative party could not find very much fault with it. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the days of the millennium must have arrived, and the lion and the lamb have surely lain down together.

Mr. PUTNAM: Which is the lamb?

Mr. FINDLAY: I rather think the lion is inside the lamb. I listened with very much interest and pleasure to the speech of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). I have a great deal of admiration for the hon. member, but he also aroused my sympathy. He has not altogether fallen from grace, as he said yseterday:

> I do not believe and I have had nothing to convince me that so heavy a rate of protection is required as is given to the industries existent in this country to-day.
>
> I for one want to know definitely why such high protection is needed for some of these industries.

With both of these statements I can respond with a hearty "Amen." A peculiar situation exists at the present time. I claim, Sir, that I am a Liberal. That statement may perhaps cost me some votes if I ever find it necessary to look for votes again.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It surely will.

Mr. FINDLAY: What I want to tell this House—and I hope my voice will go further than this House—is that as I understand Liberalism I still am a Liberal. Up to the present moment I cannot find myself guilty of having ever gone back upon what I was brought up to believe were true Liberal principles, but if I were to support this budget I am afraid my sleep would be disturbed for a good many nights to come. I was very much pleased with the speech which we listened to a few minutes ago by the hon. member who just sat down (Mr. Archambault). I have not the slightest doubt that he was more pleasantly and more genially employed in delivering a

speech of that kind than he would be in attempting to defend this budget. His speech was along Liberal lines,—fairly good Liberalism. I regret very much that I did not have an opportunity this afternoon of hearing all of the address of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). I was very much impressed with the part I did hear. It was delivered in a fair and genial manner, but he too appeared to be in a peculiar situation. He made a speedy attempt to defend the tariff proposals but I could not help thinking of the days gone by when he and many more members sitting on the government benches to-day used to attack and condemn these very same tariff proposals, and I wondered why it was that to-day we find men who, a few years ago, were very emphatic and very energetic in their condemnation of the system of protectiton, to-day defending a budget which they cannot but admit is a protective budget.

Mr. EULER: The hon. member says that I used to attack and condemn proposals such as are in the budget. Will he quote statements of mine to that effect?

Mr. FINDLAY: I do not know that I can recall any particular instance, but I think I am not out of the way in saying that the hon. member as a Liberal has in the past opposed the protective tariff? Is that not correct?

I want for a few moments to refer to the amendment proposed by my honoured leader (Mr. Forke). It is charged that this amendment was carefully worded in order that it might not get the government into trouble. The duty of the group sitting in this section of the House is neither to get the government into trouble, nor to get the government out of trouble. As I understand our business, it is to endeavour to get good legislation, and personally I have never yet been prompted by any desire to get this government out of trouble. I must confess that I had some hopes; I was buoyed up with a good deal of hope that we might be able, by some means or another, to get something in the way of tariff reduction, relief from taxation, from this so-called Liberal government. You know it is said that "hope deferred maketh the heart sick." Sometimes it also makes it rebellious, and the time may come when we may be prompted, perhaps from a spirit of revenge, to join our forces even with the Conservative group from which we have no hopes of getting anything. We may, however, be tempted, from a motive of revenge, to join our forces with the gentlemen who sit to our right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

[Mr. Findlay.]

Mr. FINDLAY: You are driving us to that. That may be the only course that is left open to us, and we may some time in the near future be compelled to take that course.

I was on the verge of saying that I could not help, the evening before last, drawing a comparison between some of the speeches that were made in this chamber. It is an unfortunate circumstance that it sometimes happens that a really good speech is postponed until the late hours of the night.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FINDLAY: I am not saying that that has happened to-night by any means, but it did happen the night before last. During the afternoon and the early hours of the evening, a fairly well-filled chamber and a crowded gallery listened to a sort of burlesque on parliamentary procedure. Late in the night, when most people had gone home, a well thought-out, careful and sensible speech was delivered and almost lost on an empty house. That was an unfortunate occurrence. I only wish that I could bring before this House at least one of the thoughts that were presented to this Chamber by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) the other evening. He was endeavouring to show how this movement in which we are engaged was a movement which was permanent, a movement which had come to stay, a movement which could not be injured because of ridicule hurled at the party in this House who are representing and supporting it. He said that the movement was greater than we are; that it would live after we were all gone; that even those who had been with it temporarily and who had gone back to the fleshpots could not but feel for a long time afterwards the exhilaration which they had received while amongst us. That thought I want to convey particularly to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Hammell). When I use the prefix "honourable", I would like the Press Gallery and the Official Reporters to understand that an interrogation mark should come after that prefix, or my real meaning may not be conveyed to the country.

I am very much disappointed in the budget which has been presented to the House by a Liberal government. I have been a Liberal all my life. I supported Liberal principles because I believed in them, and I had hopes of this government which was elected on a platform containing planks in regard to their trade policy which I approved, which I believe a large number of the people of Canada approved, and which were largely responsible for putting this government into

power. There is not the slightest doubt that many people, especially in Ontario, were deceived by the trade planks of the Liberal platform of 1919, which planks this government since coming into power have repudiated. The time will come when the people will again have an opportunity to express themselves at the polls. As was said this evening, when this government have cut themselves loose, openly and above board from their platform of 1919, the people of Ontario and, indeed, the people of the whole of Canada from one end to the other will know exactly where the government stand. The next time they will appeal to the people, the people will understand perfectly that they can expect nothing in the way of tariff reduction or in the way of Liberal principles from the government which occupy the treasury benches at the present time.

On motion of Mr. Grimmer the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Friday, May 18, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Report of the Royal Commission on Lake Grain Rates.—Hon. Mr. Robb.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

PETITION NOT IN REGULAR FORM—MOTION FOR ITS RETURN

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of Petitions reports that he has examined the petition of W. J. Bartlett and others, of Vancouver and other places in British Columbia. The attention of the House is directed to the fact that the said petition is irregular in that it is addressed to the Right Honourable William Lyon Mackenzie King and the members of the government of Canada, and not to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled, and as it does not contain three signatures on the sheet containing the prayer of the petition, as required by rule 75, it should not be received.

Mr. McQUARRIE: May I ask that the petition be returned to me so that I can send it to the petitioners?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will make a motion to that effect at a subsequent sitting—or, by unanimous consent at this sitting—the petition will be returned to him.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I will move that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

LAKE OF THE WOODS REGULATION

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 175, to repeal The Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921.

He said: This is a similar bill to one which was introduced at the last session by the then Solicitor General. It is in regard to the control of the Lake of the Woods, the Winnipeg and English rivers and Lac Seul. As hon. gentlemen will remember, some time before the session of 1921 an agreement was arrived at between the federal government and the government of Ontario to the effect that the control of these lakes and rivers should be given to a board composed of four members, two appointed by the federal government and two by the Ontario government. This arrangement was put into force by orders in council passed by the two governments, which in turn with the agreement, were to be confirmed and ratified by this parliament and by the legislature of Ontario. In accordance with that agreement a bill was introduced and passed in this House, and it is now on the statute book as chapter 10 of the acts of 1921. The government of Ontario introduced a similar bill but the House prorogued before there was time to pass the measure. In these circumstances the government of Canada thought it wise that federal legislation in the matter should be enacted without delay, so chapter 38 of the statutes of 1921 was passed, giving the Canadian government control of the Lake of the Woods, the Winnipeg and English rivers and Lac Seul. It was also provided by that statute that whenever the province of Ontario should legislate in accordance with the arrangement made, the Governor in Council should repeal chapter 38 of the statutes of 1921. We now propose by this bill as it was last year to repeal purely and simply chapter 38 and for this reason: In addition to what I have said, there was a clause in that chapter to the effect that while the Governor in Council would have a right to repeal the statute, this would not affect a certain clause in virtue of which it was declared that all these works around the Lake of the Woods and the different rivers mentioned were for the general advantage of Canada. It has been represented to us that this was not the agreement, and that the two parties, the government of Canada and the province of On-

tario, should be put in exactly the same position as they were when the arrangement was agreed upon and signed. That is the reason why we now repeat this same legislation. I may say that the bill last year, while it passed this House, was not assented to by the Senate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask, what is the attitude of the present government of Manitoba toward this bill?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I think that the government of Manitoba will be satisfied with the bill if it passes as introduced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend says he "thinks" so. Has he had word from the government of Manitoba to that effect?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I may say that there is an agreement among the three parties, that is, the Canadian government, the province of Ontario, and the province of Manitoba, that when certain conditions have been fulfilled by the province of Ontario the province of Manitoba will be willing and will consent to the passing of this legislation.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 171 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Teague.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 172 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth McKinley.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 173 (from the Senate), for the relief of Algernon Cecil Aubry Moran.—Mr. Baxter.

Bill No. 174 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily Adlene McCausland.—Mr. Boys.

LABOUR AND ORGANIZATION

REPORTED ACTION OF THE POWELL RIVER PAPER COMPANY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the notification by the management of the Powell River Paper Company to the members of the local union of paper makers in their employ that unless they surrender their charter by Sunday the 20th instant all members of the union in their employ will be discharged, this action in the absence of any strike, threatened strike or labour trouble constituting an attack on the right of any Canadian worker to join a legitimate trade union if he so desires.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say that the motion comes under Rule 39. It is certainly a definite matter of urgent public importance. However, subsection (4) of Rule 39 says:

> He (the mover) then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the House.

Has the hon. member the leave of the House to introduce said motion?

Some hon. members: Aye.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule goes on:

> If objection is taken, the Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places and, if more than twenty members rise accordingly, the Speaker calls upon the member who has asked for leave.

I take it that more than twenty members said "Aye." The hon. gentleman may proceed.

Mr. NEILL: This matter has been brought up so hurriedly that I have not had time to provide full data on the subject, but the facts are so outstanding that they almost speak for themselves.

The Powell River Company is a large paper manufacturing company on the coast, about one hundred miles north of Vancouver. It is one of those places called a company townsite, that is, the company obtained a townsite, put up their works, and are the exclusive owners of the townsite with the exception of one small block which is owned by a Chinaman. The effect of this is that the company practically controls everyone who lives and speaks or even thinks in that town. I wish to give full credit where credit is due. The town is very well run from the point of view of labour conditions, that is, the living conditions are satisfactory, the houses are quite properly built, the sanitary conditions excellent, and the light and water satisfactory. The houses are furnished to the company's workers at a very reasonable rental. There is nothing to complain of in that respect at all. I wish to give credit where credit is due, but unfortunately the company have the idea—it is an American company, under alien management and with alien capital—which is prevalent in some sections of the States that the workingman is practically a chattel, and they not only have the people in that town working for them but they wish to think for them. I am not exaggerating because I know the circumstances. I know a case where a man went as a delegate to a political convention and was promptly discharged for that reason. I know another case where a min-

ister of the gospel was accused of being too democratic in the views of Christian democracy that he preached, and that man—he was not fired for they do not fire parsons, but he was notified that his house was required for some other purpose. The parson was willing to stay, and his congregation were willing to keep him, but that man had to sever his connection with that church because the views of Christian democracy that he preached there were not acceptable to the management of the town. I am only saying this by way of illustration to give the House an idea of the attitude of the management towards the people of that town. The company, of course, is largely employed in making paper, and there is a paper makers' union, a trades union, in that town, and the union has been languishing a great deal because since labour conditions got hard, the union was frowned upon by the management, and the only place they could hold their meetings was in this Chinese block that I mentioned before. The company was unable to get this Chinaman to move. He had bought the block before the company acquired their property. The officials of this organization were notified about a month ago that their services would be dispensed with. Every official of that union was discharged and their places were taken by somebody else. Now the members of this trade union have been notified that unless they surrender—that is the word used—before next Sunday their charter, that is—go out of business entirely—that is what it amounts to exactly—all the members of the union there will be discharged. I wish to state that my information further says that there is no strike or threatened strike, and there is no labour trouble of any description. It is simply that the employers and the organization of employers take the stand that they will prevent, so far as they are able, labour from organizing in their particular way.

Now, I thought the time had long gone past in this day and generation, when it would be necessary for me or anybody else in this House to rise and defend the rights of ordinary labour to organize for their own protection and in a thoroughly legitimate way. But it appears that there is a reactionary sentiment which always crops up in this country and which is very much alert. Not only is it unjust but it is a very bad policy to treat trade unionism in this way because trade unionism is the bulwark of society against Bolshevism. Certain people may not think that, but it is the case. Wherever there is a genuine trade union you will always find it opposed to any suggestion of Bolshevism. There is some kind of an international union which is affiliated with the Bolshevists of Moscow, but that is not supported or endorsed by the genuine trade union—in fact the most bitter conflicts take place between the genuine trade unions and the Bolshevist. Therefore, I am justified in saying that when these organizations of genuine working men get together for their own improvement or benefit they should be encouraged rather than frowned upon. They are the future bulwark, as I have said, against Bolshevism. And what do you suppose these men will become if they are compelled to surrender their charter on this occasion, or if they are thrown out of their homes and employment in consequence of this action on the part of the employers? What will be the next step in the political affiliations of these men? They will become Bolshevists and I would not blame them if they did.

I would like to point out that as far back as 1918 the late government passed an order in council, No. 7,143, on the 11th July, in which there is what is called a declaration of a war labour policy. I grant you it says a war labour policy. Conditions were very unsettled then. Indeed we did not know from day to day what steps or what attitude labour might take. It was very urgent that labour should, in plain language, be conciliated, and the Dominion government very properly stepped in and pronounced, so to speak, or declared, what they considered was a proper war labour policy to be followed not only by the Dominion but by the employers on the one hand and the employees on the other. They formulated practically a policy for better mutual relations which they endeavoured to induce the two parties to adopt voluntarily as between labour and their employers. The second condition reads as follows:

> That all employees have the right to organize in trade unions, and this right shall not be denied or interfered with in any manner whatsoever, and through their chosen representatives shall be permitted and encouraged to negotiate with employers concerning working conditions, rates of pay, and other grievances.

I do not believe there is one per cent of the employers of Canada who do not subscribe to that declaration, and who do not prefer to see trade unions in their neighbourhood so that they can deal with their representatives in all matters of dispute. If that was good law or sound policy for the government to adopt in 1918 it cannot be very far off what is just and fair to-day, and there is the whole question in a nutshell. I simply ask protection for these men in their legitimate rights to organize—not for strikes, or anything of that kind, there is no strike, but simply the right to organize.

I may say that this industry is not without obligations to the Dominion government. They get very substantial protection—my hon. friends to the left of me will be glad to know—ranging from 15 per cent to 35 per cent; and I may say that my information is that during the war the production of their paper was costing them $32 a ton and it was selling in the neighbourhood of from $90 to $160 a ton. To-day conditions are different. The price of paper now will probably run—under the present conditions of manufacture because they have got modern appliances—about $25 a ton and the selling price of paper is somewhere from $60 to $65. So that the protection this industry is getting from the Dominion government affords these manufacturers at least a very adequate measure of protection, being the difference between $25, or say $27, and $65 a ton. Therefore they could well afford to lend some ear to the government if they interfere on behalf of these working men. In the present case I feel like adopting the remarks of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) the other day when he suggested that the way to solve the question of the enhanced price of sugar was to give the refiners twenty-four hours to come down in their rates or they would see the effect in the budget. Perhaps it is not too late to insert an amendment in the budget which would solve this situation also.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): I do not think it is necessary for anyone to make a speech at any great length on the question. It seems to me that it is a simple question and the issue very clear. I wish to say, in the first place, that the labour men concerned in this difficulty, as well as the whole labour movement in Canada, are indebted to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni for having brought this matter to the attention of the government and the House. I think that from his presentation of the case it is an attempt being made by the employers concerned to prevent labour from organizing. They have given an ultimatum to the men that before next Sunday they must surrender their charter or leave the job. The men concerned are not very likely to give up without a struggle. Not only so, but the principle underlying this ultimatum involves the whole labour movement in Canada, and I do not suppose that organized labour as a whole would be willing to quietly sit by and see the principle upon which they are organized challenged in this way, knowing that if it is surrendered in the one instance it may be surrendered in other instances, and that ultimately there will be no labour organization at all. So that, in the interests of the country at large as well as in the interests of labour, I hope the government will take whatever steps may be in its power to put this matter right. There is no doubt that if this thing is allowed to go on—and the government, I presume, has the power to do something to prevent it—unrest will follow. I do not, of course, anticipate that the government will take any attitude that will be detrimental to the interests of labour in this case. On the contrary, I quite assume that it will do the fair thing. I am not clear as to what exactly the government has it in its power to do in this connection. However, I have no doubt the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) will make that clear to us. I would conclude by urging that in the interests of the general public and in the interests of the labour movement as a whole—seeing that their right to organize has been threatened in this high-handed manner—the government will take whatever steps are in its power to prevent this thing being put through.

Mr. FRED STORK (Skeena): I wish to endorse what the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has said. This is the natural outcome, as I see it, of the "closed town" system as we know it in British Columbia. It is what might be expected from the system that has prevailed there of recent years. There are in my constituency several towns which are entirely manufacturing centres, but they are owned and controlled absolutely by the company which operates the industry. These companies have prevented anyone else from coming in; they have a complete air-tight monopoly. The system has been imported from some of the American states. Some years ago it was in vogue in Montana and other states where they had industrial centres that were owned and controlled entirely by the mining corporation. To the people of the United States it proved to be a very irksome system and they wiped it out there. Apparently the American manufacturer coming over to Canada has brought this system with him, and we find to-day in British Columbia quite a number of centres, as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has mentioned, where the industrial corporation completely controls the whole situation. The men who are on their payroll are entirely under the jurisdiction of the company. In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, that does not make for good citizenship. A situation in which a man labouring for a corporation in which he has no voice of his own, in which to a very great extent he is precluded from

taking part in public discussion, where he is prevented from exercising his own free will as a citizen, and prevented from joining anything he wants to join, cannot make for the wellbeing and prosperity of the Dominion. I am of the opinion that we have the power to very much curtail this system. This is a matter which has received some attention from former provincial governments, but up to the present time no action has been taken. When a company policeman can meet the incoming boat, and tell any man who steps off the boat that his presence is not required there, that is a condition which should not obtain in any British free country. We find that these corporations enjoy the benefit of police, they enjoy the benefit of post office and custom houses. I agree that some attention should be given to this matter. In accordance with the suggestion of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean, in regard to sugar, it might be well to serve notice that if people are going to endeavour to carry on the feudal system in Canada they should not expect to make use of governmental services and all our modern public utilities.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): The Labour department has received no official advice in regard to the particular question referred to by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), although this morning he mentioned the advice that had been received by him from British Columbia, and this afternoon he sent across the floor of the House for my perusal the telegram which he had received. As indicated by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine), it is rather uncertain what this government or this parliament or the Labour department might do in regard to the situation referred to. Many hon. members in this House, I think—and I know very many people outside of parliament—are of the opinion that the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act is intended to maintain some timely supervision and authoritative control over such a matter as the one we are discussing. But that is hardly the case, as the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act only assumes to maintain some reasonable timely supervision over certain possible industrial controversies in what might be regarded as public utilities, chiefly railroads, mining and certain municipal undertakings, and even in regard to the latter it has been found necessary to secure the concurrence of the civic authorities and the workmen before the Labour department undertakes to give assistance in ironing out the disputes.

I hope no hon. member of this House would have any doubt as to where I, as Minister of Labour, stand on a matter of this kind. I belong to a labour organization, and have belonged to that organization for more than thirty years. I officially represented a labour organization for more than twenty years and have been confronted, not once but many times in the years gone by, when acting on behalf of the employees with the statement, "We recognize no organization and do not propose to deal with anyone representing an organization". Therefore, the particular question that we have under consideration to-day is not by any means a new thought to me. However, during the past few years I believed that times had materially changed, both immediately prior to the war, and especially during and immediately after the war, and I believed that the general world sentiment conceded to labour certain inalienable rights that had been in the ages gone by conceded to the employer, to industrial captains, or others, throughout Canada—yea and throughout the world. I am not going to rely on, or to press, my personal judgment in regard to the position that I think should obtain in a matter of this kind, but I am going to refer to some decisions that have been made by higher authorities and I think it would not be improper to refer to the position taken at Versailles when the general principles were enunciated as the labour features of the Treaty of Peace. It is not necessary to read them in their entirety, but to read those principles as enunciated which bear particularly upon this question that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has brought before the House. It is stated—

> Among these methods and principles the following seem to the High Contracting Parties to be of special and urgent importance:
>
> First, the guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.
>
> Second, the right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

That is the view on this particular question before the House that was taken at Versailles when the Treaty of Peace was being dealt with. But to come more closely to home, might I suggest that in 1919 the government then in office appointed a royal commission on industrial relations, and that royal commission travelled throughout the length and breadth of Canada from Vancouver, British Columbia to Sydney, Nova Scotia, and interviewed employers and workmen and representatives of the great public interests on the question of maintaining harmony and co-operation

between employer and employee. That royal commission made a report, and I want to quote a portion of that report as bearing directly upon the particular question that we are considering. I might say that what I am going to read deals with some other phases that we are not at the moment considering; but I think it is necessary to read it in this way so as to give the complete text and to couple up the portion that has a direct bearing upon the matter under consideration:

The chief causes of unrest may be enumerated as follows:

1. Unemployment and the fear of unemployment.
2. High cost of living in relation to wages and the desire of the worker for a larger share of the product of his labour.
3. Desire for shorter hours of labour.
4. Denial of the right to organize and refusal to recognize Unions.
5. Denial of collective bargaining.
6. Lack of confidence in constituted government.
7. Insufficient and poor housing.
8. Restrictions upon the freedom of speech and press.
9. Ostentatious display of wealth.
10. Lack of equal educational opportunities.

Paragraph 54 reads:

Employers may be divided into three classes: (1) Those who deny the right of their employees to organize and who actively take steps to prevent such organizations; (2) those who, while not denying that right of their employees to organize, refuse to recognize organization among their employees, and persist in dealing with them as individuals, or as committees of employees, without regard to their affiliation with the organization; and (3) those who not only admit the right to their employees to organize, but recognize and bargain with the organization on behalf of their employees.

Paragraph 55 reads:

There are not many employers in Canada who belong to the first class, but there are a very large number who belong to the second class. The employers who openly object to their employees organizing are not many, but, rightly or wrongly, the workers believe that numbers of employers who openly declare their willingness that their employees should organize, covertly interpose obstacles in the way of their doing so, and that employees who are active in organizing their fellows into trade unions are got rid of, or penalized in some other way. To the third class belong the great railway, telegraph and mining companies and many building trades. Outside of these, the employers of labour who recognize and deal with organized labour as such are in the minority.

Paragraph 56 reads:

The government of Canada, by order in council passed in July, 1918, make a declaration of policy with respect to organizing. One clause of this order in council provided that "all employees have a right to organize in trade unions, and this right shall not be denied or interfered with in any manner whatsoever, and through their chosen representatives they should be permitted and encouraged to negotiate with employers concerning working conditions, rates of pay, and other grievances."

There is a great deal more of this report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that might be read, but I think that is sufficient to indicate the position that was taken by that commission after having investigated the underlying causes of unrest, and of the dissension and disputes occurring between Capital and Labour, between employer and employee, throughout the length and breadth of Canada. As a result of that report a conference was held at Ottawa in the fall of 1919, that conference being known as the National Industrial Conference. It was made up of representatives of important employing interests and important labour organizations throughout the Dominion of Canada, and remained in session for several days. That conference appointed certain committees of employees and like committees of employers to deal with certain questions, amongst them item No. 4 of the agenda respecting the right to organize, recognition of labour unions and the right of collective bargaining. It is only proper to say that these committees of workers and of employers did not reach a mutually satisfactory settlement of their differences of opinion. In other words, the conference adopted no general declaration as the result of those two committees' meeting. But it is at least fair to read what the employers' committee reported to that conference, because, if the position taken by that employers' committee had been recognized by the paper company at Powell river, we would not at this moment be considering the particular question that is before the House. The employers' report reads:

Your committee recommend that:

(a) Employers admit the right of employees to join any lawful organization.

(b) Employers should not be required to recognize unions or to establish "closed shops".

Employers insist on the right, when so desired, to maintain their plants as "open shops", by which they mean that no employer should discriminate against any employee because of the latter's membership or non-membership in any organization, and no employee should interfere with any other employee, because of the latter's membership or non-membership in any organization.

(c) Employers should not be required to negotiate except directly, with their own employees or groups of their own employees.

This is signed for the employers' section by the three representatives of the employers who were appointed on that committee.

I do not want it to be understood in any way that I am subscribing to just what has been written, but the position I take is that even the employers at that National Industrial Conference conceded the right of employees to organize, and it is indeed passing strange that we find, at various points in Canada to-day, some four or five years after

the war, employers who still take the pre-war position that employees have not the right to organize for their mutual protection. The Criminal Code of Canada has, I think, conceded that right for a number of years, as have also various combines' measures that have been before parliament on many occasions in years gone by. Might I say to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) that the Powell River Paper Company is not the only employer of labour in Canada that, maintains the position that is indicated by the reference that has been made to the Powell river situation? There are in the Dominion other employers, some of them large employers of labour, that, the Labour department has from time to time learned, have no regard for the right of labour to organize. By various methods, either openly antagonistic or otherwise they undertake to dictate to their employees what they shall or shall not do if they hope to hold their jobs. So I think that it is rather a fortunate thing, in a way, that this particular matter has come up in order that parliament might have an opportunity of learning some of the facts that are to-day existent in Canada. In July, 1918, when the Great War was possibly at its most critical stage, it was no doubt properly regarded as the right thing to concede to labour the privilege of organizing, presumably for the purpose of maintaining that degree of satisfactory harmony and co-operation between employer and employee which was necessary to carry on the affairs of Canada and assist in winning the war. It seems to me that if that was the proper condition at that time, under the stress and strain of war, it is equally necessary that the same condition should prevail now and should be recognized as applicable to after-war conditions, when it is just as incumbent upon us to carry on the affairs of Canada with the greatest degree of satisfaction and harmony so that we may promote that agricultural, industrial and general prosperity which the Canadian people have a right to expect. I have no words sufficiently strong to express my personal view of operating officers of any particular employing company who, at this particular stage in Canada's history, yes, at this stage in the history of the world, and in view of labour organization elsewhere, take the position that they will dismiss a large number of men and turn them adrift to look for occupation in other places, unless these men turn in the charter of a presumably reputable labour organization, before Sunday next. But having said that, we have a great deal more to consider. We have come to this question: What is this House going to do in the matter? And we find ourselves in the position of being unable as a federal government, or if you like as a federal labour department, to adopt any measure, so far as I know, that would dictate to any particular employer just what he should or should not do in a matter of this kind. In other words, this is a question that has reference to provincial rights conceded under the British North America Act, it is one of the property and civil right prerogatives of the province of British Columbia, in this particular case, and of the other provinces of the Dominion where a similar situation might develop. The provincial remedy, I should think, ought to be available to employers of labour throughout the length and breadth of Canada, who I am sure desire a return to normal conditions in this country and that resumption of business activity which Canada is capable of. But it seems to me that these business concerns, whether at Powell river, British Columbia, or at the farthest eastern end of Canada, should realize as soon as possible that this particular method of denying red-blooded workingmen the same rights that they demand for themselves is regarded, or at least it ought to be regarded, in this country, as ancient history. Employers would complain very bitterly and make endless representations to this parliament and to the governing bodies in the provinces, if they were denied the right to organize. I think if the circumstances in regard to the situation at Powell river are as indicated by the telegram read by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), that this House is justified in feeling at least keen regret that any employer of labour in this day and age should have taken or should maintain the position that has apparently existed in connection with these workingmen.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): There are a few points which I should like to introduce by way of supplement to what has been said by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork). Very few people who live in the East or in the central portion of the East recognize the evils that are connected with these company or closed towns. There are a few such towns I believe in the province of Ontario, but there are a number on the west coast, remote from the centres of civilization, where the employers have absolute control over the lives of their employees. Not only does the company control everything that goes on in the
4 p.m. factory, but the only house that can be rented by anyone is a com-

pany house; the only store at which anyone can deal is a company store; the only church which anyone can attend is a church maintained by the company. A clergyman who was officiating in one of these churches told me that he was practically dictated to as to what he should say in that church. The only schools to which the employees can send their children are those that are more or less dominated by company officials, and the only places of recreation to which the people can go are those provided by the company. An Englishman who was about to lecture in one of these company towns informed me that before he could obtain any place in which to lecture, the church building being the only available one, the superintendent of the company had to be consulted; and before he was allowed to stay overnight in the town he had to report to the superintendent. That is the situation that prevails in these towns; there is practically no civil liberty whatever. In some instances, even the government post office, is located in the company's store, which brings all the mail under the survey of the company's officials. If a man were suspected of receiving a letter from some labour agency he would be liable to be dismissed. I was told by an old classmate of mine, who happened to be at one time in the employ of one of these companies, that even the labour newspapers which passed through the government mails, were refused delivery to the employees. And in this case the employers were American companies. I submit that with such a condition of affairs in existence in this country we have a right to know who is going to be supreme, the government of Canada, which ought to embody the best ideals of British liberty, or some of these firms which come in from the other side of the line and attempt to administer their affairs on this side in the way in which they have done in the western states. The member for Comox-Alberni, I think, was quite right when he pointed out that perhaps there is nothing that will bring about a spirit of unrest so much as this denial to the ordinary workingman of the very first principles of liberty. The member for Comox-Alberni himself suggests that he does not very much wonder that people labouring under these conditions become restless—to use his own words, become Bolshevists. As a matter of fact, it is where these principles are denied that you find the greatest unrest to-day, and it is for the government of this country, if it would avoid these evils, to devise constructive measures which will safeguard the interests of the humblest subject in Canada. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) ought to go a great deal further than he seems prepared to do at this time. He has told us of the decisions of the peace conference at Versailles and of the conference on industrial relations which took place some years ago. He has said that no words of his can be too strong to express his personal view in regard to this matter. But it is not his personal view that we want to hear; what we want to know is what the government is going to do under the circumstances. He says it is very strange that these things should take place anywhere in Canada, yet in the same breath he says it is too true that they do take place. We submit that under these conditions it is for the government to say what they shall do.

The Minister of Labour denounces those who deny to red-blooded workingmen the right to organize. But what is he going to do for those same red-blooded workingmen? Curiously enough, the Minister of Labour again presents us with the idea that we must not come in conflict with provincial jurisdiction. It is a very strange thing that when we ask for some provision for unemployment insurance we are told that it is a question of provincial jurisdiction. When we ask for some provision for old-age pensions, we are told that for the Dominion government to act in that manner would constitute an interference with provincial jurisdiction, and so on with measure after measure. Surely here is one case in which there can be no conflict of authority; here is one instance in which the federal government can act. If the federal government is not in a position to assure civil rights to its people, I want to know for what we exist? A few months ago, when there was some trouble down in Nova Scotia, troops were immediately rushed to the eastern coast to protect property. If it is within the jurisdiction of the federal parliament to protect property, if they can find the means so to do, surely it is within their jurisdiction to find some means to protect personal rights. It is not for members in opposition to say how this can be done. Early last session I introduced a measure to amend the civil code in such a way as to protect the workingman in his right to speak freely, That measure received its first reading, was sent to a special committee, and was reported by that committee, but we had not the opportunity to give it its second reading. Within the first two or three weeks of the present session I introduced a measure similar to that which had been favourably reported by the special committee last year, but we have not had an opportunity of getting it before the House. It is next to impossible, on account of the way the busi

ness of this House is conducted, for any private member to introduce a bill with any hope of its going through the House or even of its being discussed by the House. In these circumstances it is useless for anyone on this side to introduce legislation to meet this case. It is, however, quite within the power of the government—indeed it is their responsibility—to introduce such measures as will safeguard the rights of individuals. I am not suggesting what might be done. One member has thrown out the idea that we might very well—

Mr. MURDOCK: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it not a fact that the British North America Act gives the provinces the exclusive jurisdiction over property and civil rights?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not know that it does, Mr Chairman.

Mr. VIEN: You ought to know the British North America Act.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I take it that the Dominion government has certain rights, and also certain responsibilities, in the way of protecting its citizens against unjust treatment. If it has not, then I repeat that I do not see why we are here. If the government were really interested in the matter it would be possible in various ways to accomplish this purpose. I know that the threat of the tariff would accomplish it, but I would like to see some better method adopted. I say that the threat of the tariff would do it if the government chose to use it—and they would use it under certain circumstances. After all, without going into a discussion of the matter, does it not seem absurd that the beneficiaries of this protective tariff on the west coast should for the most part be made up of firms financed by American capital? In other words, we are protecting the Americans, who are largely the beneficiaries. But I care very little about that part of it. I am pleading in the interests of large numbers of workers on the west coast and elsewhere throughout this country. I am asking that the government should not pass this matter by, but that it should devise ways and means of protecting the undoubted liberties of the people. I am not going to offer any threat; I do not believe in making threats. But I should like to offer a little bit of advice, if I may, to the country and to the government. Some of us have been trying to urge that the labour people act through what are termed constitutional methods. Some of us have been trying to urge that they adopt political means of bringing about desired results. But how can wo do so with any hope of success if the government admits that under the present circumstances it is helpless to protect the men? In that case sooner or later—I do not know about the circumstances of this particular case—undoubtedly the men will attempt to protect themselves. I think such action is recognized by British law as being the right of every man. According to the older philosophers and lawmakers that was one of men's inalienable "natural rights;" it was looked upon as deeper even than any political or government rights. Sooner or later if political institutions fail to function, men will take that view.

Somebody has just suggested to me that I make one point clear so before I sit down I should like to reiterate it, although I have already emphasized it. If this matter of civil rights and property rights is entirely within the jurisdiction of the provincial governments, why, as I asked a little while ago, did the federal government last year send troops down to Nova Scotia?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, coming from the far eastern part of Canada, as a citizen of this country and a member of this House, I want to say a word or two.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) intimated in the course of his remarks that the federal government and the parliament of Canada had no power in a matter of this kind, and later he stated what is undoubtedly true, that the question of property and civil rights pertained exclusively to the provinces. Then it strikes me as a layman, not as a lawyer, why was that order in council passed in July, 1918 if it had no power to interfere in such matters?

Mr. MURDOCK: Under the War Measures Act.

Mr. HUGHES: I was just going to ask whether the government at that time was exercising the power it had received from parliament under the War Measures Act. If that was the case, I will reason this way: If parliament had the power to give the government of that day authority to act in that way, has parliament not that power at the present time? Perhaps the reply may be that we were then under war conditions. Well, Sir, if matters of this kind can go on I would almost say that we are at war now. We are under a measure of war, because this is a very serious matter. It involves not only the rights

of property—and I take second place to no man in protecting the rights of property—but the rights of man are also in jeopardy. So far as my voice and my vote will go, I will support this government, the provincial government, or any power in Canada, that will exercise every power it possesses to protect the rights of property whenever and wherever they are threatened, but I will say the same and go a little bit further perhaps in protecting the rights of man. I think this is a matter that should receive the serious consideration of parliament. We should let the labouring man and every man in this country know that he will be protected in his civil rights so far as we have the power, and if parliament has not the power it should obtain the power by some means or other. If an occasion should arise when the provincial government would refuse to interfere, what would be done then? I repeat, this matter should receive very serious consideration, and these men who are doing no wrong but against whom a great wrong appears to be contemplated, should know that they have the sympathy of this House and the sympathy of the people of Canada behind them.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) has said that he has spoken as a layman. There are questions with which this parliament cannot deal unless we amend the British North America Act. When a workingman leases his labour to his employer he passes his civil contract to his employer, and that contract is subject to all the conditions that the parties thereto have agreed upon. When an employer who leases the services of the employee puts in the contract a condition that the employee shall not belong to a union or inserts some other condition, I fail to see how this parliament would have jurisdiction to interfere in the matter of the civil rights and the civil contracts of the two parties. It is all very well to talk about sympathy for the labouring man and of protecting property, but it is talking outside of our jurisdiction, outside of our province, if the British North America Act reserves that to the provincial authorities. I beg to submit, Mr. Speaker, that the question is absolutely without our province and that the provincial authorities concerned should take the necessary steps to redress the grievance.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the British North America Act override the British constitution?

Mr. VIEN: Yes. The British constitution has nothing to do with Canadian affairs. We have clamoured time and again that we are a nation governed by the British North America Act, and the principles that are not sanctioned by the British North America Act and that may be in force under the British constitution have nothing to do with us.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has the common law of Great Britain nothing whatever to do with us in Canada?

Mr. VIEN: Nothing at all. The common law of Great Britain has nothing to do with us in Canada except in those provinces that have said that their civil rights shall be governed by the common law of England. In this country the common law is left to the provinces, and if the provincial authorities, acting within the powers that are given to them by the British North America Act, declare that their civil rights shall be governed by the common law of England, then the common law of England applies, not on account of its power and authority, but on account of the fact that the provincial authority has accepted the common law of England as governing its civil rights.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not a fact that in all the English-speaking provinces of Canada the English common law is in force save in so far as it has been altered by statute and where it has been found inapplicable to our situation as a colony? I think my hon. friend will find that is a correct statement of the case. I think that is the principle established by the case of Uniacke vs. Dickson.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend will find that the principle I have enunciated is exactly in conformity with his own opinion. The common law of England applies in provinces that have sanctioned it in their provincial law Civil rights are left to the provinces and if in the exercise of their jurisdiction the provincial authorities find that they should apply the common law of England as their civil law, they are absolutely free to do so. I grant that outside of the province of Quebec all the other provinces have done so, but this does not change the principle that I was discussing; that is to say, whether it is the common law of England or a provincial statute that governs civil rights in any province, any question arising out of civil rights is left to the jurisdiction of the provinces, and we are simply wasting our time discussing a matter which should have been raised in the legislative assembly of the province interested or taken up with the provincial government interested. For that reason I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock),

and I am ready to support the stand he has taken.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): In rising to say a word on this question I might state that I have known the Powell River Company for many years, and I did not think they would lower themselves to take the stand they are taking at the present time. Surely, when the people of Canada can organize and pool their wealth in companies and corporations, the workingmen of Canada should have the right to pool their labour and organizations to deal collectively. I think that this government, if it is possible to do it, should take some steps to bring this company or any other company to time that tries to take advantage of the workingman of this country.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I listened patiently during the eloquent address of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) for some suggestions as to what might be done, but I was exceedingly disappointed when he sat down without having suggested anything but his inability to make any recommendation whatsoever. I think we ought to have some suggestion from the government, or from the Department of Labour, as to what positive powers the province would have, and as to how this matter can be dealt with either by the present government or by the provincial authorities. To simply sit helpless and hopeless in the face of such a situation as this seems to me to be, to say the least, most regrettable.

I have just two other very short observations to make on the situation. One is in answer to the hon. member for Lothbinière (Mr. Vien), that we were a nation governed by the British North America Act. Well, we are scarcely a nation if we have no control over our own constitution. If such is the case, I hope the time will soon come when we shall have control in this matter. The other remark I should like to make is that the situation which has been presented to us is the natural and inevitable result of the capitalistic system in industry. We cannot help it developing, and so far as I can see we have got to face even instability, inefficiency, sabotage and bloodshed until this system is replaced by something of the co-operative nature. I hope the government will, in spite of the confessed inability of the Minister of Labour, take this matter in hand and in consultation with the province of British Columbia, do something to avoid and avert what may be a very serious thing.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I wish to draw the attention of the House to the circumstance that all we have before us in the present discussion is a communication which my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) has read. We do not know the particular organization to which reference is made; indeed, we do not know any of the facts other than as represented in this message. It is somewhat difficult for the government to make a pronouncement that will cover what may be a hypothetical situation. I do not hesitate for one moment to say that if the facts are as represented in this message, and I have no reason to believe that they are other than as represented, it should be intimated to the company, and it will be intimated to them, that this parliament in the name of Canada has given its adherence to the articles of the Treaty of Versailles and the labour convention attached to it, and that one of the terms of the latter is the right of association for all lawful purposes—by the employee as well as the employer—to preserve this right is something to which we are committed and bound by that treaty. I think it will be sufficient if the attention of the company is drawn to that particular article, and to the debate which has taken place here, to focus public opinion and public sentiment upon any course of behaviour on the part of this company which may be counter to that particular article of the treaty. If that is not sufficient I shall be very much surprised if the parliament of Canada cannot find some means of satisfactorily dealing further with the situation.

Mr. L. W. HUMPHREY (West Kootenay): Notwithstanding the remarks made by the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr Vien) I feel that he does not wish to have a wrong impression created in this House. He seemed to be of the opinion that an agreement had been entered into in this case between the employees and the employer stating that the former would not become members of a trade union. I feel that such is the case because my knowledge and my experience lead me to believe that the employers of labour throughout the Dominion welcome the idea of labour organizing into trade unions. During the last twenty years I have not met any employer of labour who did not welcome the principles held in mind by labour men in organizing and becoming members of these unions. The principle involved in the case to which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has drawn attention was decided many years ago. To-day the majority of the largest employers of labour throughout the Dominion not only recognize that principle but they welcome discussions by represen-

tatives of labour bodies on industrial matters of mutual interest and even, at times, invite discussion on the management of their particular industry. In the majority of cases this policy ensures better service, a greater degree of efficiency, and on the part of the employee a feeling of contentment. The principle involved here is so important that I was disappointed the Minister of Labour could not make a more definite statement as to what action he was prepared to take. Because failure to take the right course might precipitate a very serious situation. It might involve a strike on the part of the employees of the Powell River Company, to say the least of it. So that any action on the part of the Department of Labour or of the Government in opposition to the drastic and extreme course apparently pursued by this corporation would be welcomed by the trades unions as well as by the general public throughout Canada. In my opinion the government would be well advised in taking such steps as will re-assure the employees of this industrial concern as to their rights in this matter.

Upon Mr. Neill rising to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under sub-section 2 of Rule 21 the right of reply is allowed to an hon. member who has moved a substantive motion. In this case the motion was to adjourn the House, and therefore there is no such right. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) may, however, be granted the privilege with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. NEILL: I only wish to speak for a few moments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have leave to reply?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. NEILL: I thank the House for permission to reply. I hope the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien), was not sincere or not correct, when he made the statement that when a labouring man leased his labour to his employer it was possible and proper for the employer to include in that contract a provision that he should not join any particular body. In that case, the contract necessarily carries with it the converse; that the employer has the right to compel the employee to join a particular body. If the principle applies to a trade union, it would apply to every other organization. It might for instance, be a religious body. It might be a condition of the employment that the employee should forswear the religion he had followed and adhere to that of his employer. The proposition lends itself to no end of possibilities, or impossibilities. It might also go to the extent that his employer would include in the lease or contract of labour the disposition of his vote. That might happen quite easily and it is a legitimate deduction. We would then be going back to the pocket burroughs of the feudal ages, where we had a man buying a certain seat with two or three representatives in it who had to vote the way their purchaser or employer dictated. I thought the feudal system had been done away with some hundreds of years ago, but I am sorry to see it is still lingering in certain corners. I am not a lawyer, and I cannot follow the intricacies of the debate as regards common law as against any other law, but I do know that there is a law of common sense and it is against common sense to say that when a working man sells his labour to his employer he also sells his soul to the employer. If the argument were carried out to a logical conclusion, that would be the situation.

The remarks which have been made here today, and especially the remarks of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) show that there is a real necessity for legislation dealing with this matter. If the minister cannot deal with it—and he has shown fairly plainly that he cannot deal with it formally—I might say, at this moment then it shows there is need for legislation. With reference to the question as to where the jurisdiction lies I think the power that passed the order in council, even though it was not entirely obligatory, yet was almost mandatory at any rate—has also power to deal along those lines, even in times of peace. At any rate we are aware that this parliament has passed legislation such as the Industrial Disputes and Investigation Act and provided for boards of conciliation, and so on, dealing with relations between capital and labour, and certainly those relations can well be deemed a national issue rather than a provincial one. For the rest of my remarks I might merely echo the statement of the Prime Minister. While there may be no legal way to deal with the situation, we know what Shakespeare says—"Conscience doth make cowards of us all," and there is no greater pressure on some people than the pressure of sentiment and public opinion. If the Minister of Labour were to advise this particular company of the provisions of the order in council which I have quoted, and tell them

that, while it is not obligatory, as there is no penal clause attached to it, if it were not adhered to by labour on the one hand and employers on the other ,it might be necessary in the opinion of the Minister of Labour to crystallize that order in council into legislation, it would have a very salutary effect. He might also summarize the debate in the House, and say that the House has expressed strong disapproval of any company so heavily protected as they are, refusing the right of their employees to join a trades union. I think that would be more effective than putting the legal machinery at work. If he would act along the lines suggested, I am satisfied the situation would be adequately met.

Motion withdrawn.

CANADIAN NAVAL RESERVE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Defence (Mr. Macdonald) a question, based on a despatch which appeared in the morning Chronicle of Halifax a few days ago which reads as follows:

> Ottawa, May 14—(By Canadian Press)—An official announcement to-night states that five companies of the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve have been formed and others are almost up to strength.
>
> The companies already formed are Quebec, Ottawa, Hamilton, Saskatoon and Calgary. Edmonton and Winnipeg will be ready to form their companies within a few days.
>
> "The progress which has been made in recruiting for the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve has been satisfactory. This reserve is composed entirely of young Canadians between eighteen and twenty-two years of age. They are already showing fine interest in the work and promise to build up a highly efficient reserve force," adds the announcement.

I desire to know from the minister if this is true; and if the despatch is true, why is it necessary to recruit members for a Royal Voluntary Naval Reserve in the inland cities of Saskatoon, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg and Ottawa? I desire to know why, instead of recruiting Royal Voluntary Naval Reserve in these places, they do not go to such ports as Pictou, Sydney, Canso, Lunenburg and Yarmouth on the Atlantic coast, and Vancouver, Victoria, Prince Rupert and Alberni on the Pacific coast? Why go to the expense of recruiting these men in the inland cities, and taking them to the seaboard at a very great expense? I wish to know also if, when the naval reserve volunteers are recruited, every volunteer will be supplied with a package of Mothersill's seasick remedy?

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): I rise to make clear exactly the position of matters in regard to the naval reserves. There are two reserves, the Royal Naval Reserve, and the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve. The Royal Naval Reserve is made up entirely of men who are accustomed to the seafaring profession, and whose duties upon ships would be those which would be usually performed by men who have been engaged in seafaring life. During the last year preparations have been proceeding, and it is expected, in regard to this branch of the service, that after the first of July, in the maritime ports both on the Pacific and the Atlantic, volunteers will be asked, and careful provision is being made for the inauguration of this part of the service. There is a Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, which is made up of another branch of the service. On naval vessels there are to be found men who have been engaged in almost every kind of occupation, from sailors to mechanics. Organizations for training recruits are being formed in the inland cities very largely through the influence of the Naval League.

Mr. DUFF: Are there no sailors on the Atlantic coast?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): We will look into that when the preparations are all made, which we expect will be after the 1st of July. In the various parts of Canada, in the interest of those who are devoting themselves to naval matters, organizations of this kind are being formed, but there are men who happen to be born inland who would be able to serve at sea, in the occupations they had been engaged in, and I think it is of interest to state that during the late war a very great proportion of the recruits obtained for the United States' naval force were drafted from the inland cities. These naval companies are made up from men of this class, who had been engaged in occupations which would fit them to go on board vessels in some capacity, and these men are trained and drilled at their own homes. Arrangements are being perfected as the force is being developed, to provide for a certain short period of training at the seaports, either on the Atlantic or on the Pacific. The difference between the two classes of people who are being recruited for the services is simply the difference between these two services.

Mr. DUFF: How are they going to train them? Will they use prairie schooners?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is very keen and the acumen which he

has been accustomed to display in the House in a good natured way, causes him to take a great interest in this matter. I have been in the department four weeks and have been devoting myself with a good deal of interest to this line of service, and I can assure my hon. friend that I will welcome his co-operation in this matter, so that we may have a service on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might remind hon. gentlemen that such questions must not degenerate into a debate; otherwise we shall find ourselves at sea.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the question drops, would the minister tell us which of these forces it is—or is it both?—the training of which consists in learning to fish? We were told by the hon. member in the debate on the estimates, that that was the training that was to be given to one of them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is a phase of the subject I have not yet considered.

Mr. DUFF: Evidently they have not given it much consideration.

BUDGET STATEMENTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Yesterday I asked for the elements, the items constituting the revenue of the country for the preceding year. Those I have received. I wish to ask further for particulars of the appropriation credited against the National Railways this year and last year—some $92,000,000 and $97,000,000—in the speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I think we should have the items that make that up, and the purpose to which each has been devoted. Some of it, of course, was in the recoupment of deficits, but a very large amount must have been in the way of advances. I think the House should have been informed of this in the budget speech itself.

I also call attention to the fact that the budget statement gives no account of our present debt. Not only should we have a statement of the present debt, but a historical account; but if the items are given, that is all I will ask for at the moment.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think I have in mind what my right hon. friend wants; but if he would give me a written memorandum of it, I will give him the information as far as possible.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Thursday, May 17, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee on Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Robert Forke.

Mr. R. W. GRIMMER (Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, in the budget presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I note that the proposed change in the British preferential tariff will apply a further discount of 10 per cent in customs duties on goods coming directly to Canada by way of Canadian ports. The object no doubt is to encourage the use of Canadian ports and incidentally the use of the Canadian National Railways. I believe in the principle of giving every encouragement to imports coming directly to our ports. At the same time we should not lose sight of the fact that Canada is an exporting country, and that we should encourage, perhaps I might say, educate our people to the fact that to build up our country, our railways and our ports, it is absolutely necessary that our exports should be sent by Canadian roads through Canadian ports to the markets of the world.

I am sure we must all admit that one of the greatest problems that Canada is facing to-day is that of our railways and transportation. We are all familiar with the situation as it now stands. Our railways are not hauling the traffic that legitimately belongs to them, and the United States is receiving that traffic, which is assisting to build up the port of Portland and other foreign ports, this being detrimental to our own in Canada. The greatest difficulty in solving the problem is the argument that as yet we have no port that is absolutely adapted as an all-the-year-round outlet to our railway system in our own country, in spite of the fact that large sums of money have been spent in the development of our ports throughout Canada. I believe it to be in the interests of the people of Canada to make these expenditures, and I would urge upon the government the necessity of the earliest possible development of all our ports. Even then, however, it is not possible to obtain results that will entirely remedy the present system of transportation. When the people of Canada fully realize that Canadian products shall be carried by Canadian rails through Can-

adian ports to the markets of the world, then and then only will Canada become the nation that she is destined to be, and our ports will naturally come into their own. We may very well take a lesson from the great republic to the south of us, whose people have built up a wonderful commercial country by the development of the ports along their coast line, taking care of their own business, reaching out as handlers of the export trade of Canada, thereby receiving every year millions of our good Canadian dollars that we should be spending in the development of the industrial life of this country, patronizing their own railroads, spending their own money in the industrial life of their country, giving employment to their people and making them happy and contented. Here in Canada with a larger extent of area, with the unbounded, undeveloped natural resources of a great country, linked together as we are from ocean to ocean by railways owned by our people, with branch lines running into every important centre, we should patronize our own railways by carrying our exports to our own ports, spending our own money in Canada in developing the industrial life of the country, giving employment to our own people and keeping our young men at home, because this is the best immigration policy that any government could adopt.

Realizing as we do that 70 to 80 per cent of the export trade of this country is going through American ports, why should we permit a condition like this to continue to exist, when we have an all-the-year-round outlet to our railway system in Canada situated at our door in Charlotte county in the greatest natural harbour on the Atlantic coast of North America? This harbour is pronounced by experts to be one of the great world ports created by the hand of nature with a 60-foot depth of water for four miles of harbour, 60 feet to 150 feet deep all the way from the Atlantic ocean into the port where the largest vessel that has ever been or ever will be built can come in under her own steam and dock without the assistance of tugs. There are no shoals or ledges to contend with. There is a splendid opportunity for anchorage for ships in Passamaquoddy bay in event of storm. There is ample accommodation for the fleets of Europe, and the harbour is free from fog and ice and open all the year. No dredging is required; nature has done it all. We would advocate connecting by rail with the Transcontinental at Quebec, making St. Croix the nearest possible point on the Atlantic coast to Winnipeg.

A report was made by a special committee of the Senate of Canada, consisting of fourteen members, assembled at Ottawa, April 20, 1921, "to inquire into" conditions responsible for the routing of a large portion of "Canadian export trade via American instead of Canadian ports," this committee having power to call for persons and papers in connection with the subject to be investigated. The committee, after many sittings, made its final report June 9, 1922, and so satisfied must it have been with the evidence submitted that it concludes its exhaustive findings, in part, in the following words:

> After careful consideration of all the evidence submitted, your committee is of opinion that there exists a most serious condition of affairs with regard to the diversion of the western grain trade to New York and other United States seaports for export.
>
> There seems to be no doubt that two-thirds and problably four-fifths of that trade takes that route and that we are paying many millions annually to United States railways, lake carriers and elevators that would be earned by our own railways and trainmen if it were possible to export this grain at Canadian seaports.

Since this evidence was taken government statistics show that the diversion still continues and that of the bountiful crop of 1921 no less than 99 million bushels of wheat went from Fort William to Buffalo.

Evidence was produced before this committee to show beyond any question that wheat could be hauled profitably from Winnipeg to Quebec over the National Transcontinental Railway for 18 cents per bushel. This fact being established it could be continued 260 miles further to St. Croix harbour for 22 cents per bushel. The rate to New York is 32 cents per bushel. Thus a saving of 10 cents per bushel on even 200 million bushels would mean 20 million dollars saved to the farmers of the prairie provinces yearly.

What does this mean? It means that $20,000,000 distributed annually to the farmers of the prairie provinces would so improve conditions that it would not be necessary for them to ask the banks to advance loans to enable them to carry on their industry, and would place them in the very near future in that position in which they would be able to ask the banks whether they could not pay more than 3½ per cent on the deposits of farmers. In the year 1837, Admiral Sir W. F. W. Owen in a report to the Imperial government on this harbour had this to say in part:

> There is no point within my knowledge better adapted by nature than St. Andrews for being made a mercantile port with extensive advantages and facilties, the outports,—so to call them,—or ports adjacent to this port, are in themselves very commodious ports and furnish shelter of easy access to any number of ships of any magnitude, even for

all the navies of Europe and, in short, what Liverpool has been made as a mercantile port, at an incrediable expense, this port of our colonies has every advantage to adapt it for and which might be made fully available at trifling cost.

Commander Campbell, of the Beaver line fleet, says:

There can be no doubt that St. Andrews, both from its geographical position and from the natural advantages of a fine, commodious, landlocked harbor, is certainly equal, if not superior, to any other port in the Dominion as the natural winter port. It is nearer England by over sixty miles than Portland, Maine, and as a harbor is infinitely its superior, being shut in from heavy seas from all quarters. It is also free from any serious difficulties in the way of ice and carries a depth of water in the outer harbor sufficient for the largest steamers afloat. It would, if properly conducted, be a cheaper port for discharging and loading vessels when accommodations are made and ought to compare favourably with any port in Canada. I have often wondered that, possessing so many natural and geographical advantages as it does, it has not long ago become the most important winter port of the Dominion.

Captain Henry Mowat, for many years port superintendent for the Canadian Pacific Steamship line at Liverpool, England, in a report on this harbour in 1913, says:

The approach to the port of St. Croix via Head harbour is equal to the approach of any other port in the world, and in many instances excels the best for depth of water. There are no great ports which have such great depths of water from the sea clear into port as that of the St. Croix; it is such that the largest ships now in existence and with the greatest draft of water can enter the port at the lowest possible tides.

The channels from Head harbour into Passamaquoddy bay are that the largest vessel that ever will be built can be navigated with ease at top speed with perfect safety. They are free from shoals and rock and have ample width for turning a ship in the narrowest part. The tidal currents are nothing in comparison to the river Mersey, England, and other ports I have navigated, etc.

After careful investigation, I consider St. Croix river and Passamaquoddy bay, equal to any in the world for a great national port.

In the year 1913, the Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works in the federal government of that time, and himself a western man, seeing the possibilities of the development of St. Croix harbour, engaged Mr. E. C. Swan, a harbour expert, and a gentleman of recognized ability in his profession, together with the engineers of the Department of Public Works, and also three master mariners, to visit the harbour, make investigations, take soundings, boring, and so forth, submit specifications for the equipment necessary for the development of the port, and to draw up a report for consideration by the Public Works department. All that information secured at that time is at present in the possession of the department and no doubt would be available to any hon. gentlemen who might care to learn the facts in connection with this matter. This investigation was made shortly after the outbreak of the war when, as we are all aware, all public works were cancelled and every energy was put forth in the prosecution of the war. Mr. Swan in his report goes into the matter very thoroughly. He deals with conditions at the port, and so forth, but I shall read only his concluding remarks.

[Mr. Grimmer.]

In considering the St. Croix river for shipping purposes and as a possible auxiliary to St. John, more particularly for the extensive traffic during the winter months, it seems to have many attractions such as—it is some 50 miles nearer the mouth of the bay of Fundy than is St. John. The distance from Montreal to St. John by Canadian Pacific railway is 483 miles. The distance from Montreal to Oak bay St. Stephen, by the Canadian Pacific railway, is 438 miles or thereby, and if in the future a branch line is constructed from Mattawamkeag to Oak bay, this would shorten the total distance from Montreal to Oak bay to 410 miles. The river St. Croix and Passamaquoddy bay is comparatively well sheltered water, never closed by ice and protected from the swell of the bay of Fundy by numerous islands near the mouth, and as there is deep water right close in shore to the sides of the river and bay, practically no dredging whatever would be necessary to form a shipping channel. Leading lights for the guidance of shipping at night would of course have to be provided; probably some joint agreement regarding cost of same could be made with the United States. . . . I therefore recommend with great confidence that wharf areas, railway terminals, roads and freight handling facilities in general, should be designed on a comprehensive, practicable scale, and constructed by degrees at Oak bay as may be necessary.

Mr. F. C. Goodspeed, an engineer of the federal department, with whom probably hon. gentlemen in the House are acquainted, in his report as to the cost of soundings, borings, the construction of quay walls, docks, and so forth, gives an exhaustive survey of the whole matter. I quote the following:

Throughout this whole distance of eight miles, port development along the shore is possible, using quay walls along the narrower sections and where the deep water approaches close to shore; while piers or jetties would be provided at Joe's Point and Oak Point and near the mouth of the Waweig river. . . . Any sized yard room required could be developed at the head of Pagan's Cover for storage purposes, while further yards would be available at the docks. These docks would be 438 miles from Montreal by rail, via the Canadian Pacific railway, compared with 483 miles to St. John. Oak Point would also be about 50 miles nearer to the mouth of the bay of Fundy than St. John is.

This means fifty miles shorter water route to Liverpool. Mr. Goodspeed is further reported as follows:

Mr. Goodspeed also gives estimates for development of Joe's Point and at the mouth of the Waweig river, both of them being a part of the possible extension of the harbour for eight miles along the eastern bank of the river.

The three master mariners who accompanied these gentlemen on their survey and investigation submitted a report in respect to the

approaches and entrance to the harbour. They had this to say:

Bold and steep, suitable for safe navigation of vessels of any size provided proper aids to navigation were established for navigation at night or in foggy weather. Channel between Indian island, Campobello and Eastport (turning point St. Croix river) of ample width to handle with safety any size of vessel. Good anchorage in event of fog.

St. Croix river and Oak Point: Safe and well sheltered entrance and approach, suitable for safe navigation of any size of steamer.

M. N. Fillies, master mariner, Supt. Donaldson Line, Ltd.

D. L. Kenney, master mariner, Supt. Head Line steamers.

G. O. R. Elliot, master mariner, Asst Marine Supt. C.P.R. and C.S.S. Lines.

This, Mr. Speaker, should be sufficient evidence to establish the suitability of St. Croix harbour, when properly developed, as a great shipping port for our grain products. The part of St. Croix river which constitutes this harbour extends from the town of St. Andrews up to what is known as the ledge. I may say in this connection that when lumbering was the chief industry on the St. Croix, as many as twenty-five of the largest vessels then in the ocean trade were frequently seen at one time in the harbour known as the ledge, situated between St. Croix harbour and the town of St. Stephen. These vessels were engaged in the transport of timber across the Atlantic, and it was owing to the heavier class of timber in this immediate vicinity having become exhausted that the traffic gradually disappeared. This harbour is within four miles of the town of St. Stephen.

It may be interesting to know that the town of St. Stephen is an important industrial centre, some of the largest industries of their kind in the Dominion of Canada being located there. I may mention two of the articles that are manufactured there, Ganong's chocolates and Surprise soap, both known in every household from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Among other industries that we have may be mentioned the following: The Dominion Fertilizer Company which has an output of 25,000 tons of fertilizer annually; the Mann Axe and Tool Company, with an output of 4,000 tons annually; Ganong Brothers, sweet manufacturers, output 5,000 tons annually; Haley & Sons, handling about 5,000,000 feet of lumber anually; Canadian Cotton factory, 1,000 tons anually. We have a pulp mill with an output of over 100 tons daily, and there is the Eastern Pulp Company, handling from 50 to 75 cords of pulpwood. Coal to the extent of 50,000 to 75,000 tons a year is imported. The St. Croix Soap Company does a very large business, and there is also a shoe factory in St. Stephen whose operations are very extensive. We have also sardine factories, granite quarries and many other industries in the adjacent parishes. Recently an American company have purchased land and water powers in anticipation of erecting another large pulp and paper mill in the near future. Another of our chief industries is the fishing industry, the market value of its products last year being over $1,420,000. We do not claim to be an agricultural county—that is, to the extent of making any considerable exports—but we have in the past exported 40,000 tons of potatoes annually. So that the moment accommodations are provided, a considerable amount of traffic would be available the whole year round for St. Croix harbour.

Where can we look for an outlet for our railway system, through which our grain products, running into hundreds of millions of bushels and increasing each year, may be continually shipped all the year round to the markets of the world? There is but one answer to that question, the port of Quebec in summer and St. Croix harbour in winter. The building of the National Transcontinental railway has made the port of Quebec the logical outlet in the St. Lawrence for the grain products of the northwest during the open season of navigation. The city of Winnipeg is situated at the very eastern threshold of the vast grain trade, and at that point must be assembled some time during the year the great bulk of all the grain raised in the districts to the west. Three great railway systems converge there from the west, and they again converge at Quebec bridge. The shortest route between these points is the National Transcontinental; on that road a distance of 1,350 miles brings Winnipeg nearer to an ocean port on the Atlantic seaboard than is possible by any other route. Mr. D. F. Maxwell, former railway engineer in the provincial government, a man of outstanding ability in his profession who has devoted many years of study to this great question, does much to solve the problem in an article he has written, and from which I will now quote:

From an engineering standpoint, the arbitrary points, both physical and commercial, which would influence the location of a railway between this harbor and the great bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec, come so near the air line that it is safe to conclude that a railway can be located that would not exceed the air line distance by more than fifteen per cent, thus making the total distance 260 miles on the whole and thus making the total distance from Winnipeg to St. Croix harbor 1,610 miles, or more than 100 miles shorter than from Winnipeg to Portland, Maine, via Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk railways, (shortest

route) and more than 200 miles shorter than from Winnipeg to St. John, via the Canadian National Railway, (shortest route), and about 370 miles shorter than from Winnipeg to Halifax via Canadian National railway, (shortest route).

When this route is completed and properly put into commission, and when the necessary grain exchange, elevators and so on are established at Quebec, the great question of the transport of our grain will have been settled so far as the St. Lawrence route goes and our problems in that connection will at least have been partly solved.

The next question is, will St. Croix harbour serve as a winter port? The St. Croix harbour is in the St. Croix river, which forms the boundary line between New Brunswick and the state of Maine. The air line distance from Quebec bridge to St. Croix is 226 miles. St. Croix harbour is without doubt the greatest natural harbour on the Atlantic coast of North America. A distinctive feature is its geographical position, which will naturally have a favourable effect upon insurance rates as compared with the rates to United States ports. Then, St. Croix harbour is nearer the great coast cities of the United States, the West India Islands, Cuba, Mexico and South America than is any other port in Canada. It is nearer Europe than any port in either the United States or Canada that could be considered, except Halifax. A very important feature in connection with the harbour is the small cost of development. But the most unique feature is that the St. Croix river, being the boundary line, it may be both Canadian and American, a condition that could not be possible anywhere else.

Halifax, as you are well aware, has never shipped any quantity of grain on account of the long rail haul which made it impossible for it to compete profitably with American ports. St. John will always continue to ship annually, and Montreal will always continue to be as it is now the summer port, as it is the summer terminal of the lake water route as well as of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk railways. What we want, Mr. Speaker, is to haul over our own railways and to ship through our own ports practically seventy-five or eighty per cent of the grain that now finds its way out through Portland, Boston and Baltimore. If we were taking care of this traffic ourselves our railway deficits would soon begin to disappear. If this harbour were developed to even one-half its present capacity and railway connection were made with the Quebec bridge the transportation problem would be fully and completely solved. Again, it will be physically impossible to transport in winter grain from Winnipeg to any other Atlantic port as cheaply and as expeditiously as it can be carried by this proposed route to St. Croix harbour for the reason that gradient and the ton-mile haulage must continue to be the governing factors in the cost of railway transportation.

The building of the National Transcontinental railway, and particularly the part between Winnipeg and Quebec, and the bridging of the great river at this point, changed the westward objective of all Maritime province railways and brought the prairie provinces nearer by some three hundred miles to the Maritime province ports than was the case before, as well as giving the port of Quebec its commanding position as the logical outlet in the St. Lawrence. This is a great national project. It was intended by nature as the greatest highway possible between the world's greatest granary and the nearest and cheapest possible points of shipment during the whole year for its products for the world's markets.

Then, of course, would come up the question, how can this proposed railway across Maine be built? That is a pertinent question to the inquiry. The answer should not be difficult If the parliament of Canada was justifiec thirty-five years ago when its revenues were under 40 million dollars a year, in granting financial aid to the Canadian Pacific railway, across Maine to the extent of five million dollars for a maritime winter outlet for that railway, why should it not be justified in granting financial aid now to a similar undertaking when its revenues are more than ten times what they were then and grant aid commensurate with the cost of building a railway to-day and in consideration of the character of a road necessary to be built to-day, with a standard grade of 21.4 feet per mile, against a grade of 52.8 feet per mile at that time, and particularly in view of the fact that the government owns two transcontinental railways now resting their noses on Quebec bridge and looking for a maritime port of which the nearest and best possible one to be had is this splendid undeveloped St. Croix harbour, which can be reached by building about 200 to 210 miles of railway at the most.

This is made possible by utilizing that portion of the National Railways east of Quebec as far as St. Malachie and for which distance it is pointing directly for this harbour and where it then turns north around the state of Maine on its way to Moncton, New Brunswick.

How can this project be successfully carried out? The Canadian National Railway Board cannot build a railway across Maine.

The answer to that is that if the Dominion government will grant a suitable subsidy each year for twenty years for the purpose of constructing a railway from Quebec bridge to St. Croix harbour by the shortest and most practicable route, a private corporation could, no doubt, be formed that would guarantee its construction and hand it over to the Canadian National Board, who no doubt could operate it.

When this is done, all that remains necessary to be done is to equip Quebec and St. Croix harbour with the necessary docks and elevators and which may be accomplished, covering the period of, say, ten years by spending a certain amount every year on each, by the end of which time we would be shipping all of our own grain over our own railways, through our own ports.

This is no visionary scheme, but a plain, business proposition, and one quite within our financial ability to carry out, and the carrying out of which will settle for a long period of years our most vexed problem.

This is not only a practical solution; it is the only solution.

Reliable data at hand show another physical feature that distinguishes this route. That there is only one summit between the St. Lawrence and this harbour to overcome and that only 1,200 feet above the sea level, compared to 1,854 feet on the Canadian Pacific between Montreal and St. John, and 1,800 feet on the Canadian National. Reliable surveys already made show that it may be overcome with a four-tenths per cent grade.

I wish to point out that the people of the Maritime provinces are solidly behind any project that would remedy the present condition of affairs under which our traffic is being diverted to the United States. This traffic which now goes to Portland and other United States ports should go through Canadian ports. We should keep our own railways busy carrying our own products. That would be in the interests of the whole of this country.

St. John, as you know, is the only winter port on the Atlantic at the present time for the shipment of grain. It is an important and valuable port but unfortunately the port is limited in the degree to which it can be extended. Both Halifax and St. John are doing a great public service. Both have magnificent harbours and should be developed to their utmost capacity, but even if they were developed to their utmost capacity it would not be possible for them to handle all the traffic that might be diverted from United States ports. Therefore, I think it is necessary to develop St. Croix harbour. We in Charlotte county do not look upon this development as a great boom for the county or the province of New Brunswick. We feel that it is a work of a national character for the benefit of the whole Canadian people, because at the present time we could not take care of the traffic if it were diverted from the ports of the United States. I should like to quote from an editorial published in the St. John Journal of January 23, 1923, which I hope will convince hon. gentlemen that the people of St. John are in sympathy with the development of any of our ports along the Atlantic coast:

> There is no doubt that St. Croix is a great natural harbor and experts have testified that it and Sydney, Australia, are the two greatest harbors in the world. The development of St. Croix should not necessarily injure St. John. Canada is exporting this year in the vicinity of 350,000,000 bushels of grain and of that amount St. John gets about 20,000,000 bushels. A mere bagatelle! Where does the rest go? Montreal gets a large proportion of it in the summer months but about 200,000,000 bushels of this grain go through American ports and are transported over American railroads. Mr. Maxwell estimates that if this vast amount could be routed over Canadian roads by the short rail-haul he suggests, through the building of 200 miles of railway to connect with the Transcontinental at Quebec bridge, that the saving to Canadian farmers alone would be $20,000,000 yearly and the revenue to our national lines would be almost sufficient to pay off their deficits.
>
> Statements such as these if backed by facts—and the people of St. Stephen are anxious for investigation—transform the development of St. Croix harbor into a great national project. There are about twelve miles of harbor, sufficient according to expert testimony to shelter the navies of the world, and this great port has a natural breakwater in the island of Grand Manan. It is stated that there is a sixty-foot depth throughout this expanse of water and that practically no dredging would be needed.
>
> The suggested construction of 200 miles of railroad in order to connect this port with the Transcontinental at Quebec would probably be frowned upon at the present time, when Canada is already over-burdened with railroads. But when it is considered that the construction of 200 miles of railway will make this port the nearest point on the Atlantic seaboard to Winnipeg, cutting below the present rail-haul to Portland by over 100 miles, and when it is realized that the port is open all the year and that it could be developed to look after the whole winter grain trade of Canada, it will be seen that the project deserves very serious thought. It is not merely the dream of a visionary. The people of St. Stephen and of the whole of Charlotte county are solidly behind the scheme. They believe they have the door which Canada needs for they feel there is no other port which provides the unique advantages and is so perfectly situated geographically to handle the fast growing volume of Canadian trade during the winter months.
>
> The development of St. Croix would not mean that St. John would no longer be a grain port. The construction of the railway would also place St. John sixty miles nearer Winnipeg than is Portland and St. John could be developed to its capacity. There would be plenty of business for both. St. Croix at least deserves the very serious consideration of the federal government, and of the railways.

That comment coming from a paper published in St. John is very agreeable to those who are making exertions for the development of St. Croix harbour. The policy pursued in Canada in the past has been such that we have been adding enormously to our railway mileage without enlarging our ports to any appreciable extent. Is it not a recognized fact that in any country where facilities ahead of the actual requirements have been provided an enormous development has taken place with a resultant increase of trade and of population? It is an unchanging law in economics that exports, in the end, have to be paid for by imports. We should encourage shipping in both directions—from our ports in Canada to European ports, and from the ports of Europe directly to Canada. Such a policy would not only help to find a market for Canadian manufactured goods, but would also assist the Canadian consumer by enabling him to receive goods from the European markets not obtainable in Canada as cheaply and as directly as possible.

We believe in Canada. We have great faith in the future of the Dominion. Still, are we as Canadians doing our best to bui'd up our own country rather than the United States? If we are, may we not ask ourselves the question why we should be giving even one-half our export grain trade to a United States seaport? What we need are such grain rates on our railways as will develop trade through Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, St. John, St. Croix, Vancouver, or any other Canadian ports in preference to ports in the United States. But if we develop St. Croix harbour we can take care of all our export trade. Is it not a matter of interest to every Canadian that every possible bushel of grain should be shipped out of Canada through a Canadian port; and is it not of just as much interest that every ton of goods imported into Canada should enter through a Canadian port? If that hope were realized our railway deficit would soon be lessened and there would be fewer empty cars going west along our railways. The utilization of St. Croix harbour does not concern the people of Charlotte county alone. It will not only be a benefit locally but it will result in national benefit, it will be profitable to Canadians as a whole. If this port is made use of the development of trade as a result will be such as to dispel, to some extent, the dark cloud of gloom which seems to have settled upon the farmers of the West, judging from the speeches of some of our Progressive friends, with respect to the future.

[Mr. Grimmer.]

In summarizing the situation which exists in connection with the harbour of St. Croix we have these advantages to offer: The port will be a terminus of a Canadian railway system running entirely through Canada. We have the greatest natural harbour on the Atlantic coast of North America. The harbour is well sheltered and there is a straight run from the Atlantic ocean into the port with a good depth of water the entire distance. There is ample accommodation for the fleets of Europe, and no dredging is required. The port is fifty miles nearer Liverpool than any port on the Atlantic coast except Halifax. It is 100 miles nearer Winnipeg than Portland, Maine, by the proposed route. It is 200 miles nearer Winnipeg than St. John by the proposed route. It is 370 miles nearer Winnipeg than Halifax by the proposed route. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the project I have placed before the House is feasible, is advisable, and is not only in the interest of our railways but will be advantageous to Canada, and the Canadian people as a whole.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say at the outset that it is not my intention to occupy any undue amount of the time of this House, and that in the course of the few remarks which I intend to offer I shall not discuss the tariff in a scientific way, nor follow some of my Progressive friends through the mazy labyrinths of political economy which they have outlined.

Before getting down to my speech I wish to discuss briefly the remarks of the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Findlay) who spoke yesterday. He was very profuse in his expressions of regret with respect to the policy of the Liberal party, and seemed to be very much put out because that party had not put into force the so-called tariff platform of 1919, which necessitated his leaving the Liberal fold. My hon. friend should have been surer of his facts, because he forsook the Liberal party and opposed the Liberal idea prior to any time during which that party would have had an opportunity of putting the so-called platform into effect. However, I am glad to know, and many gentlemen on this side, I believe, are glad to know, that the hon. member has still a spark of Liberalism within his breast, because I believe if that were not so, good and honourable as he may be, he would "be as Sodom and like unto Gomorrah.'

I am not going to take up the budget from a scientific standpoint. In the course of my remarks I am going to be somewhat local,

and am going to endeavour to place before this House some of the matters as I see them, that are of interest to the Maritime provinces. I am not going to discuss tariffs. I do not know very much about scientifically making them, however, I am opposed to any tariff which has for its object protection for protection's sake. I have not changed my idea one iota in that respect. I am a low-tariff man. I was elected on a tariff-for-revenue platform, and I believe, in the light of all the conditions obtaining in Canada at present, the tariff policy which has been brought down by the Minister of Finance (Mr Fielding) cannot be characterized as other than a tariff for revenue. People in this country are clamouring for government ownership of railways. I am not going to give to any extent my reasons why I may be, in some respects opposed to government ownership, but if the railways of Canada last year had a deficit, we are not going to get the money for the purpose of paying that deficit unless it is by some sort of a tariff, or by direct taxation upon the people of the country, and I believe the people of Canada are so pressed down by taxation, municipal, provincial and federal, that they are not prepared to accept any more direct taxation at the present time. I believe that if my hon. friends would, at least, meet this question in a spirit of compromise, and say that they would be prepared to give up government ownership of railways, in order that they might get low tariff, then, with the result we have to-day, the fifty millions of money spent to meet deficits on the railways might go towards the lessening of the tariff. So long as the country is advocating government ownership, just so long will it be necessary for the people of Canada to get their revenue from tariff sources, and the sooner we come to a realization of the fact that there is no royal way for the country to secure money, and that there is no other method than by taxation, the better for all concerned. I believe I can say of the hon. Minister of Finance, in so far as the tariff is concerned, the words of Goethe, "All I have done, I have done in a kingly way, and let tongues wag, what I saw to be the right thing, that I did." That I believe is the attitude and state of mind that animated the Minister of Finance in the budget policy.

He has divided his budget into various heads, and I am going to deal with one of the most important from my point of view, or more properly I should say, from the standpoint of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, namely, in regard to our relations with the United States. Some of my hon. friends will say, "Your constituency in 1911, when it had the opportunity of securing reciprocity, defeated that issue at the polls". I can say that also to my hon. friends from the province of Manitoba, but I do not say it in a bitter way, as I believe it is to the everlasting disgrace to the people of Manitoba and of Nova Scotia that they defeated reciprocity. But the people probably did not have the matter properly placed before them at that time. Matters of reciprocity were not discussed on their merits. People on the other hand were carried away from the issue by flag-flapping and all sorts of special pleadings. The government to-day has placed in the budget an offer of reciprocity to the United States. It is true it has not so far met with a great deal of favour in the United States. It is probably not receiving very much favourable comment from certain sections of that country. The government has gone further; they are asking parliament to give them the right of negotiating with the President of the United States, if at any time they feel the occasion is ripe. These are, I say, outstanding characteristics of the Liberal party's policy and they show that they are always prepared, on all occasions when the time is ripe, to fulfil all the pledges they gave to the people of the country. I am for reciprocity. I do not apologize from any standpoint for my tariff views, and I am supporting the budget, not on account of the element of protection in it,—though I know that a budget which has for its object a tariff for revenue, must incidentally give some protection—but on account of it being a tariff for revenue, and irrespective of the incidental protection that results therefrom.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was dealing with the offer of reciprocity as contained in the budget. I need not dilate upon the benefits that would accrue to the people of the Maritime provinces were we in a position to secure reciprocity with the United States. The government has done everything possible to that end. With a view to showing how reciprocity would affect one of the chief industries of Nova Scotia, I crave your indulgence while I place upon Hansard a brief statement with respect to the fishing industry in that province.

Some time prior to the coming into force of the Fordney tariff the people of Nova Scotia as well as of the other Maritime provinces could get their fish into the United States, which was their chief market, but the Fordney tariff now makes it almost impossible for them to do that. The injury that is done to the fishing industry of my province as a result of the Fordney tariff will be realized from the following comparison of the duties under the Fordney tariff and the Underwood tariff respectively on fish and fish products which constitute one of our main exports:

Article	Underwood Tariff	Fordney Tariff
Fresh or frozen halibut mackerel or salmon.. ..	Free	2 cents per pound
All other fresh or frozen fish, except shellfish ..	Free	1 cent per pound
Dried fish..	Free	1½ cents per pound
Pickled herring and Mackerel..	Free	1 cent per pound
Finnan Haddie ..	Free	25 per cent ad valorem
Smoked herring ..	¾ cents per pound	2½ cents per pound
Green salted cod, etc..	Free	1¼ cents per pound
Cod oil..	3 cents per gallon	5 cents per gallon

As I have already stated, the United States had always been our chief market, having usually taken over 40 per cent of our total exports of fish. Of course, some of the fish imported into that country were for re-export. The following is an estimate, based on the business done in 1920, which was a normal year in the industry, of the duty collected on Canadian shipments of fish and fish products to the United States, and what that duty would have been under the present tariff. From the whole of Canada the total value of the fish exported to the United States was $15,541,517 and the estimated duty collected was $72,558. Under the Fordney tariff the duty would have been $1,710,055. From the Maritime provinces we shipped to the United States fish valued at $9,075,457. Under the Underwood tariff the estimated duty was $15,842; under the Fordney tariff it would have been $933,887. You will thus see that the United States market and low American tariffs or reciprocity is necessary to our fishermen if we are to survive in the fishing industry. Is it, therefore, any wonder that we in the Maritime provinces are looking for the markets of the New England states for our fish? The only way in which we can get that market is through reciprocity. If we had in force a reciprocal arrangement such as was made by Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson in 1911, we could put our fish on that market free of duty. To-day our people are still looking forward to the day when they will once again have the opportunity of carrying out a reciprocal agreement with the United States; because I believe, Sir, that if the question were placed before the people of the country to-day they would not repeat the mistake which was made in 1911.

Now, there are several phases of the question that might be dealt with, but I want to refer more particularly to the effort which has been made to get this measure of reciprocity. I stated before recess that the government of the day had gone a long way in this direction; they have not only placed a declaration for reciprocity in the budget, but they have asked parliament to give the Governor in Council authority to appoint one of the ministers of the Crown to carry on negotiations to that end with the President of the United States if at any time the conditions seem favourable. But to-day I think we have a weapon in our hands whereby we could to some extent force recognition from the United States authorities. I am not one of those who believe that because the United States people have set a high tariff wall against us we should retaliate by setting up an exceedingly high tariff wall against them. I do not believe, Sir, that that is good Liberalism. There is something of the milk of human kindness in the breast of the Liberal party; we are more inclined to follow the Biblical injunction to turn the other side of the face.

However, we have a weapon, I believe, in our hands. Every person here knows that as a result of the treaty of 1818 the United States authorities renounced forever the right to come within three maritime miles of the coast waters of His Britannic Majesty save for the four humanitarian purposes of wood, water and shelter and effecting repairs. An act, however, was passed by the Canadian parliament, Chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes of 1906, under section 2 of which act the Governor in Council was and is empowered to grant to the United States fishing vessels the right to come into our ports for every other purpose whatsoever. That is done by means of a license, and a fee is charged. For a time the fee was something like $1 50 per ton, though I believe of late years it has been reduced to the sum of $1 per ton. These vessels are coming in and using our ports. At the outset we would not grant any licenses to United States vessels if they were propelled by motor power or by any power other than sail, but as a result of the war when people were coming very

much closer together the people of the United States were given the same rights to obtain licenses for motor craft as they were for sail craft. The result is that the United States vessels being a great deal further from the fishing banks are enabled by means of this licensing system to come into Canadian ports, and use our ports to tranship their catch, take bait, buy their nets, twine and all their other supplies and outfit, and ship their goods through to the United States in bond. As a result of these licenses enabling the United States vessels to make use of our Canadian ports, they can ship their fish through in bond and they go in as American fish, and thus evade the United States duty, whereas when our own fishermen come in from the banks, if they wish to sell to the United States, which in days gone by took forty per cent of their catch, they are obliged to pay two cents a pound duty on fresh fish, which is practically a prohibitive rate. The United States vessels I believe would not be able to successfully prosecute the catching of fresh fish if they were not allowed the use of our Canadian ports, and while to prohibit them from using those ports might affect certain sections of the province of Nova Scotia to-day, particularly the merchant class who sell them supplies, I think it would be good business and in the interests not only of the province but of the country as a whole no longer to permit United States vessels to use the ports of Nova Scotia or any other ports of Canada for fishing purposes. If they were denied that privilege I really believe that it would be conducive to the United States authorities negotiating with the Dominion government for reciprocity at least in fish. I think I have stated fairly succinctly what the benefits to be derived from reciprocity with the United States would be and if I have not made myself intelligible to most members of the House they will simply have to pardon me in that regard. I have simply taken one great industry and I believe, Sir, and I say it without fear of contradiction, that I have demonstrated beyond all peradventure that reciprocity in fish is in the best interests of the fishermen of Canada.

Now I pass on to the question of bounties as noted by the hon. Minister of Finance. As I said before, I am not going to deal with the tariff in a scientific way. I am not capable of doing that. I have often heard it said, and I believe it has been said by many political economists, that bounties are the most vicious form of protection. If that is so, then God knows I do not want them, but I do not believe they are the most vicious form of protection. I believe they are best suited to encouraging industry. It is true that of bounties we might say in the words which Addison puts into the mouth of that fictitious character Sir Roger de Coverley "Much might be said on both sides." I have at least to my own satisfaction convinced myself that the Minister of Finance did the right thing by not increasing the tariff and giving instead bounties in order to encourage these particular industries.

I said at the outset that I was going to be brief. I believe it was St. Paul who said that a man should always be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in him, and that was my only purpose in rising to say a few words in regard to this budget. I know I shall be told by some of my Progressive friends, many of whom I admire, that I have developed into a protectionist since coming into the House of Commons. I would hurl that back at them and say that I am as much a low tariff man as ever. As I said this afternoon, I am supporting this budget because Canada needs revenue, and the primary object of this budget is to raise revenue.

I have one or two other reasons for supporting this budget. First, because I say it is a tariff for revenue, and that is the policy of the Liberal party. Secondly, because the changes in duties are made downward. Thirdly, because it increases the British preference. There are about eighty-two classes of goods on which that preference has been increased. I have not the list here although I have read it, and if any hon. member wishes to see it I will secure it for him. Fourthly, because it adopts reciprocity as a permanent plank in the platform of the Liberal party. Fifthly, because I was elected as a Liberal. I was opposed both by a Progressive and a Conservative. I stood on the straight Liberal platform and the understanding of the people of my constituency was that if my hon. leader were returned to power the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) would be Finance Minister. That is to say, he would have charge of the tariff. He has had charge of the tariff, and I believe I am only doing my duty by supporting that government whose Finance Minister has the confidence of my constituency and who has framed the tariff which I am supporting to-day. If I took any other attitude than that I would deem it my duty, Sir, to go back to my constituents and to hand them back my mandate. They knew, as I have already said, when I was coming here that I was coming here to support the Liberal party not the Progressive party, not the Conservative party because I got no support in my constituency from either. I got

support from what are always known down there as straight Laurier Liberals.

I have also another reason. If we are going to prevent the railways which have been handed over to us from going on the junk pile it is necessary for us to raise a revenue, and the people of Canada to-day with the demands that are made upon them for municipal taxation, provincial taxation, and direct forms of federal taxation are not prepared at all times to have moneys to pay to the Dominion government when such are demanded of them. But when we have a tariff for revenue such as this, they can buy the articles upon which a tariff is imposed to suit their convenience, and they are thus enabled to stretch that taxation over a period. I am one of those from the maritimes, probably the youngest man from the maritimes, but I want to say this: I have faith in my party, I have faith in my country. I believe this is not a time for pessimism. There is already a bright star breaking over the horizon, and if we in this House, particularly the men from the West, will not be pessimistic but look towards the future and not go around crying, "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me?" and rather give our attention to the stream of prosperity and drink of the brook of optimism by the way so that we will lift up our heads, then in this Canada of ours, which is a young country, with a Finance Minister still young, we will sing in concert:

> Grow old along with me!
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life, for which the first was made:
> Our times are in His hand
> Who saith, "A whole I planned,
> Youth shows but half; trust God: see all, nor be afraid!"

In other words, have faith in Canada, have faith in the Liberal party, have faith in the Minister of Finance, have faith in a tariff for revenue, and you will soon see Canada back to the golden era of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's day.

Mr. J. W. KING (North Huron): Mr. Speaker, I desire to unite with other hon. members in the felicitations which they have extended to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I have been a great admirer of that hon. gentleman for years, and I hope that he will long live to deliver budget speeches although not exactly of the nature of his recent deliverance.

I do not agree with the tariff as embodied in the budget speech we are now considering. Take for example the duty on automobiles. How does it operate? Why, sir, Henry Ford is probably one of the greatest customs collectors we have in Canada. Henry Ford collects somewhere in the neighbourhood of three or four million dollars per annum. And where does that money go? Into the pocket of Henry Ford and it will doubtless be used to defray his expenses in the next Presidential election in the United States instead of going into the exchequer of Canada.

The hon. member for Hants who has just resumed his seat said when he began his remarks that he was not a tariff expert, that he did not know very much about the tariff. Yet, almost in the very same breath he went on to state that the present tariff is a tariff for revenue only. How can the hon. gentleman advance such a contention as that when I have shown the enormous sum of money that the people of this country pay in duties on automobiles alone? Does not that one instance prove that the present tariff is a protective tariff purely and simply? Sir, it is because the Liberal party did not live up to its promises in regard to the tariff that the Progressive party is in existence to-day. In 1896 the Liberal party had a good platform and I helped to support it. Sir Wilfried Laurier was probably one of the greatest statesmen ever produced in Canada, and I heard him declare on one occasion in the neighbouring town of Listowel that if he were returned to power he would positively reduce the tariff. Not only that but that he would either abolish the Senate or place it on an elective basis. How did the Liberal party carry out their promises when they were returned to power in 1896? They acted in just the same way as they are doing to-day. I do not impugn Sir Wilfrid Laurier's motives in not putting into operation the platform of his party, neither do I blame altogether the present Prime Minister for not carrying out the pledges of his party. In the case of the former statesman we find that he and his party were deserted by eighteen Liberal magnates in the city of Toronto headed by Sir Thomas White. They were the men who kept Sir Wilfrid Laurier from bringing the platform of his party into effect and, Sir, if our suspicions are correct the same influences are at work to-day, the same influences are keeping the present government from carrying out their pledges. These are some of the reasons why the Progressive party has sprung into existence. Now, although we may differ politically there is no reason why we should differ socially; there is no reason for not entertaining a kindly spirit towards each other. But when it comes to politics there is serious ground for difference and we must differ and we must fight. Some of my good Liberal friends—and I have many yet—and some of

my good Conservative friends, say "Scratch a Progressive and you will find a Grit or a Tory." Well, they have been scratching for the last eighteen months and what have they found. The Liberal party found two members of the Progressive party that were not true Progressives, and the Tory party have found in the provincial arena in Toronto two others who were not real Progressives.

An hon. MEMBER: Horse and horse.

Mr. KING (Huron): I may say to the two old-time parties that those still in our ranks are genuine Progressives. I am reminded in this connection of the story told of the teacher and the pupil. The teacher offered the pupil an apple and asked him whether he would prefer the whole apple or two halves. The boy replied that he would sooner have the two halves. The teacher curious to learn the boy's reason inquired "Why would you sooner have the two halves?" And received the reply "I would then see what the centre is like, whether it is rotten or not."

I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) raise the question of a capital levy. It should be understood that there are men in the Progressive ranks who are just as cautious as those of any other party, and I for one am thoroughly opposed to any such thing as a capital levy. Introduce such a thing into any country and the result will be disastrous. The very moment you impose a capital levy, capital will desert the country and will not return while that condition exists.

I do not notice many gems in the budget speech but if there is one it consists in the offer of reciprocity with the United States. I certainly believe in reciprocity between Canada and the United States, and in my opinion the time is not very far distant when the two countries will come to terms on this matter. It is true that under the Fordney-McCumber tariff there are high duties against the natural products of Canada, but do you for one moment believe that the 72 per cent of the people of the United States who are consumers will long consent to have their necessaries of life so taxed? They certainly will not.

I asked the House to bear with me for a few minutes while I suggest certain sources of revenue in this country which have not yet been availed of. I do not think, Sir, that we have been sufficiently severe in the matter of luxuries, nor do I think we have gone to the extent we might have with respect to income tax. Furthermore I do not see any reason why the federal government might not institute a succession duties tax even in addition to the provincial tax of that character. I hold in my hand the official year book of the Commonwealth of Australia, and I find that the Australian government is getting excellent results from a federal inheritance tax. I remember quite well when the province of Ontario first instituted the provincial succession duties tax. There was at that time living in Toronto a Mr. B. B. Osler, one of the cleverest men probably that ever adorned the Canadian bar. On being told about the imposition of the duty he said: "It is a grand law that makes the dead pay the taxes." We find that in Australia they put an additional tax on the absentee landlords, and I would do the same here. The federal government for the first time introduced succession duties on the estates of deceased persons in addition to those taxes already imposed by the state governments. They imposed a scale of succession duties. I am not asking our government to copy their scale. They can work it out for themselves, but I would make the tax a good deal steeper than it is at the present time in Canada. The commonwealth scale of succession duty, exempting all estates of less than a £1,000 net value, ranges from a minimum of 1 per cent to a maximum of 15 per cent. On estates of a higher taxable value than £71,000 the rate of duty goes up one-fifth per cent for every increase of a thousand pounds in the taxable estate.

There is nothing in the world to hinder the federal government of Canada from imposing an inheritance tax. Any person knows perfectly well that in connection with large estates particularly the beneficiaries give no value for what they receive. If a man dies and leaves an estate of $25,000,000 the provincial government steps in and takes a couple of million dollars which leaves $23,000,000. I say the federal government could step in and take $2,000,000 and leave the beneficiary $21,000,000, which the beneficiary certainly never gave value for and probably it would be better for him if he had never received it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the hon. member object to the federal government taking that $2,000,000 extra before the man died?

Mr. KING (Huron): Yes, I would object, for the reason I stated a moment ago, that any country on this earth, I do not care what country it may be, has to be very careful of its capital. If you take capital out of any

country, what have you? You place the country in a state similar to that of Russia at the present time, you drive capitalists out of the country and you prevent capital from coming in.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would it not have the same effect if the $2,000,000 were taken after the man is dead? Would not the capital of the country be affected in that case?

Mr. KING (Huron): After the man is dead he would not have any kick coming. I was particularly well pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that an offer was made of reciprocity with the United States, the offer to remain on the statute books of Canada. I wish to follow up that proposition for a few moments. One of the first arguments against reciprocity between Canada and the United States, by the opponents of that scheme, was that there is a similarity of a sameness in the products of the two countries. Granting that—and I do not grant it altogether—there is not one particle more similarity between the products of Ontario and the products of the state of Michigan than there is between the products of Ontario and of Quebec. There is no more similarity between, we will say, the products of Manitoba and the products of Alberta than there is between the products of Alberta and of one of the northern states. For instance, there might be a failure in the line of production in one section while another section might have an abundance in that same line, and by a system of fair exchange the balance is retained all the year round. Plums are produced in the province of Quebec six months after they are produced in California, and I could name any amount of other products which are in the same position. Therefore you would have a more uniform exchange for that reason.

There is also a diversity of products between the United States and Canada. Cotton and semi-tropical fruits are produced in the United States, whereas in Canada we can grow the best wheat in the world. In regard to the area from which certain products are produced, what have we in the Maritime provinces? We have coal and fish in abundance, and we have the New England states lying side by side with the Maritime provinces, and a water haul all the way, if we only had free trade. Then sir, what have we in Pennsylvania and Pittsburg? We have coal. But when Ontario gets her white coal, she will not need the black coal from Pennsylvania and Pittsburg. At the present time we in Ontario and Quebec have coal to the south of us. In the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta we have illimitable beds of coal, while in the states immediately to the south they have not this coal. What could be better than a treaty of exchange? Under the old reciprocity treaty which was in effect from 1854 to 1866 exports to the United States increased from $10,000,000 in 1854 to $87,000,000 in 1865. Our exports quadrupled in twelve years of reciprocity and the opponents of reciprocity will say that it was the Americans who got sick first. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I think it was on account of the favouritism—I might call it favouritism—shown by Canada and Great Britain towards the South in the Civil War more than anything else. When real restriction began with the McKinley tariff, the effect was more injurious and was felt with especial force by the agricultural industry of Canada. The first relief came in 1897, when the late Hon. Sydney Fisher removed the quarantine restriction. The real boom came, however, in 1913, when some agricultural products were placed on the United States free list. As a result our exports of cattle alone to the United States during the seven years from 1914 to 1920, both inclusive, was 260,000 head per annum as against only 28,000 head in 1913. Our exports of all animals and the products of animals jumped from less than $13,000,000 worth in 1913 to $113,000,000 in 1920. What better proof can any person get, or what better proof do we want of the advantages of a reciprocal treaty with the United States? If any stronger argument is required as to the value of the American market for the Canadian producer, it is found in what has occurred since the Fordney-McCumber tariff went into force. Our exports of potatoes alone were $447,000 worth in the first six months under the new tariff as compared with $2,000,000 worth in 1920.

When the question of freer trade relations between Canada and the Uuited States is under consideration, the discussion is generally limited to natural products; but I am going to say that I do not see why the manufacturer cannot live and do well also. I do not see any reason why the discussion should be so limited. In my opinion, reciprocal free trade with the United States in all lines would be more beneficial than a reciprocal arrangement limited to natural products. In no other part of the world are there greater facilities for manufacturing than in Ontario and Quebec. In both provinces raw material is to be found in abundance. It is true you do not find iron; but we have the iron if we only had the capital to develop it. That is where capital comes in. If you do not have the capita'

you cannot make a country; you cannot make a nation. Both provinces have power in unlimited quantities, and when we get the St. Lawrence deepened, we shall have power galore. There is just one thing lacking—a market. With all of North America open to our manufacturers, that want will be supplied, and in a few years no two states in the union will surpass Quebec and Ontario in the manufacturing industry.

I know that the late president of the Massey-Harris Company said to myself: "I am ready for free trade right now." Why not? I do not see that any government, I do not care what it is, need be afraid if ever we get an opportunity of concluding a reciprocal treaty with the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Were the duties under the proposed reciprocal pact of 1911 not higher on agricultural implements than they are under the present tariff?

Mr. KING (Huron): I do not know that I can just answer my hon. friend, but I do not think they were.

Mr. STEVENS: A good deal higher.

Mr. KING (Huron): I will continue. At the present time there is between Canada and the United States a better feeling than ever existed in the past. In the Canadian parliament there are 119 followers of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who have been elected with reciprocity as one of the planks in the party platform. I do not know whether they are all going to stand up to it or not. Behind my own leader there are 63 followers who have even more strongly declared for reciprocity.

Mr. GRAHAM: They will not dare to vote against it.

Mr. KING (Huron): I do not know but the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) will support it unless he has radically changed since 1910. Therefore, there cannot be quite 50 members of this House of Commons who are opposed to reciprocity with the United States.

Again the United States have at the present time a president who has done more than any other man living or dead to promote world peace by the Washington Disarmament Conference. President Harding realizes that next to the piling up of armaments by nation against nation, the greatest cause of war during the last two centuries has been found in commercial rivalry and restrictions of trade brought about by such rivalry. He also realizes that nothing will do more to ensure the peace of the world to-day than the complete removal of tariffs and restrictions now interfering with international commerce. Examined from every angle, there never was a more opportune time for the beginning of negotiations towards the making of a trade agreement with the United States. It seemed in the past that when Canada was ready for a treaty, the United States was not ready, and vice versa. We went around with a chip on our shoulder at one time, and at another the Americans went around with a chip on their shoulder. Any boy who goes to school knows that the boy who goes around with a chip on his shoulder will eventually get some one to knock it off.

We have a great country to live in, and what we want in Canada is citizenship. It is estimated at the present time there are five million Canadians in the United States. Chicago has the largest Canadian population of any city in the United States and New York is a close second. Everywhere one goes in the United States, one finds Canadians in positions of eminence. That is the kind of people the Canadians are; no matter what country they go to, they secure positions of eminence. Have we the best possible people to take their places to-day? We have brought over shiploads of riff-raff and remnants of Europe, and we have planted them on the land. What are we going to do with them? We should have taken hold of this problem as our neighbours to the south of us have done. There they have told the foreigners to become good Americans or get out, and we ought to do the same in Canada. We ought to tell the foreigner when he comes to Canada that he must become a good Canadian or get out. That is where we have fallen down. We should at once put up the bars against all those whose children we would not like to see marry our children. We should not admit anyone who would not become as good as ourselves, and we should keep out those whose traits are dishonest and whose morals and mode of living are low.

In old times citizenship was valued; but even the Roman Empire went to pieces from two causes. One cause was the depopulation of the land, and I warn Canadians in this House of Commons that we are in danger from the same cause at the present time. The other cause was that they let anything and everything become a citizen of Rome. Let us start right away to teach every boy and girl in Canada citizenship, to take an interest in Canada. We have everything in Canada worth while. Canada is a white man's country, and I hope to see it remain a white man's country.

Mr. E. B. RYCKMAN (East Toronto): I hope the Minister of Finance will not think I am lacking in that profound admiration and respect which I certainly have for him if I frankly criticize this budget. I think the budget is a disappointing one; I believe that the minister has told us in it that he has not quite done his best. He has said that it is a budget of compromise, for a government which consists of sections is possible only through compromise. If a man is compromised he has suffered somewhat; if a woman is compromised she has suffered more; and if a country is compromised its position is still worse.

This budget has not met the challenge which every worthy, and, may I say, self-respecting budget must meet, namely, that of striking the balance. It has been announced to the world that Canada cannot meet her bills, that Canada has an unbalanced budget. Canada is in the same category as Brazil, though not to the same extent, of course—a wealthy country with large resources which cannot meet its budget and with a currency that is depreciated. That is the state of affairs, and I believe it has already had its effect. It may not be that the relationship of the New York exchange market to our budget is perfectly distinct, but New York exchange has risen since this budget was announced. When a household is unable to balance its budget that household is on the wrong road; and it is the same with a country. The budget could have been balanced, it seems to me there is no question about that. However, that is something to which I shall refer later on. The failure to face the situation squarely means that this country will suffer from the bare fact that there is a discrepancy, which has to be taken into consideration although it is not a very large one; and we shall find that throughout this year Canada will be subject to a disability that will come from the reputation of an unbalanced budget.

The fact is that the budget has tried to satisfy too many factions. So to speak, there is a little blood let here, a small poultice applied there, a hot bath given and a cold douche administered; and we are expected to be satisfied with this. From the reports that have appeared in the newspapers, it is abundantly clear that the Canadian people do not feel that in the budget which has been brought down by the minister the requirements of the country, its necessities as they exist to-day, have been met. There are many matters to which I should like to refer, but in the time at my disposal I do not think I shall be able to deal with them all.

There is one small item I would take up first of all, and that is that the incidence of some taxes on certain businesses that might be described as summer trades has been changed, but the change does not come into effect until the first of August. I do not know whether the reason is that the Finance Minister is in league with the weather prophets or whether he knows for a certainty that we are not going to have summer until the first of August. It is to me quite manifest at any rate that since the Minister of Finance has said that the change was desirable and since these particular businesses are summer trades, the change in this respect should be put into effect now. I offer that suggestion respectfully for the consideration of the government. There is one feature of great merit in this budget and that is the assurance that we shall have stability in this country. Canada needs stability, for there cannot be any sustained effort in industry, no matter in what branch, unless the people engaged therein can feel assured that there will be some certainty in conditions. That assurance has been given by the Minister of Finance and I believe it will be lived up to. But we have it from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), who comes upon the scene, that this stability does not and will not exist, that there is no finality, and that we may expect changes to continue until we have that condition which the Liberal party has declared in the past that it would endeavour to bring about. However, I prefer to take the express statement of the Minister of Finance. There has therefore been given to the manufacturers and their workmen this assurance of stability; but so far as I can see nothing of a similar character has been offered to the farmers.

First of all, let us consider this sales tax. I consider that the imposition of this tax and the method provided for its collection are, if I may use the word, cowardly, in this respect in that there are a couple of thousand manufacturers and importers in this country and hundreds of thousands of jobbers and merchants. What this tariff proposes to do is to call upon the manufacturers and the merchants to do the collecting of this revenue and to account for it to the government. What happens? The manufacturer levies the 6 per cent; the jobber then levies his profit on the manufacturer's price plus the 6 per cent. Jobber No. 2 then comes along and exacts his profit on all that has gone before; and, as we were told at the last session of parliament, there were in some cases seven intermediaries, jobber No. 3 and those who follow him secure their profits in a similar way, with

the result that when the farmer or the housewife or the labourer gets these goods, with all these profits added to the price, the tax really is not only 6 per cent, but has increased by as many times as a profit has been added. The farmers therefore get no benefit from the tax, and it will be found that less revenue will be collected, while there will be more expense involved in the collection of the tax.

Let me say a word with reference to the income tax, which has been dealt with by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. King). But before I speak of that tax I want to refer to an incident that occurred in this House last year. The House will find a reference to it at page 3241 of Hansard of that year. The occasion was the discussion of the duty upon cigarettes which this year has been taken off. I rose in the House then and told the Minister of Finance that while I did not desire to be considered a champion of the cigarette trade, at the same time representations had been made to me from which it was obvious that there must of necessity be a loss of revenue if the tax which he proposed then was put on cigarettes. I declared at that time that so obvious was this to me that I desired to go on record in the matter. The minister replied that representations had been made to him also, that he had considered them, and that the matter was doubtful. But he was determined to impose the tax for the then current year, and if it was found, as represented, that there was a loss of revenue the tax would be taken off.

The Finance Minister was as good as his word; the tax was taken off, and there was an immense loss of revenue. The loss, as was stated during the course of this debate, was $5,000,000 in connection with the tobacco trade and $1,200,000 on the item of cigarettes alone. How this should have been allowed to occur I cannot understand. I do not think the Finance Minister gave the matter his personal attention; he probably relegated it to his adviser in the department. I think that that gentleman, or whoever was responsible for the decision which meant a loss of revenue to this country of $1,200,000 should lose his position. It was plain that that result would follow, and there should be no chance of such a thing occurring again.

With regard to the income tax, with its surtax and its supersurtax, I am of the distinct opinion that this country is losing money every day by its imposition. It is lessening production and I believe it is lessening revenue. It is deliberately cutting off the limb upon which sits any chance for the growth of industry in this country. I feel very strongly on this point, and I hope I may be able to convince the government that that is the view to be accepted. Let me develop the point a little; the argument is not mine originally, but every reasoning fibre of my being is responsive to it. One of the chief fallacies in taxation is that if you levy the tax at the top, the bottom will escape; in other words, that if you levy the tax on the rich you will avoid imposing it on the poor. That is an absolute fallacy. In the next place the income tax is altogether unfair; it means the imposition of a levy on those who have worked and saved, for the benefit of those who will not work and will not save. That is the doctrine entertained by some of my friends to my left, and when you get to the extreme left you have the doctrine which would go to the extent of taking away all capital from the rich in order that the poor might benefit. The idea would be fine if it worked, but it does not work, it never has worked and in the nature of things it never will. In this connection I want to adopt the argument of Mr. Otto H. Kahn, a distinguished banker and publicist of New York, a German by extraction whose conduct during the war was admirable, and I have great pleasure in quoting his views. He says:

> The usual advocate of the income tax says: "Supposing the rich man is made to pay two-thirds or more of this income in taxes. He still has plenty left." The user of this argument can see no farther than his nose. He forgets that the income tax drives capital out of constructive use in the first place.
>
> In the second place, it reduces the incentive to venturing to the vanishing point, so that capital will not undertake new work.
>
> In the third place, money that ought to be used in the expansion of the country's business and the prosperity of the whole people is drained into the coffers of the government.
>
> Again, it amounts to a campaign against thrift. Why save when the government will rob you of your savings? The income tax is half brother to the inflated currency of Germany and the confiscation policy of Russia. It promotes extravagance and discourages industry among the rich.
>
> The one point that is overlooked is, as Mr. Kahn points out, that the income tax and surtax defeat their own purposes. Greed, envy, and injustice always overreach themselves. The result of these excessive taxes is not only that capital turns to tax-exempt securities for investment, but it takes every legally permissible dodge to escape intolerable taxation, while a reasonable tax would willingly be paid.
>
> That this is not theory but actual fact is proved by statistics, which show an enormous reduction in the revenue derived by the government from large incomes.

The government referred to is, of course, the government of the United States. They have reduced their income tax. The United Kingdom has reduced its income tax by one-third since the war began. Canada is the only nation I know of that has increased its income

tax since the end of the war. All this means that the levying of income tax brings about increased cost, reduced purchasing power, curtailed production, and lessened employment.

Further than that, there is an indirect loss and a very distinct one. Let me first say that the evidence that the income tax has this effect is seen in the budget itself. The Finance Minister has told us that this is just what does happen. And how is this evidence given? The Finance Minister says, "We have to borrow a few odd millions for temporary needs. I am paying on that borrowing 5½ per cent, which I think is a good rate in the circumstances." Well, find out what tax free bonds are quoted at in Montreal or Toronto, and you will see that the 5½ per cent bonds can be bought only at a price that will yield 4¾ per cent or less. In other words, this country has to pay for money by reason of that policy, one-half of one per cent more than the bonds that have been issued tax free command in the markets of this country. If you gave an order to a broker to buy $100,000 of these bonds in either Montreal or Toronto, you could not get them without a rise of perhaps two points in the price—and why? Because of what I have stated: the people of this country, knowing that these bonds are tax free and knowing that if they put their money into industry they will be taxed on anything their money earns, put their money into the tax-free bonds. Thus the money is taken out of circulation, taken out of use, and the country is prevented from using what funds would otherwise be available to meet the needs of its development.

There is also an indirect loss. On account of Canada's reputation for having a much higher income tax than the United States, a tax which is higher in many respects than the similar levy in Great Britain, people will not come to this country. I saw a short time ago a statement of the amount of money that wealthy people in Great Britain, who left that country for reasons associated with post war conditions, had taken to other lands, money which constituted a distinct addition to the wealth of the lands thus sought out by these capitalists—because they were no other than that. I have forgotten exactly what the amount was, but it ran into hundreds of thousands of pounds. And what about the young emigrant? Is he going to a country which hangs out a "Don't Come" sign? for that is what is involved in our having the highest income tax of any country to which he could go. You may say that the immigrant who contemplates coming to Canada has not much money. But potentially he has; in his dreams he looks forward to the day when he will be rich, so the very fact that our taxation is so high causes us to suffer in the matter of immigration.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there should be substituted for the income tax which we have now a graduated income tax. Tax every man fairly, and so that he knows what he will have to pay, so that if his income is a certain amount he will know the tax applicable to that amount. But what is the situation to-day? If a man has any income at all and there are any complicated calculations he has to employ an accountant to make out the tax bill that this government requires him to return. That is an expense, but apart altogether from the expense it is an intolerable nuisance. It could be easily overcome by establishing a graduated income tax, which I submit would be in the interests of fairness and for what it would mean in dollars and cents alone to the government it should be adopted. I say therefore, substitute a graduated income tax for the grotesque tax we have now which is higher I believe than that of any other country in the world, with the exception of Great Britain in some divisions of the tax.

Another chief objection that I have to this budget is that not being a balanced budget, there being this discrepancy of $49,000,000, as the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) says, or $57,000,000, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) says, we have to do one of two things: Either the one that was in the mind of the Minister of Finance and which he indicated to us, the levying of new methods of taxation, or we must practise new methods of economy. Now I maintain as emphatically as I can that the people of this country do not want any new methods of taxation. They are sick of the taxation that we have now. What the people of this country do want is not new methods of taxation, but new methods of real economy practised so far as the treasury of this country is concerned. I submit to hon. gentlemen of this House that the reason why Canada has an unbalanced budget to-day is because this House of Commons has declined to practise what is real economy. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no meaning to that word either in the French or English language as we practise economy in this House. Economy is a plank in the platform of every party. It is especially emphasized by my friends to my left, but during all this session up to this budget debate there was nothing that meant economy either said or done by the party to

my left until the speech of its leader in this debate. I am excluding the twenty minutes of vaudeville performance, I was going to call it, which took place when the resolution of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) was before the House. That resolution was to reduce the salary of the Prime Minister and of ministers and members by 12½ per cent. I wonder how the demand of the Progressive party for economy was going to be satisfied by a reduction of 12½ per cent in the salaries of ministers and members. Only a short time after that by some chance a paper published in North Battleford, represented by a Progressive member in this House, fell into my hands, and that paper said that it was a mistake to think the Progressives did not earn $4,000 a session, that that was not the way to practise economy; let the indemnity stand and attack something else. I will add my voice to that request that there should be some other efforts made—make that particular effort too, if you like—to bring about economy in the administration of the affairs of this country.

I feel this very keenly. I have in my desk copies of the estimates running back three or four years, and I find that when an amount once gets into the estimates it is indented there and you cannot get it out. It stays in there during the years; a little may be subtracted, but the chances are that in the majority of cases much more is added to it. Really, Mr. Speaker, this thing got upon my mind. I did not wish to pose in any sense as the champion of economy. It would be an altogether new role for me, but I investigated the matter somewhat and as nearly as I could learn I found there was almost an aristocracy of spending here; that certain departments presided over, of course, by deputy ministers were supposed to grade a shade higher than others by reason of having a larger amount to disburse, and that once a sum had been voted to a department it was felt that there was a certain diminution of prestige if that amount were not carried along from year to year. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who has followed the votes in this House, anyone who knows what is the practice of business in this country, anyone who has had forced upon him the necessity in these times of making economies such as it was thought never could be made, must come to the conclusion that the business of this country is carried on now, and has been carried on, without a proper regard for the amount available to the government of Canada for expenditure

I took this matter up with a Liberal friend of mine who has been honoured by his party and sits in this House. I mentioned to him what I have already said and something more, and asked, "How is it that we cannot lay hold of this hand of debt and take care of the Civil Service, the Civil Service which has grown so enormously, and which now costs more than the expenditure of all Canada a few short years ago? Why is it that when a man dies his position cannot be filled by some one of the thousands in the Civil Service? How is it if there is a new appointment to be made, that someone in the service who is adapted to the work cannot be got and the position he formerly held be taken over by someone else in the service?" He replied, "My dear fellow, government is not like business. Any government that ever attempted that would go out of power." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that what this country demands at this time is that the national budget be balanced, and not only that, but that the government of this country shall be carried on with the economies that are now being practised in the business world.. That is the chief criticism I level at the budget. It falls far short of a true understanding of those economies which the people of this country are demanding and, I feel satisfied, are determined to get.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the finances of Canada should be kept in a way the people can understand. Our system of finances is so complicated that the plain people do not know what amount is being paid for the administration of government or how it is being paid. They want to know also what the railways are costing and the true facts of the war expenditure. We are now raising a revenue enormously larger than before the war. That is most disappointing. Still these war expenditures were willingly incurred, the people were determined that the war should be vigorously prosecuted, and the money that was expended was cheerfully contributed. But having done that, and the war being long over, the people now wish to know what the ordinary government of the country costs, what is required for war expenditure, the amount required to pay the interest on the debt, the cost of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, pensions and the like. They want to know what the expenditure is in each particular case, and then what the railways are costing Canada.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the ordinary expenses of government should be met by the customs and excise revenue as was the case before the war. I also submit that the expenses attendant upon the war should be

met in a special way. The Finance Minister has said—has said it several times in my hearing—"Oh, it is difficult to raise money for the war debt. It was incurred while the war was on and there was a patriotic and most commendable feeling in the public mind. Bonds could be sold and money was cheerfully contributed by the people because it was for the carrying on of the war. But that is all past and the money cannot be raised now." I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the very same spirit could be depended upon to raise revenue—perhaps not to as great an extent but still to a very considerable amount—in this country to-day if the government would only adopt the right method. What method would I propose? Well, I would take the sales tax which is so objectionable to some and I would scrap it. I would then introduce what is known as the "turn-over" tax. That is well understood by all the members of this House but in short it is this: There should be a tax levied upon all processed goods, and upon all annual services in the case of doctors, dentists, and other professional men. Speaking of processed goods I would say the tax should be in turnover to the extent of $10,000 annually, using that figure only for the purposes of illustration; in the case of professional men it should be applied to incomes of $5,000 annually. The turn-over tax should be one per cent and whatever that tax yielded should be applied to war expenses, interest on the debt, pensions, and so on; but that not one cent of revenue from that tax should be paid for any other purpose than war expenditure. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied the amount such a tax would yield would take care of the necessary war expenditure that we have and, together with a properly graduated income tax, would provide even for the railway deficits. This tax has been tried in Switzerland and has worked well; but we would be satisfied with knowing that this tax of one per cent, which I have mentioned for the sake of example, would not be objected to. Who would object to paying one per cent on $10,000 a year? Who would object to paying ten cents on any $10 article he purchased? No one at all, especially if it were known that the revenue from it would be devoted to meeting war expenditure exclusively. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that after the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 the lament of the next generation of young English boys was that they had not been of an age which would have permitted them to have taken part in the wars in which Great Britain triumphed so magnificently. I want to say that if opportunity were given our people to contribute of their means to war expenditure they would gladly subscribe if they knew the money would be solely devoted to meeting war expenditure. The spirit which was so splendidly exhibited during the war is still alive. The young men who will succeed us, if the tax is still in existence, will know that in bearing it they were upholding the sentiment that the Canadian nation upheld and fought for during the Great War. I say, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister does not know the immense amount of money that would be willingly given by the nation for this purpose. No one would default in payment of this tax, few would try to do so. But consisting in the main in small amounts the total revenue to be derived from this source would largely meet the burden that now rests upon the shoulders of the people and which, owing to our confused system of finances, is of such a character that no one really knows how much money is taken or how it is expended. If, after the imposition of such a tax the budget failed to balance I am quite sure that by practising the real economies I have spoken of the ill would be cured.

We are told that the farmers are still suffering and that they have a strong antipathy to a protective tariff. Really I have been much amused during the progress of this debate to observe some of the statements which have been made. For example, the leader of the Progressive party during his speech said that he lived close to the international boundary line, and that he could buy more cheaply on the other side of that line and that he could obtain a higher price for his products. I could not help but think that the hon. member should have paused for a moment to consider where that kind of argument led him, because if there is any country in the world that has a tariff "as high as Haman's gallows" it is the United States. There is where you have a real high tariff protectionist country. Yet the leader of the Progressives tells us that we ought to have free trade in Canada, and that if he crosses the boundary line into that highly protected country which is so near to him he can buy—he did not say everything—but he can buy many articles much more cheaply and if he went to sell his farm products he could get a much higher price. A short time ago I had the pleasure of reading a biography of William Henry Seward, a very distinguished man, an Olympian, who was overtopped only by Abraham Lincoln. He was the Secretary of State in Lincoln's cabinet

He was an orator, a patriot and a public man of the highest integrity, and in making a political speech seventy-five years ago, before any of the Progressives were born he said:

> Industry falls into three classes in this country, agriculture, manufacture and trade.

He said also:

> Some say that agriculture is a basic industry. It is but they are all basic industries. The three of them are so associated and dovetailed together that it is impossible to benefit one without benefiting the others. It is impossible to do an injury to one without hurting the others and equally it is impossible to in any way do anything which will displace one either up or down without affecting the other two.

He said further:

> There are some who argue in favour of a lower tariff. I will admit that if this world were composed of a number of Utopias, theoretically the argument is correct, but I have lived in this country, and I have seen that every time the tariff was advanced this country prospered and every time the tariff was lowered this country suffered. With that experienc I can do nothing else than say that I am for a higher tariff.

And he concluded by saying that the prosperity that the United States had up to that time—and it was borne out by the history of the United States—had been brought about by the high tariff imposed. It is the same thing to-day, Mr. Speaker. We are told the United States is prosperous. We are not prosperous to the extent the United States is, and I submit the reason is that we have not enough tariff protection. Only a short time ago, through the kindness of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) there was distributed to us a memorandum showing that there had been imported into this country during the last twelve months $208,000,000 worth of farm products, brought in to compete with the products of our Canadian farmers. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that if I had the opportunity I would make it perfectly certain that any taxes which the United States imposed upon farm products going into the United States from Canada would be imposed by Canada upon that $208,000,000 worth of products that came into this country, and I would make it abundantly plain that any man who wanted grapefruit for breakfast would know he was paying for it, and that he could get a Northern Spy apple at much less cost than he could obtain grape fruit or foreign fruit from the southern parts of the United States. I do not see why that argument is not sound, and I believe the course I suggest is in keeping with our self-respect. Why should we as a people admit produce from the United States amounting to more than one-fourth of our total imports and not tax as freely as we are taxed? That is the self-respecting course in dealings between man and man. You are not going to allow one man "to put it all over you," as the saying is, and so I say that much of these ills that we have suffered, much of the deficits that we have to meet by taxes levied upon ourselves, could be taken care of by a proper tax upon the $208,000,000 worth of the products of the farm, because it includes food and all products as well.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does that include all fruits?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would think so. I have no doubt the hon. member received the same memorandum, and the item will be found in the first two lines of the memorandum. We have $208,000,000 of farm products, one-fourth of all our imports, brought into Canada from the United States. I submit if we provided for an item of that kind by adequate taxation, and if we met the difficulties of the western provinces with regard to transportation—and I believe there is a difficulty there—we could without trouble, without great sacrifice, with the money derived from such a source, pay something like $20,000,000, which would mean 5 cents a bushel to the farmers, when they transport 400,000,000 bushels of grain. If there were a national policy inaugurated for the farmers at this time, founded upon the necessities of the farmers, and in order to meet their difficulties, there would be great sympathy in this House and in the country. But at the present time, when our friends to my left are railing against a protective tariff, and when, as I say, it seems that the opportunity will not come to them very soon of converting anybody they ought to cease worrying us with attacks on the tariff, if they think otherwise, I would advise them to commence operations on the two members who recently left them, and have now joined the party which stands for a high tariff as some people put it. But let us forget about that and struggle to alleviate the conditions which are certainly oppressing our western farmers.

In regard to the reciprocity resolution I take an altogether different view from the one propounded by the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. King). I think these resolutions do not comport with the dignity of this country. I think they are also unseemly. It is something like the lady proposing and when the lady proposes the person to whom she proposes generally cools off a little bit anyway. It often results in a very distinct and lasting coolness. There was a failure in 1911 to obtain reciprocity, and I have heard our respect-

ed and honoured friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) speak of this on three or four different occasions. On two occasions he has said—

> There is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to fortune.

The day before yesterday the Finance Minister, before the Banking committee, described as a crime the fact that the reciprocity pact of 1911 did not become law. I think that it never should have become law in 1911, and it did not, and that it should not become law in 1923, and it will not. I know that the Finance Minister is absolutely sincere about that; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. PUTNAM: Should it have become law in 1854?

Mr. RYCKMAN: That was before I was born, and I cannot answer the question.

Mr. PUTNAM: It is a short time in the history of a nation. I asked if the hon. member thought reciprocity should have become law in 1854.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I feel satisfied that I could not answer that question to my hon. friend's satisfaction, because I am not familiar with the facts. My first connection with political life was when this country suffered by reason of the United States doing as it could do in 1911 and afterwards, and as it could do n 1923, namely, disrupt the pact and throw his country upon its own resources absolutely, when it had been accustomed to deal with the United States. It would be all very well if proper safeguards were provided which would properly care for trade relations in reciprocity agreements with the United States. But that is the point I was coming to. I have had a large experience with the United States. I have been interested in business there. I have spent a good deal of my time in the United States. I think I have been in the capital city of the United States as much as any member of the House. I have sat in clubs of the United States for twenty years and have heard these questions discussed. I have come to the conclusion—and I say this with all seriousness; do not let anyone think that I am girding at the United States—that the United States, as regards their patriotic view, are the real Sein Feiners of the world —for themselves alone. The United States would enter into a reciprocal pact with Canada at any time that this was to the advantage of the United States. The United States would crash through any reciprocity pact with Canada at any time that this was for the advantage of the United States. Do hon. members not think that is so? What is the lesson of the late war? Remember I am not in any way saying that the United States has done one thing that, as a nation, it was not entitled to do. Nations as individuals must take care of themselves, and the United States certainly does so. What did they do in the late war? We were in that war, Great Britain was in that war for two years and eight months before the United States came in. The United States came into the war, and they say they won the war. It was, therefore, their war, and from the beginning during the two years and eight months, they took, as they had every right to take, this gold which is in their coffers to-day. Then the question arose of settling up the debts of the war, the war which they will tell you frankly they have won. I have heard a general in the army, officers in the executive offices at Washington, and army officers argue with me to a demonstration, as they thought, that the United States won the war. When the war was over, Great Britain offered to forego the debts which the Allies owed to her. When the proposition was made to the United States, the United States declined. The United States had a perfect right to ask Great Britain to pay her debt. Great Britain is not complaining; Great Britain will pay it. But there is nothing that I am surer of on earth than that if the reciprocity pact or any other international agreement were made with the United States, and it became of interest to the United States, of vital national interest for the prosperity of its people, to crash through that agreement, the United States would do so. That being my view, I certainly cannot feel that this country suffered anything by not accepting the reciprocity pact of 1911, and I think this country as a self-respecting contracting nation has lowered its standing as such by putting before the face of the whole world that it is offering to deal with the United States, the United States having taken the stand that it has taken with regard to the late war and back again, as more closely related to ourselves, when it closed out the trade agreement that we had in years gone by, which action put this country on its back, so that for a long time it could not recover until the National Policy of Sir John A. Macdonald gave this country an opportunity to breathe and live again.

Mr. PUTNAM: Would the hon. gentleman cite any agreement that the United States ever crashed through? He used that harsh term twice.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I want to be absolutely fair in my statement to the House. By the

term, "crashed through," I do not want my hon. friend to understand that I was speaking of a breach of agreement. A more felicitous expression would be to say that they would put an end to it whenever it suited their purpose to do so. To my mind it is a great pity that this country has not the same opinion of itself that the United States has of itself; that this country does not determine that what it shall do shall be for the benefit of Canada first, because that is the duty, I submit, of this parliament. We are walking around, making overtures to the United States, and the wire comes back hot from Washington on the 16th May that a proposal of this kind will not be entertained now. What would have happened supposing we had had reciprocity in 1911 and that this farmer bloc, which is the reason that the Fordney-McCumber bill is law in the United States to-day, came into existence; supposing that reciprocity had existed and it was contrary to the interests of those farmers in the United States that Canadian farmers should have a benefit, do you mean to say for one moment that they would not have insisted on their rights? Certainly they would; they would have asked that this reciprocity agreement inaugurated in 1911 should be cancelled. The United States will be very glad to deal with us as long as we can offer her a consideration and as long as everything is flowing freely her way. But just the moment that boot is on the other foot, there is a distinct change of attitude on the part of the United States. They want to retire from any obligations that would in any way mean loss to them.

In conclusion, I was put in mind by the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. King) referring to ancient Rome and what was going to happen to us, of what we all used to read in our history books of the days of ancient Rome in the time of Marcus Cato; Cato, the censor. Whenever Cato addressed the Roman senate, no matter what the topic was, he concluded every speech, without regard to the relevancy of the remark, with "Delenda est Carthago"—"Carthage must be destroyed." Scipio Nasica his rival on the opposite side of the senate then got the habit of concluding his speech with the statement: "In my opinion I think that Carthage should be left standing." I would that I could conclude this speech with an injunction that would have the success that Cato's had, because his advocacy won the destruction of Carthage; the Romans finally determined upon that, and Carthage was destroyed. If I could lay an injunction upon this House, it would be this, that we must practise economy; and if ever the day comes—and I believe it will come because I think the people of this country will insist upon it—when that injunction will be met and satisfaction given to the people of Canada by economy, real and earnest, put into practice, I for one will feel that I have not spoken altogether in vain in urging in an imperfect way that the expense of this country could, if a determined effort were made, be cut down to a figure that would surprise even the members of the House themselves.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, some years ago, in fact a good many years ago, when I was learning to write in a country school, the teacher in those days set headlines for the pupils who were learning that craft, and our teacher rather prided himself upon the number of aphorisms that he could use on such occasions. One of them that came under the letter "M" ran as follows:

> Many men of many minds,
> Many birds of various kinds.

As I have listened to the speeches in this debate, in fact as I have listened to all the speeches in parliament, I have been driven to the conclusion that there was a good deal of truth in the first part of that aphorism, because there is certainly great divergence of opinion as regards the budget and nearly everything discussed under it. I read somewhere that in a multiplicity of counsel there is wisdom and I thought that was a very wise saying. But I have changed my mind in that respect. I have also read that much speaking darkeneth wisdom, and I think there is something like that in the book of Job. Well, I have come to the conclusion that there is a good deal of wisdom in that statement. But notwithstanding that fact I may be a sinner to some extent to-night. I trust however that what I say will not have the effect of darkening the vision of parliament because I would not fall into the same error that some others have fallen into.

Unfortunately, I did not hear the budget as delivered by the Minister of Finance, but I had the privilege of listening to the speech of the chief critic of the opposition, the hon. member for West York and ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and I read it afterwards besides. If I were to judge from that mild criticism that he indulged in, a criticism in fractions of fractions, I would conclude that the budget was unanswerable, because he made no real attack upon it. And that hon. gentleman is the chief critic of the opposition. I might almost say the same thing of the speech

delivered by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke).

There is an assumption running through the speeches of the Conservatives in this House that some one is responsible for the tremendous taxation and the enormous public debt under which the people of this country are staggering at the present time, and the assumption seems to come from our friends opposite that they are not responsible, that they are the men who can wash their hands of this condition and place upon some other party in the House the necessity of providing the funds to meet these enormous obligations. I totally dissent from that assumption. I see the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in his seat; he is an intelligent man and he knows that there is no foundation for it. He knows that when the party of which he is now leader came into power there was hardly any public debt and practically speaking we did not know what taxation was. Immediately after his party assumed office the expenditure under the consolidated fund began to go up by $10,000,000 and $15,000,000 a year. But when the war started, then the floodgates were opened wide; all restrictions were removed. I know quite well, and I am willing to admit, that under war conditions enormous expenditures will be incurred, because prices will be two or three times the worth of the article, and everything will be expensive under such circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman appeals to me; perhaps he would like to have my opinion of his statement. It is absolutely wrong.

Mr. HUGHES: What part of it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first two years of the government of Sir Robert Borden there was an enormous diminution of the national debt, the first year by almost a million dollars and the second year nearly $26,000,000.

Mr. HUGHES: I spoke of the expenditure under the consolidated fund. The condition of the country was so good after fifteen years of Liberal administration, the revenues were so buoyant, that the expenditure could go on mounting up by $10,000,000 and $15,000,000 a year, and yet the public debt had not yet greatly increased.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was an item of $15,000,000, but it was a loan to that precious creation of my hon. friend's party, the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. HUGHES: Since my hon. friend and I have come into conflict on this point, I can give him a few items in regard to which the government could have exercised control. I heard my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) speak of economy a few moments ago. Well, the Conservative party were hardly in office before some 12,000 civil servants—I am giving the round numbers,—were dismissed from office and upwards of 25,000 were appointed to take their places.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not right.

Mr. HUGHES: The public records will prove it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Get them now.

Mr. HUGHES: The returns were brought down to the House at the time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Produce them now; the statement is utterly untrue.

Mr. HUGHES: Utterly?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, utterly.

Mr. HUGHES: I am surprised—

Mr. MEIGHEN: So am I.

Mr. HUGHES: —that the leader of the Opposition should make that statement. The returns brought down by the government of which he was a member will prove the truth of the statement. I made the statement a few moments ago that when the war came the floodgates were opened, but I have already stated that under these conditions very high prices would be paid for everything the government needed to purchase at that time to prosecute the war. What I complain of however, and the leader of the Opposition knows it, is that much of this expenditure was due to premeditated arrangement whereby enormous prices would be paid, much higher than were necessary for the goods that were required. I do not want to go into this matter at this late hour of the evening, after some years have passed since these events, but my hon. friend knows that what I have said is true. He knows that in many instances no effort whatever was made by the government of which he was a member, at all events by the ministers of the Crown in some of the departments, to curtail some of these expenditures or to see that anything like value was obtained for the money expended. I am quite conservative when I say that for every dollar expended in the war at least 50 cents was either wasted or stolen, and this could have been prevented. The result is that the public debt to-day might have been a billion less than it is and taxation nearly cut in two. I do not want my hon. friends opposite to assume therefore that there is any political party in this country responsible for the enormous debt

which is now resting upon us, and for the heavy taxation which we have to meet, except the official opposition of to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did that enormous waste apply during the years the hon. gentleman's friends were associated with us?

Mr. HUGHES: My friends?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: There were none of my friends associated with you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are there certain hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who are not the hon. gentleman's friends?

Mr. HUGHES: The circumstances to which I have referred existed in the early days of the war before my so-called friends were associated with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is pretty hard on the Minister of Finance.

Mr. HUGHES: No, the Minister of Finance was a defeated candidate. He was not in parliament at the time to which I refer, so that he could not have been associated with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will get down a little finer still, then. Would he tell us what the articles were and where it was so shown?

Mr. HUGHES: Who?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I do not know who—whoever he likes.

Mr. HUGHES: What question did the right hon. gentleman ask me?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought perhaps the hon. gentleman might be specific say, as to a dollar or a dollar and a half.

Mr. HUGHES: Parliament is not a kindergarten. If the right hon. gentleman wishes to attend a school of that kind there are opportunities, I believe, in Ottawa. He should not descend to these little quibblings.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was asking you to.

Mr. HUGHES: You were asking me? You should have the information yourself without asking me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have.

Mr. HUGHES: You should have had it before you became a member of parliament, and you should have more since you are the leader of a political party.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member just intends to stay up in the air and not give us any concrete cases at all.

Mr. HUGHES: Do you wish a concrete case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, if you have the evidence.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, I will give you one.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members that they must address themselves to the Chair, and that one hon. member in referring to another should use the third person.

Mr. HUGHES: Very good, Mr. Speaker. We are both sinning in that respect. Now, I will give a concrete case. When the war broke out, an agent of the largest manufacturing drug concern in the world—in America at all events—came to Ottawa for the purpose of obtaining an order for medical supplies for the house he represented. He went to the department and stated his business—and this was sworn to under oath. He was told that the department would not do business with him—that he had to do it through a middleman. It was brought out in sworn testimony that the person who really gave that order for medical supplies for the army was a boy fourteen years of age who had had one year's experience in a drug store. That boy stated under oath that he did not know what he was doing, that he put down the figures just as he was told by other people. The agent of Bauer and Black came before the Public Accounts committee and swore that his house was quite willing to furnish these medical supplies to the department at the price at which they supplied them to this boy, but when the supplies reached the department the prices were three or four hundred per cent higher. That was premeditated; that was done by arrangement; that was not an accident. And there are many others.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is altogether a wrong recital.

Mr. HUGHES: There were others. We can give a number of these things if my right hon. friend wishes.

The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) said this evening that the government should practise economy; that failure to practise economy was one respect in which the government was derelict in its duty. Well, during the last session of parliament—that is not long ago—when an effort was made to reduce the expenditure where such reduction would work no injury to the country—the reduction proposed was a reasonable one, in connection with the Militia department—the hon member for

East Toronto and nearly every other hon. gentleman sitting in that corner of the House objected. Our Progressive friends, or many of them, spoke in favour of the reduction; they showed their sincerity in that regard. I have yet to find where one member of the Conservative party has put his finger upon a concrete saving that could be made by the government. They invariably oppose our efforts to practise economy, while in a general way they preach it.

The hon. member for East Toronto also found fault with the offer the Finance Minister is making to the United States in the matter of reciprocal trade arrangements. He said it was a case of the lady proposing and that generally when the lady proposed the offer was turned down. I would ask my hon. friend, did the lady propose when Sir John A. Macdonald brought in the so-called National Policy and put that very invitation in it and kept it there for forty years? It was only when reciprocity was actually obtained, only when a better arrangement was entered into than anybody in Canada could have expected, that my hon. friends discovered that they were opposed to reciprocity.

Mr. CHAPLIN: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? How could Sir John A. Macdonald leave such a proposal in the tariff for forty years?

Mr. HUGHES: All parties were in favour of it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: For forty years?

Mr. HUGHES: From 1878 to 1911; you can figure it out for yourself. I suppose if it were thirty-nine and a half, hon. gentlemen opposite would object.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman surely does not know what he is talking about. Does he mean to say that was in the act up to 1911?

Mr. HUGHES: It was a standing offer to the United States. In 1891 Sir John A. Macdonald dissolved parliament a year before its term expired, on the plea that he had an invitation from Washington to send representatives there to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, and that he wanted to get a mandate from the people to strengthen his hands in those negotiations. He got a mandate from the people; his party were returned to power, and it turned out that the statement was incorrect. Mr. Blaine, then Secretary of State in the United States, said that no such invitation had ever been sent, so that the statement made to the people in that general election was untrue. But that was the way the Conservative party were acting in those days. Then when a real reciprocity arrangement was actually entered into, they discovered that they were opposed to it. As has been well stated, the defeat of reciprocity was the greatest crime ever committed in this country.

With regard to the respective merits of protection and free trade, I wish to put before the House two or three propositions which I think are sound and upon which I wish to build an argument. It is generally held that when the exports of a country exceed the imports, that country is doing business profitably; that is generally held up to be a good condition of affairs. What is known as the balance of trade has not been the subject of very much reference in this debate. I think that general proposition is a fallacy. It may be correct under certain conditions, but generally speaking, trade is profitably carried on when the imports exceeds the exports. As I have said, I will lay down two or three propositions in that connection and I will give one or two concrete instances by way of proof. I make this statement: If the exports are greater than the imports and if the exports are only paying for the imports, then we are trading at a loss, and the measure of our loss is the difference between our exports and our imports.

Further, if our exports are greater than our imports and if our exports are not even paying for our imports, then our loss is even greater than the difference between our exports and our imports.

Again, if our imports exceed our exports and if our exports are paying for our imports, we are trading at a profit, and the measure of our profit is the difference between our imports and our exports.

Further, in such a case if our exports are more than paying for our imports, then the measure of our profit is even greater than the difference between our imports and exports.

Again, if our exports exceed our imports and if our exports are not only paying for our imports but are enabling us to pay off our foreign obligations or make foreign investments, then we are trading at a profit, and the measure of our profit is the reduction in our foreign obligations or our investments or both together.

Further, if our imports exceed our exports and if our exports are not paying for our imports and if we have to borrow money to pay the difference, then manifestly we are trading at a loss, and the measure of our loss

is the amount of our borrowing for this purpose.

Now then let me give one or two concrete examples to prove these propositions.

I will say that I am an exporter and that I am exporting wheat. I will take 100,000 bushels and for easy computation say that it costs $1 a bushel. I send that to Liverpool or London. The export entry is $100,000. I sell that cargo at a profit say, for easy computation, of 50 cents a bushel, realizing $150,000. I invest that in merchandise in Great Britain which I bring back to Canada. The import entry is $150,000. I have made a very profitable transaction. The import is 50 per cent in excess of the export. What is profitable to me is profitable to my country.

Supposing I am not an importer at all and I bring back a bill of exchange. That enables some other man who is an importer to bring in $150,000 worth of goods and to pay for them, because we have that bill of exchange. That, of course, will apply to every other article of commerce in which the country can be engaged.

The reverse is also true. Supposing I sell my wheat at a loss. For easy computation say I sell it at 50 cents a bushel. The export entry is $100,000 and the import entry $50,000. Our exports are twice as great as our imports in that case, and yet we are trading at a tremendous loss. So the balance of trade theory will only hold providing you take all the circumstances and all the conditions into account, but generally speaking when the imports exceed the exports the country is trading at a profit because all profit in trade, in foreign trade at all events, and I think in all trade, is made by taking things from where they are comparatively cheap to where they are comparatively dear. Therefore it follows that the imports of all the countries in the world could be greater than the exports at the same time and all countries be doing business at a profit. That international trade of itself would be one of the greatest industries that the world could be engaged in. There cannot be any question or doubt about it. There is no question in my mind that when the Creator made this world, with all its varying climates and varied production, it was His wish that the people who inhabited this world might trade with one another. The greatest good of mankind would be produced by free international trade. To my mind it would be just as reasonable to put up toll gates between Canada and the United States or between the different provinces of this country as to prevent trade from flowing north and south or between the provinces. We erect artificial barriers to prevent the natural flow of trade. It seems to me a paradoxical thing for governments to send trade commissioners abroad, and to subsidize steamers and make treaties to promote trade, and then by tariffs to fine the people who engage in that trade.

Mr. KELLNER: Would the hon. gentleman mind handing a copy of that article which he has been reading to the Minister of Immigration?

Mr. HUGHES: I really do not know what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. KELLNER: I mean that article the hon. member is reading from in regard to trade balances.

Mr. HUGHES: I read from no article.

Mr. KELLNER: Well, the paper you quoted the figures from then.

Mr. HUGHES: I have no objection to showing it to my hon. friend or anyone who wishes to see it. The figures will all be on Hansard to-morrow and be available to everybody.

Mr. KELLNER: The hon. gentleman's views are entirely in accord with my own, but I thought it would be well for him to hand the statement to some of his colleagues.

Mr. HUGHES: When two nations go to war and one wishes to injure the other, and injure it very effectively, if they are maritime nations particularly, the one blockades the other. That blockade is established, not for the purpose of preventing exports, but for the purpose of preventing imports, it being instinctively realized that you can injure an enemy nation far more quickly and effectively by preventing its imports than by preventing its exports.

The leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) said a good thing the other day, though I suppose he was not the first to say it, when he said: You cannot sell unless you are prepared to buy. The greatest fallacy that it is possible for any man to hold has been enunciated this session and in all previous sessions in which I have held a seat in this House by the Conservative party in regard to trade matters. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and other gentlemen in his party say that they never change their views. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a line of kings in France a few years ago of whom it was said they never learned and they never forgot—and they did not go down in history as being very intelligent men.

If what I have said is true, and I think it will bear critical examination, there is nothing

that we could do that would so promote the interest of the world or of two nations lying alongside each other like Canada and the United States as to have free trade or as large a measure of free trade as we can have between the two nations. I have not lost faith in the intelligence of our neighbours to the south, and some day or other they may repeat the offer they made to us. They are quite justified now in being indifferent in meeting our offers because they made an arrangement with us that was certainly to our benefit—was to their own benefit and to ours to a very much greater extent than we ever expected to receive from them—and we turned it down. I do not know whether reciprocity got a fair hearing in the country at that time or not, I do not think it did. It was the former member for West Peterborough, Mr. Burnham, who told us in this House that he never heard reciprocity mentioned in his part of the country but that other issues entirely were raised by the Conservative party, and issues that were not very creditable to any party. In the province of Quebec also reciprocity was hardly mentioned. There was at that time in that province a political school headed by a man named Bourassa, called the Nationalist party, and our good friends the Conservatives who wanted to defeat reciprocity joined in an alliance with the Nationalists. That alliance was afterwards called "The unholy alliance" but I am afraid the Conservative party would join in any alliance to defeat a Liberal government no matter what the consequences might be to the country.

We cannot expect world-wide free trade. Perhaps we cannot even expect free trade between Canada and the United States. The question naturally arises, if we cannot get that and if other countries maintain high tariff walls against us, would it be in our own interest to raise high tariff walls against those countries that are not willing to trade with us. Would it be in our interest? I do not think so. I have often heard the argument made that if we reduced our customs duties other countries would flood us with their cheap goods, let us examine that argument and see what is in it. For the sake of argument let us take an extreme case. Supposing other countries could send us their goods for nothing. That would be flooding us surely but would that injure us? If we could get the things we require to import for nothing, if we had to give nothing for them, manifestly that would not injure us. Supposing we got those imports very cheap at 25 per cent of their value? That would not injure us either, could not possibly injure us, and to the extent they took something in return would not injure our industries. Supposing we got those imports for half their value the same thing would apply. Supposing we got them for 75 per cent of their value the same thing would apply. Nations do not trade with one another but the individuals that compose nations do. No two men will carry on a trade unless it is beneficial to both of them, and if it is beneficial to the people that are carrying on that trade then it must necessarily be beneficial to the respective countries; there is no getting away from that fact.

The other day in the committee on Banking and Commerce I heard the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman), speaking in regard to a motion that was made there, say that we should not legislate to protect grown up red-blooded men from doing that which they wanted to do themselves. That was good sound doctrine. To-night he proposes to raise tariff walls, to impose high customs duties, to prevent men living in Canada from trading with their neighbours in the United States if they want to do so and if they find such trading to be to their advantage. The two positions do not agree. Either the hon. member was wrong in his statement before the Banking and Commerce committee or he was wrong in his argument to-night.

However, we are not living in an ideal world and some $400,000,000, or nearly that amount, have to be raised in Canada to meet our obligations. The Minister of Finance has to raise that money in some way or another. Under the circumstances would he be justified in reducing the customs duty, in lessening the amount he expects to receive from that source? I question it very much and, free trader in principle as I am, I will tell you why. Any government must be guided by the people from whom it is legislating. In the case of the government that was in power from 1896 down to 1911 every change it made in the tariff was in the direction of reducing the duty. Many people in Canada thought the Laurier government was not going fast enough and far enough. A large delegation came to Ottawa in 1910 or 1911, very largely composed of farmers from the province of Ontario and aggregating some seven or eight hundred in number. They asked for lower duties and particularly that efforts should be made to bring about reciprocal trade relations with the United States. A number of men in that delegation represented the fruit grow-

ing industry. The government heard the representations of the deputation and a few months later was in a position to carry out their wishes. Did these men respond? No, they took the earliest opportunity presented to them to turn the Laurier government out of power, they were not ready to receive the legislation for which they asked. The province of Manitoba also turned down the reciprocity agreement, and I am sorry to say the province from which I come sent half of its members to parliament to vote against reciprocity, although there is not a province in Canada that would have benefited to a greater extent from it than Prince Edward Island. Therefore, no matter how convinced you are of the soundness of certain legislation, no government can proceed faster than the sentiment of the people warrants. I think it was Solon who said that his laws were not the best possible, they were not even the best he could write, but they were the best the Athenian people were capable of receiving. Take the constituency of the present Minister of Finance who negotiated that reciprocity agreement. The province of Nova Scotia, including the county of Shelburne and Queens, which is largely engaged in the fishing industry would certainly have benefited largely by reciprocity, yet that constituency voted against the government. Even if it were not necessary to raise the large amount of money which is now required, would any government be justified in going faster than the present government is doing in the direction of freer trade or of making efforts to obtain reciprocal trade agreement with the United States.

That is a question which our Progressive friends will have to ask themselves. I want to say this to them: Did they show their sincerity to the extent of 100 per cent in regard to this matter? They blame the present government for not adhering more strictly to the platform of 1919. That platform surely appealed to the Progressive party in western Canada, but was the appeal sufficiently strong to attract their support? No, in every constituency in western Canada, or in most of them at all events, a candidate was put up to try to defeat the Liberal candidate and to defeat the party that framed that platform, and that had given the proof years before that they were in favour of such trade conditions.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The hon. member was endowed with his spirit of prophecy then.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not catch the observation of the hon. member. I will mention an instance which comes nearer home. Since I have had a vote I have always voted for freer trade, because I was convinced it was sound policy. I voted for reciprocity. I was elected on that issue, and I came to parliament and advocated reciprocity to the best of my ability. Every vote that I ever gave was in favour of it. What did my Progressive friends do in the last election? The leader in the Progressive party came down to Prince Edward Island and assisted his nominee against me. The gentleman who opposed me had voted against reciprocity, had stumped the country against it, and had voted against the Liberal government on every free trade measure that they introduced. Did that show 100 per cent sincerity?

Mr. GOULD: He got what was coming to him.

Mr. HUGHES: He got what was coming to him. He was licked because he was insincere, but he had the full support of the Progressive party and had the endorsement of the leader of that party.

Now our Progressive friends should not expect so much. They should not expect any more than they have got, and they should be sincere in this matter. If this question is fundamental with them, if they are convinced that it is one of the best things Canada could obtain, then they should support the men who have proved by their work that they are sincere in this matter, and if our friends have made a mistake in the past, let them try to rectify it in the future

These are my views on these questions, and if our Conservative friends would come to us and acknowledge that they are largely responsible for the debt and taxation of the country at this time, if they would strike their breasts and acknowledge their guilt, we would feel like forgiving them to a large extent, and forgetting their record in the matters to which I have referred and in many other matters to which I might refer. Now actions speak louder than words, and under all the circumstances I do not think our Progressive friends are justified in moving an amendment to the budget. However they are the best judges of their own conduct. I belong to that party which has consistently worked for those measures which have been dear to us all for so many years. I am convinced of the sincerity of the members of our party, and am convinced that they are doing the best they can under the circumstances in which they find themselves placed. Therefore, I am going to vote

against the amendment and for the budget, believing that I am working and voting in the best interests of the principles which I have placed before the House this evening.

On motion of Mr. Morrison the debate was adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 145 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mabel Gertrude Johnston.—Mr. Mewburn.

Bill No. 146 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wilfrid Charles Brown.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 147 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gertrude Andrews.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 148 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Henry Davidson.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 149 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Robert Webb.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 150 (from the Senate), for the relief of Katharine Bryans.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 156 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Austin Trow.—Mr. Duff

Bill No. 157 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Jean Buchan.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 158 (from the Senate), for the relief of Louisa Wemp.—Mr. Simpson.

Bill No. 160 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edgar Lindsay.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 161 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Marigoli Hare.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 162 (from the Senate), for the relief of Esther Levin.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 163 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hilda Marguerite Watt Black.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 164 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abigal Aileen Beryl McCrae Tull.—Mr. Duff.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 167 (from the Senate), for the relief of Christina Julia Hamilton.—Mr. Simpson.

Bill No. 168 (from the Senate), for the relief of Smith Kain.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 169 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Malcolm Mushett.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 170 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Francis Rafferty.—Mr. Irvine.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

[Mr. Hughes.]

Monday, May 21, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS

Fifth report of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce presented.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

First interim report on the second part of investigation by the Royal Commission on Pensions and Re-establishment.—Hon. Mr. Beland.

COMMITTEES—CHANGES IN PERSONNEL

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I beg to move that the name of Mr. Garland (Bow River) be substituted for that of Mr. Reed on the standing committee on Banking and Commerce and that the name of Mr. Reed be substituted for that of Mr. Garland (Bow River) on the standing committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

THE PUBLIC DEBT—RAILWAY APPROPRIATIONS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The leader of the Opposition asked the other evening for certain additional information concerning the public debt and railway appropriations. The debt statement is brief, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read it:

Net debt, 31st March, 1922, as shown in the Public Accounts laid on the table of the House during present session..	$2,422,135,801 73
Estimated amount to be added to the net debt in the year just closed as given by the minister in his budget speech..	49,293,086 00
Estimated Net debt March 31, 1923..	$2,471,428,887 73

The statement regarding railway appropriations is more elaborate, and I will send it over to my hon. friend rather than read it.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION AND RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 180, to amend the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act.

Mr. MARTELL: Is this simply to extend the so-called Calder Act?

Mr. FIELDING: No. That will come up at another time. There is a clause in the old Superannuation Act which authorizes the Treasury Board to grant additional years in fixing a retiring allowance. We think that some embarrassment may arise from that, and we propose to repeal that clause so that if in any case it is deemed necessary to make any addition to the amount granted it can be done by special appropriation by the House, instead of by act of the Treasury Board.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 176 (from the Senate), respecting The Northern Trusts Company.—Mr. Hudson.

Bill No. 177 (from the Senate), respecting The Subsidiary Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 178 (from the Senate), for the relief of Winifred Scatcherd.—Mr. Church.

OLEOMARGARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): I should like to ask the government whether it is the intention to introduce this session legislation to further extend the period during which oleomargarine may be manufactured and sold in this country, and imported. The act of last session only extended until 31st August, the right to manufacture and import oleomargarine, and until 1st March next the right to have that article in possession.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I promise my hon. friend that the government will give serious consideration to his representation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In that connection may I state that I got a similar answer some two or three weeks ago. How long is this state of giving the matter consideration going to last?

Mr. FIELDING: The subject is very serious.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not possible to get an answer without this evasion?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think that is nice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps it is not, but does the government deserve anything better?

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid, to use the Asquithian phrase, my right hon. friend will have to wait and see.

COMMISSION ON LAKE RATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I wish to inquire when the report tabled the other day from the Royal Commission on Lake Rates will be printed and made available for the use of members.

Mr. FIELDING: I presume that the printing of this report is for the printing committee to decide. I think that is the usual course followed. I do not think these reports are printed unless so ordered by the printing committee. However, I will make inquiry for my hon. friend. I do not think any special instruction has been given about it one way or the other.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): It is very important that this report should be printed and in the hands of members at an early date.

Mr. FIELDING: The printing committee can direct the printing of the report at once.

PUBLICITY AGENT IN LONDON

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is reported from Great Britain in the morning press that the government has appointed a publicity agent or publicity representative in London, and that the appointee is one Mr. W. T. Cranfield, of Great Britain. May I ask if the report is correct, and when the process of appointing other than Canadians is to cease?

Mr. FIELDING: I must confess that personally I am not aware of the matter, but I will have inquiry made. Speaking for myself I am not aware of such an appointment; it may have been made in some one of the departments.

WHEAT BOARD

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have another question to ask. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), in whose department the matter lies, is not in his seat, and I was withholding the question in the hope that he would come in. Probably some other member of the government will be able to answer. The question is this: Have the government had a request from either the government of Alberta or the government of Saskatchewan, or a joint request from both, to extend the wheat board legislation by order in council as provided by

the act of last year? Further, have any names been suggested to this government to handle the proposal for the present year?

Mr. FIELDING: This matter comes under the direction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, unfortunately, is not present. I will see that the inquiry is brought to his notice and that the information is given to my hon. friend as early as possible.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Friday, May 18, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee on Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Robert Forke.

Mr. JOHN MORRISON (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance on this the occasion of his seventeenth budget. I am only sorry that it contains so little encouragement for agriculture and for the working classes in general.

It has been frequently stated here, Sir, that Canada is passing through a very precarious era; and some speakers have been roundly denounced for attempting to relate just how bad the conditions are in their particular districts. Well, Sir, the conditions over some very large areas are fully as bad as have been described. Climatic causes have contributed very largely to these conditions. Adverse weather for four and sometimes fives successive years, together with high operating costs —some of which were controllable and others uncontrollable—have contributed to place matters in very bad shape. Other causes were —the non-appreciation of the real facts by the government, and that combinations of different kinds, who thought the country could stand it, have kept increasing their charges for their respective services, whether it was, lending money, carrying freight, or supplying coal, farm implements, or manufactured goods. When deflation struck the country, farming was the first industry to feel it, as the prices of farm products were fixed by world conditions plus the ability to buy and pay for those goods. Our income fell to one-third of previous years, but costs stood pat, they remained away up. The result is that the greatest basic industry in Canada to-day has a very low purchasing power. Our inability to buy means that the manufacturing establishments are only running from 25 to 75 per cent capacity, and their overhead costs are very high. According to Mr. Bradshaw, General Manager of the Massey-Harris Company, giving evidence before a committee of this House the other day their overhead was up about 400 per cent as compared with that of pre-war days. Surely then protection has failed to fulfil its purpose in keeping our manufacturers busy. That grand old policy of protection, which the Conservatives boldly proclaimed in office and out of office, that policy which the Liberals denounced when in opposition and practised when they got into office, has failed to fulfil the expectations of its friends.

It is claimed, Sir, that the outcry of hard times in the West has injured Canada. Not very much I think. It has been my observation, Sir, that if there is anything wrong doers dislike, it is publicity in regard to their evil practices. We have tried other methods and we have failed to get any response, and yet when we tell the facts in order to try and bring about a remedy we are called calamity howlers. I do not think that the government could supply a remedy for every difficulty which exists, but there are measures which could be applied if this government was fearless and determined to give a square deal all round, if service was the big idea and fear was not so prevalent.

I think the British Preference should be increased to at least 50 per cent all round. That is a very desirable course in order that the prices paid for goods that we need shall be reduced to a reasonable rate. It will also make it hard for our oppressors to combine, and will render easy the enforcement of the Anti-Combines Act. If that is done, combines will find it very hard to operate in Canada. Another reason for increasing the British preference is to be found in connection with the shipping conditions. Referring to the annual report of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, I find on page 5 a paragraph which reads as follows:

> It is admitted by the best authorities that the past year was the worst in recent shipping annals. While tonnage offering increased to some extent the commodities were of lower value than in preceding years, and, as a consequence, the earnings fell off considerably. Outward tonnage was fairly well maintained, but on the other hand the inward business, more especially from the United Kingdom, Oriental and Australasian ports fell away to such extent that it was exceedingly difficult—and at times impossible—to obtain, and, on this account, a great proportion of the voyages during the year resulted in losses. The Merchant Marine had a deficit of $9,649,478. Our exports to Great Britain for the four years ending 31st March 1923 amounted to $1,480,427,628. Our imports from Great Britain were only $597,759,207, a balance in favour of Canada of $882,668,421, and average balance per year of $220,667,105.

Now sir, this one-way-load transportation is a very expensive business. That is another serious loss caused to us from over protection. When people stray from sound business principles their difficulties are always cumulative. One wrong leads to another, and one difficulty causes another difficulty. The way of the transgressor is hard in public business, the same as in private life. Surely our friends who are so long on loyalty and on patriotism should be willing to give the Motherland a chance. Great Britain is putting up a great fight to-day. She is a manufacturing nation as well as a good trader, but she has still 1,200,000 men in enforced idleness, because world conditions are bad. We must buy her manufactured products if we expect her to buy our wheat, flour, cattle, bacon, and dairy products. Nobody can continue buying if he cannot sell. Neither can a nation buy, if she does not sell. Britain has been our second best customer, the United States being first. For four years ending 31st March last our imports from the United States amounted to $2,714,149,766. Our exports were $1,668,-020,011, a balance in favour of the United States of $1,046,129,755. Taking the United Kingdom and the United States there was a trade balance against Canada of $163,461,334. Now there is something wrong when we find ourselves in that position. We must have such high duties that they are interfering with trade. Last year the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) brought down his budget and increased the duties on cigarettes and thought he would obtain increased revenue from that source, but he found he was $1,200,-000 in the hole. I think that shows that when they overdid it in a little thing like cigarettes, many other lines of business were materially injured. Instead of getting more business, the customs tariff was so high that it killed business. We need more British commodities from that country, and one commodity which I would suggest to import more heavily would be British people, but as they come here we have to see that they are well looked after, and not exploited, as many of them have been in the past, not brought out and dumped on the prairies and on the newer lands, left to shift for themselves, and exploited by people who make a business of that game. The newer parts of Canada are deserving of more careful consideration of her various problems. We need extensions of branch lines of railway where there are large settlements of thrifty farmers who have been holding down the job since before the war, some of them hauling their wheat thirty or forty miles to the nearest railway. Many of our people in such circumstances are becoming discouraged and are going across the International boundary line. I think it is well worth while for the government to make an intelligent careful survey of all frontier problems and meet those people half way. If we do that we will find that we can hold them. I think it is poor business to spend a lot of money in bringing in new people and not providing for those who are discouraged. We have thousands of settlers to-day who are "broke." There are men who have not any money going across the International boundary line to-day with their families, and I am told that when a man goes broke he cannot get a clearance and make an assignment for less than $500. Those men could not find $500 to save their souls. Something should be done to save those people for this country. It is folly—it is worse than folly—to let those people drift. It is not justice to them. They have suffered this loss, not so much through their own fault as the general aftermath of the war, and I think some compromise should be effected which would save those people to Canada.

Now the problem of adequate credits is a live one from coast to coast to-day. Business men as well as farmers are demanding a better system. It is a difficult problem and worthy the attention of Canada's best men. Members of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce will, I am sure, submit proposals to this House for much needed amendments to the Bank Act. I think we should have a commission on banking and credits similar to the railway commission or the grain commission. I do not know why any small bunch of men should have such arbitrary powers over the business of this country. These men have not been reasonable in the past, and we have no assurance that they ever experienced a change of heart. Now when banks want a renewal of their charter, they try to get it put through, and if they succeed the public will be at their mercy for ten years. The bank presidents and general managers who have been down here giving evidence before this banking committee have a lot to say about the stability of our financial institutions, but, Sir, there is nothing as unstable as the line of credit that the most people have been obliged to use, or to be satisfied with, during the last ten years. I know a farmer who was doing business with a bank for over twenty years before he ever asked to borrow a dollar. He had a first class farm, well improved, everything paid for and he had other investments. He went into the bank and asked for a loan of $200, and the manager told him he was very sorry but they

were not lending money that day. That money was wanted to pay for some cattle the farmer had just bought, and the man went out and got the money elsewhere. I recall another instance where a neighbour of mine had a half section, well improved, and he had horses and implements. He had borrowed some money from the bank, and when in December his note became due he wanted a renewal. He told the banker that he had paid up everything in the stores, paid his threshing bill, wages and taxes. He had paid all he said, but one lien note of $300 on a team of horses which he purchased for $600. He was at that time owing to the bank $300, and the manager said "That is all right, you just pay your note now, and you will be in good standing when your note for the horses becomes due on the 1st of March, and we will take care of you." The farmer took him at his word and paid the note in the bank. But when 1st March came around the bank refused to give him a loan of $300. The vendor of the horses had the team in town to re-sell them, when a neighbour came forward and loaned the farmer the money. I do not think the banks are doing justice to their customers in such cases as that to which I have referred. I could quote much worse instances than that of uncalled-for ill-treatment.

The banks tell us that money is tight. People who are tight when we want to do business with them are no good; we should have some way of keeping them in working order. We want continuity of service. Personally I have no complaint to make; but I have seen some gross injustices handed out to the people, and I do not see any reason why one group of men should be in a position where they can dictate the whole game right through. I do not think any man in the world is good enough to have an absolute say over his fellow man; there should be some check on him. Lack of continuity of service has been the chief cause of many people of this country getting into trouble. I have seen men canvassed to get them to use more credit, and later on the same bank manager who so canvassed them, came around and compelled them, when they did not have a crop, to give him a mortgage to protect their loan.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. gentleman not to mention in the debate, mattters which are under consideration before a standing committee, the report of which is not yet before the House. That is one of the essential rules of debate.

[Mr. Morrison.]

Mr. MORRISON: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. The United States is to-day providing for farmers a service which land mortgage companies and banks cannot give. Banks require their money out on short-term loans, because they have big deposits of money that are due on demand. They are, therefore, obliged to keep their assets as liquid as possible, and they are not in a position to lend money on live stock for one or two years until the stock grows to maturity. Our land mortgage companies also cannot touch that business. There are many farmers who have plenty of feed, but who cannot use it on this account, and there is no margin for waste to-day in agriculture in Canada. Our country requires a system of intermediate credit, similar to the United States' system, to suit the requirements of our live stock men. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), in speaking the other day, scoffed at the idea of farmers consolidating their debts on the amortization plan. Why would that not be good business for farmers as well as for the British government? The British Government had their debts to the United States spread over a term of sixty years recently, and they are recognized as the best financiers in the world. What is our own government doing? It is not trying to pay off its debts in five years. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in fact all big companies, borrow money over a long term of years, and there is no possibility to-day of farmers being able to pay their debts off in a short term of years. Recently the Canadian Pacific set an example which shows some real appreciation of actual conditions in western Canada. They announced that they were calling in some 30,000 contracts outstanding with western farmers to whom they had sold land on a short term payment plan at 8 per cent interest. They are re-writing the contracts to extend over a period of thirty-four years on the amortization plan, where the interest and principle combined will not exceed 7 per cent. This is a lead for other big companies like the Hudson's Bay Company and many others that have made colossal fortunes out of Canada. Land mortgage companies and financial institutions that have big reserves, having put many people into a position out of which it is impossible for them to get, should compromise with them and make it possible for them to stay on their land. Most of this trouble has been caused by the aftermath of war, by uncontrollable conditions, and in war time we compromised with some of these companies and readjusted their bargains. Take the case of the Crowsnest pass agreement which was cancelled for a term.

The railways found out that they were up against uncontrollable, unexpected costs, and the position was compromised and rightly so. I do not know why the small man should not receive as fair treatment as the big corporation receives. I suggest that the government should take cognizance of the advice given recently by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), and put the fear of God into some of these companies, if they will not voluntarily compromise with these men, if, rather than compromise, they will drive men out of the country. The Shylocks have had their day, and workmen and ordinary business men have had impossible conditions exacted of them. I hope the government will deal fairly and courageously with all sections and not permit these big corporations to jump on the farmers and reap the benefits of the compromise which the Canadian Pacific has made.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us the other day that he had faith in the intelligence and industry of our people; that he had faith in the people and faith in the resources of this Dominion. I would remind him that another authority said that "faith without works is dead." It is all right to have faith, but there has to be a little more than faith in order to get this mess cleaned up and things in working order again.

The Minister of Finance proposes to give bounties to companies manufacturing hemp and artifical silk, and also to the mining of copper. Non-resident capitalists can come into this country, get the ear of the government and secure big bounties. On the other hand, men who are resident in Canada and who have got into hard positions, cannot secure the ear of the government to receive any redress. These companies come into Canada, and without showing parliament that it is necessary for them to receive financial assistance in order that they may gain a footing, and make a success of their industry, they can secure a gift from the public treasury; they can get help. But we come here and present an irrefutable case, and yet we are not listened to. It is outrageous that this pernicious habit of doles to companies without their proving a good case before a committee of this House should continue. If an industry looks good to capital, capital will come and develop it. If it does not, capital will not come by bounties alone. This government proposes to put a bounty on copper of 9 per cent of the output. That would be equal to a bounty to of about 11 cents a bushel on wheat. Supposing we clamoured for a bounty of 11 cents a bushel on wheat, what would our Conservative and Liberal friends think? They would think that we were unsound, and they would be right. We do not want a bounty for ourselves, and we do not want it for the other fellow. What right has the government, when parliament is in session, to grant such a favour to any company? A matter of that kind should be considered in this House. The hemp industry proposes to establish a factory somewhere near Winnipeg and it is to get a bounty of $200,000 a year, extending over five years, on an investment of $5,000,000. Take a $5,000,000 investment by settlers coming on to the land: they will not get a $200,000 bounty; they have a penalty of more than $200,000 imposed upon the necessaries of life which they have to purchase before they can start. This penalty is not sliding down; it is climbing up for five years, and there should be a reversal of this business. The bounty should be given to the actual men on the land. When we went out West and got free homesteads, we had to live on the land. A non-resident could not get a free homestead. Therefore, the actual settlers in this country, the actual citizens of Canada, should receive preference, if any preference is to be given. I do not ask for preference, but I do not want the other fellow to get it.

We Progressives have received lately from different quarters of the House a great deal of advice about how to manage our business. When men propose to give advice, they will surely be sporty enough to take a little. I wish to advise the hon gentlemen on the treasury benches that their stock has gone down greatly in our estimation. Last year a plea was made for a little patience; we were asked to give the government a little time because they had undertaken a very intricate task, and new men were on the job who were faced with many difficulties. Last year's budget was claimed to be a step in the right direction, the inference being, of course, that when this budget was brought down we could reasonably expect a further step along the same line. Alas, however, it has been a step backwards. To-day we are convinced that the grand old Liberal party is simply a replica of the party as it was constituted in 1911, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that grand old statesman attempted to give us a fair and generous reciprocity measure. At that time Sir Wilfrid and the country found that there were wolves in sheep's clothing in that party,—high protectionists, camouflaged Tories masquerading under false colours. The mask was torn off, and all the protectionists lined up in their own ranks, and defeated

that measure, which would have been of inestimable value to this country, to the banks, the railways, the manufacturers, the labourers, the farmers and the professional men. The interests of the citizens of this country are all bound up together. To-day we have hard times, and hon. gentlemen to my right are charged by the people with a fair share of responsibility for this condition. The only difference I see between the two parties is that the Conservative party is true to false principles while the Liberal party is false to true principles. The people are tired of public men who make fair promises at election time and then do as little as possible to carry out those promises, through fear of some powerful interest. Canada is looking to-day for men like Mr. E. C. Drury, who will fight public evils in and out of office, and who dares to do right, refusing to compromise with wrong. Many good Liberals believe that their platform of 1919 is treated by this government merely as a scrap of paper, and respect for public men and members of parliament has not been enhanced in the public mind by this last budget. In conclusion, I want to tell my hon. friends across the Floor that I believe their term of office will be brief, because of their failure to implement their pledges.

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston): Knowing that there are quite a number of speakers to follow me and that this debate must terminate at a certain time, I shall make my remarks as short as possible and shall refer only to the budget. Following our principles as a party, we cannot support the amendment; therefore any remarks I have to offer will be confined to the budget. I have the same opinion as the last hon. member (Mr. Morrison) in regard to this statement of the Minister of Finance; I think it is altogether unsatisfactory and is not in keeping with the promises that his party has made. To me it seems to be nothing more than a political cenotaph of the party platform of 1919. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), the Liberal member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) and the Liberal member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) have sealed the tomb of this old platform which is dead so far as the party is concerned. It is quite true that there is a voice, but it is only one lonely voice in the wilderness, preaching this old platform of 1919, and that comes from the distant land of Prince Edward Island. It is to be regretted that the budget has created a great gap, leaving I.O.U.'s for the future; we regret that we cannot settle our own accounts but are leaving a large amount of these promissory documents for the future generations to meet. The reasons given for this state of affairs have been general. It is perfectly true that conditions in Europe are largely responsible for business conditions throughout the world to-day. It is a matter for regret that peace does not exist between France and Germany and that the old struggle is still going on, so that the old spite will be aggravated and the dispute prolonged. In addition to this, Europe is to-day divided up into a large number of small states, and this policy can but protract the unrest and dissatisfaction that now exist. To my mind, we as a British race made a mistake in the peace that has been arrived at, for I think that we should have stuck to our policy of the supremacy of the British navy. I believe that the supremacy of the British navy is the best guarantee of peace that the world has ever had or will ever have, and we can only regret that to-day on the Pacific coast we have no authoritative voice. Chinese bandits may seize our citizens, detain them, and murder them, and we are speechless and even helpless, because, as a matter of fact, the British navy has no strength on the Pacific coast. Years ago, if such a thing had happened, Britain could have spoken with some authority, and a matter of this kind would have been settled very soon.

There is another matter of complaint which has been spoken of by many hon. members, and that is the present exodus of our citizens. We have passed through the Book of Genesis, built up the country, and made a confederation, and now it seems that we have reached the Book of Exodus. There is only one suggestion which appears to me to be practicable in this matter, and that is that the government should at once institute a bureau of information so that every settler going from Canada to the United States might be questioned as to his reasons for leaving the country. We should then know whether men were leaving on account of the lack of work or were going to the United States to secure higher wages. We might also secure information as to why men were coming to Canada from the United States. Our trade commissioners in other parts of the British Empire should be able to give us information as to why settlers from Great Britain and Ireland are going to Australia and New Zealand in preference to Canada. Knowing that these people are loyal to the Empire, and would not, except for some good reason, prefer one part of it to another, we naturally ask ourselves this question; is the practice which now prevails of moving motions in this House of Commons for the purposes of disbanding the

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, of doing away with military training, and of curtailing our naval activities, having some effect on those people who would likely settle in this country? This question naturally suggests itself to our minds: Are we doing any good to the people who would like to come to Canada from the great heart of the Empire, by moving such motions in this House and having them appear on our order paper?

There is another cause of complaint which perhaps will have little weight with the government, and that is the matter of party pledges and promises to the people of this country. During the last election the workingman and the poor man were promised that they would have cheaper food. What has been the fact? Last year a reduction was made on cocoa and liquid medicines. This year, according to the member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) the government have gone one step further; they have reduced sugar somewhat, knowing that the price of sugar would jump away up beyond all expectation; but they have added to the liquid medicines. They have also given the workingmen and the poor people of the country an opportunity of buying brandy and sparkling wines at reduced prices. These fulfilments of the promises to the poor man are causing a great deal of complaint. There is no question that the prices of food to-day are not going down. In confirmation of this I may quote the prices of meats for 1921 and 1922 contained in tenders called for by a certain institution. In 1921 best breakfast bacon cost 30 cents; in 1922, 32 cents. In 1921 the best beef cost 16 cents; in 1922, 18 cents. In 1921 sausage cost 15 cents, and the same price prevailed in 1922. Smoked ham in 1921 cost 23 cents and in 1922, 28 cents. These prices are per pound, of course. These are merely a few instances; but if one goes through these lists it will be found that in nearly every case the price is up rather than down. So that the workingman has very little to be thankful for in last year's budget and in this.

There is another cause of complaint. We do not usually grumble about the cost if a suitable service is given in return; but unfortunately the money taken from the pockets of the people is not being returned in the shape of suitable service. The first complaint I shall refer to is in regard to agriculture—the expense of the tuberculin test. Nobody seems to get any benefit from this expenditure. No encouragement is given to the farmer who has his herds regularly tested in order to keep them free of tuberculosis, for he gets no better price for his milk than the farmer who does not trouble to have his cows tested. Money should be spent to ensure that every man who wishes to have his herd tested should get the benefit of this service.

Another source of complaint has already been referred to by a member from the government side, and that is the cost of special delivery of letters. I have many complaints in regard to this service. We pay heavy charges for the service and get very poor returns. When a man affixes a special delivery stamp on his letter he expects delivery will be made immediately the letter reaches the post office at the other end; but frequently delivery is not made for several hours afterwards, in many cases not much ahead of the regular delivery. These complaints are very general, and this service should be speeded up and be made what it purports to be—a special delivery service.

Complaint is also made regarding the large amount of money expended for military training. If we had adequate military training in return for this expenditure, well and good; but unfortunately we do not get anything like the proper equivalent, and I am surprised that the departmental officials informed the minister that last year's training was satisfactory. I know for a fact that it was not, and I may add that under present conditions it never will be satisfactory. Military training, to be of any use, should have two objects in view: first, to train the rank and file, and, second, to train a staff. Now, there is only one way in which you can train a staff, and that is by having training camps where all branches of the service are assembled. A properly trained staff is indispensable and during the late war we had to have British staff officers attached to our brigades and divisions to supply our deficiency in this branch. I am not advocating an increased expenditure, but I do not think we gain very much from our present local system of military training—a squadron of cavalry here and a battalion of infantry there. We should have in certain parts of the Dominion central training camps where

4 p.m.

all branches of the service would be brought together and where those of our officers who wish to go on staff service could get the necessary training. An efficient staff officer must have experience in every branch of the service, otherwise his training i incomplete and he cannot possibly measure up to the duties of his profession. We are certainly not getting an adequate return for the money we are spending to-day on military training, and I throw the suggestion out to the government that they should as soon as possible establish large camps where all

branches of the service may be assembled and where officers may be properly trained for staff service.

I think the country is waking up to the fact that if we can do without cabinet ministers for three or four months while parliament is sitting, we can get along very well without them for the rest of the year. During the session cabinet ministers are required if at any time at all, and if we can go through a whole session without three or four cabinet ministers, surely the question must arise in the minds of the people: Are all these cabinet ministers required?

Changes in our income tax law have been suggested from time to time, and I propose to refer to one particular change which was suggested last session, but so far nothing has been done in the direction indicated. Under the income tax regulations a widow is granted exemption of $1,000 and a married woman $2,000. Why should such a difference exist? In many cases widows are continuing their homes and their household expenses are a heavy burden upon them, and there seems to be no reason why they should be discriminated against to the extent of $1,000. This matter was brought to the attention of the government last year, and I hope it will now be taken into consideration and both classes be placed on an equal basis.

Now, coming to reciprocity—

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

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The hon. gentleman may not say "hear, hear" when he hears what I have to say, and that is that I am not at all in favour of reciprocity. I will tell you why. Reciprocity brings us into association with the United States in many ways, and I am going to point out how we have come under the influence of our neighbours to the south, and not always to our benefit. In our school system we have been dominated by the influence of the United States, and to-day the boy of poor parents is practically cut out from the technical courses. In my time a boy could take four years in medicine and graduate. In the past we have had some very, very successful physicians as the result of that four years' training. During the four years the boy was able to go out and earn money to put him through his course. Personally that was my experience. I had to put myself through college and earn the necessary money to do so. To-day the course takes six or seven years. This is altogether due to the influence of the United States, to our trying to imitate their system. With the lengthened course the term has also been extended so that the boy has very little opportunity of earning his expenses, and consequently the boys of poor parents are practically excluded from these branches of study—all because of the influence of the United States over our school system.

Then, too, we have come under the influence of the United States in the standardization of our hospitals. And what has it cost us? We have followed their advice under the Rockefeller Foundation and have built up hospitals according to their standardization. This has resulted in a very expensive system of hospitals, a system not at all intended for our use, a system where the poor man has to attend the public wards and take the doctors in those wards, and all simply to fulfil American ideas of standardization in hospitals.

In addition to that, our political and our social system have altogether been dominated by the United States, and to-day people are doing nothing else in towns but weighing and measuring babies to see if they come up to certain standards. This is a social service that is altogether due to the influence of the United States, and it is dominated by them. Lastly, I do not think that this country of ours is to be at all benefited by the moral influence which would come from the United States.

If you take eastern Ontario, for instance, they have had a great loss in their cheese and butter trade through the influence of the United States, and the high price which they at one time got for their cream has lately been cut down and the farmers are left drifting. In all these ways the United States has had an influence over us which has not been at all beneficial to us. I believe that we can go on by ourselves and build up our own trade without throwing our doors open to these people. Our position is not so bad as some people are crying it to be. The position of Canada to-day as a whole is not one that we need regret. If you look over the list of our products—I have taken only a few of them—in wheat, Canada is third in acreage, being headed by the United States and India only, and in production it takes the same place. In oats Canada is second in production, and the second in acreage. In potatoes we fall down a bit to seventh in acreage, and fifth in production. In live stock there are only three or four countries ahead of us in the number of horses raised, and the same with cattle. We have a field crop valued at over $1,400,000,000. Our manufactures amount each year to over $3,000,000,000. We have live stock amounting to over $1,000,000,000.

That is a condition that we need not cry about. It is a very successful condition, and I do not know if our friends to my left—I am not offering any criticism of the group system; I do not go that far; if the group system will benefit us, well and good, let it come—but this is a general condition of the country that I do not think our friends to my left could improve on if they were in power. All told we have a condition that is very favourable, and I have confidence in the future. Like the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond), my confidence is largely in the people that we have. We must have confidence in our people. The people who are building up this country have never failed in any crisis, neither has the stock they sprang from ever failed in the past. Even when almost hopelessly beaten, with their faces to the foe and their backs to the wall they determined never to give up but to go on. The blood stream of this people is coming, and has come, from the centre of the great Empire to which we belong. Their hopes in that Empire are ours; their ideals are ours, and the hope of the future lies in a strong connection with that same blood stream, no matter whether it is found in Great Britain or Ireland, in Australia or New Zealand, in India, Africa or the isles of the sea. We need no other reciprocity than a strong confidence in that race and a strong connection in the future with that race.

I have confidence also in that other great race in this country, the French-Canadian. I have just as strong a confidence in the courage and the bravery of that race. History has never shown them to be thoroughly beaten. They proved their patriotism at Chateauguay and other scenes of struggle. In the Great War it was my experience to have about fifty or sixty of these French-Canadians in my unit, and I well remember that Sunday night in the middle of the gas attack when these men who belonged to the transport column of my unit and had no reason whatever to place themselves in the front rank, came to me and said, "Here, all our stretcher bearers are about finished. Will you give us a chance?" Fifteen or sixteen of them went up to the front as stretcher bearers and before morning five of them were dead, two of them died within twelve hours, and the rest were shot to pieces. With an experience of that kind one can well have confidence in these two great races making a country of which we shall all some day be very proud.

Mr. J. G. ROBICHAUD (Gloucester): In rising, Mr. Speaker, to continue this debate it is not my intention to add very extensively to what has already been said. I am rather inclined to express the wish that we should end this long debate and get down to the real business of the country with all possible speed. For the past four months apart from looking after the best interests of my constituents, a task which in itself was not such an easy one, I have endeavoured to follow the debates of this House in detail. I have thus been more of a looker-on than a participant in our deliberations, and at times, Mr. Speaker, I was inclined to believe that from some sections of this House there was more talk than real action. It is for this reason that I shall refrain from any lengthy discussion at this stage.

I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is not in his seat for I wanted to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate him on the great wisdom he has shown in the preparation of this budget. Few men in this country can command in the same degree the admiration and confidence of the nation. He is a man with long years of experience. He has had a long life which he has devoted to the best interests of this country, and I can only wish him a still long and happy career filled with all the joys and contentment that could be wished for him.

In sizing up the political situation in this country there is one movement which gives rise to a great deal of speculation, and that is the political movement of our friends directly opposite—the Progressives. As a new member of this House I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I should be open to conviction in so far as the best interests of our country are concerned. To a young man brought up in the democratic atmosphere of Liberalism the prima facie evidence adduced by our highly educated friends has been somewhat seductive But, Sir, the more I study the political policies enunciated by our friends the more I become convinced of the futility of their efforts. I am ready to recognize the high and noble aspirations that prompt the efforts of our friends of the Progressive party. They certainly mean well; but unfortunately for themselves, and for the vast interests which they represent, it would appear to me that their actions are ill-advised and the manner in which they propose to carry out their object is somewhat inconsistent with the end in view. They have repeatedly told us of the conditions which prevail in the western provinces. Well, to a large extent we are ready to admit the truth of what they say, but the remedy does not lie in adopting the programme which they propose,

but rather in adhering to sound national policies, policies thought out by the men who have seen the growth of this nation in all its phases. Sir, we want in this country of ours that spirit of nationhood which is so essential in the building up of a new country. We cannot permit class legislation. Whatever course we may pursue in our deliberations it must be one that is in the best interests of the nation as a whole. It is all very well to express an opinion on the present economic difficulties in Canada, but surely there is no reason for shouting from the housetops that blue ruin is at our door. Pessimists and quitters have been too free in their gloomy expressions. If I wanted to draw an exaggerated picture of the conditions in the Maritime provinces I would have no difficulty whatever in out-rivalling some of my extreme friends opposite. But, Sir, were I to do that I should be paying scant justice to the courage and the energy of the people of that part of Canada. The population of those provinces is endowed with more courage and more resourcefulness than any other people that I know of. Descending as they do from the pioneers who have experienced the hardships of primitive conditions in this country, that sturdy Scotch blood of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the industrious loyalists of New Brunswick, as well as that nucleus of the French race, the Acadians, of the Maritime provinces, would not flinch from the difficulties of the hour. We have confidence in the future of our country, we believe that its prosperity is sure. We may be mistaken but we feel that the time is not ripe for any drastic change in our national policy.

Our friends directly opposite have suggested a great many reforms in order to relieve our national troubles which, if put into practice, would inevitably kill the very object they have in view. In other words, it seems to me that the remedy they propose would be worse than the disease. It is not the first time in our history that conditions have been admittedly unsatisfactory. Prior to the year 1896 there existed in Canada a condition of affairs which was none too good. There was a distinct period of depression. The ship of state was grounded and its crew, many of whom were in the state of mutiny, were leisurely awaiting the rising tide to refloat it. Happily the people realized the seriousness of the situation and handed over the administration of national affairs to the Liberal party under the direction of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The change of government was soon followed by a change for the better throughout the country. Throughout the length and breadth of Canada a revival of business took place and such an expansion of trade, such a growth of population and settlement that before long two new provinces had to be created. Soon after the late war conditions again changed for the worse. In 1921 Canada again experienced conditions similar to those which existed in 1896. Once more the ship of state was found to be badly equipped and its boatswain sleeping at the rudder. But to-day we are once more feeling the benefits of a change of government and under the Liberal regime we are proceeding again on the road to prosperity.

Sir, if the trade of the nation is in any way indicative of prosperity may I be permitted to quote a few figures showing that we are regaining our former prosperous position as a country. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, largely in consequence of policies pursued by the Conservatives, our imports amounted to $747,804,300. For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1923, however, those imports had increased to $802,465,000, an increase over the year 1922 of $54,660,700. For the year 1922 our exports amounted to $740,240,700 as against a total of $931,451,400 for 1923, an increase for the latter year of $191,210,700, or a total increase in the business of the country for 1923 as compared with 1922 of some $245,871,400. In other words our trade has increased during the last year by almost twenty per cent as compared with the previous twelve months. The expansion of trade for the year 1923, over that of 1922, was larger than the total business of Canada for the year 1896-7 by some $15,000,000. Furthermore, taking the first month of the present fiscal year we find that our imports for that month, the month of April, reached the figure of $68,181,300, as against $47,695,400 for the same month of 1922, an increase of over $20,000,000. Our exports have increased in the same proportion. For the month of April 1922, our exports amounted to $31,917,500, and our exports for April last amounted to $53,642,250, or an increase for April 1923 over April 1922 of $21,724,750. Thus we see that the increase in Canada's external trade for the last month over the corresponding month of the previous year was some $42,210,650 or an increase of over fifty per cent. Furthermore it will be seen by these figures that in 1921 there was a balance of trade against us of sixty million dollars. In 1922 the balance of trade against us was reduced to seven million dollars, and in 1923, our last fiscal year, the balance of trade was converted into a balance in our favour of some $131,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, these figures of Canada's trade do not show any sign of hardship. There is no reason to be alarmed when we can present such a prospectus of the business of this country, when you can show that for the first month of our fiscal year the business of the country had increased by some 50 per cent. Now I want to show there is no reason for alarm and that, perhaps, we have been subjected to a little too much pessimism on the part of our friends. I wish to read a portion of an article from the Ottawa Journal of 4th May last. This article deals with the Banking and Commerce committee. As the report of this committee has not yet been presented, I shall refrain from dealing with it, but if the House will permit me, I will read a portion of this article. It says:

> No good comes from ignoring facts. But what is the sense of magnifying evils, of arguing from the exceptional, of refusing to see things as a whole? It is true that we are passing through a depression. It is true that agriculture is being hit. But will anybody hold that we are not better off than most of the rest of the world, that labor and industry and agriculture in Canada are not as prosperous, as in most other countries? In Europe, nations are dogged by shadows; turbulence, economic dislocation, debt and impoverishment are their lot. In Canada we know little of such hardships. We have social and industrial tranquility our trade is reviving; our reconstruction problems diminish; there is a minimum of unemployment. Why, then, should we permit a few individuals, whom fortuitous circumstances have brought into Parliament, to keep shouting "wolf," or the summoning of witnesses before special committees to tell the world that our economic structure is trembling?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is only a fair statement to make on the present situation. I am not quite in love with the long deliberations of the committee on Banking and Commerce, I believe the generosity of the government in this respect has been abused by those of my hon. friends opposite who have been instrumental in all these long deliberations. I think after all we should trust to the wisdom and sagacity of the party of whom I am a supporter.

It affords a great deal of satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, to hear the announcement made in the budget speech of the reduction of the British preferential tariff, especially when we consider that, from this reduction, special preferment has been given to Canadian ports. This is a case of obtaining something for what we give. This was one of the fundamental principles underlying the reciprocity pact of 1911, and in my humble judgment this principle should form the very basis of our national policy. The announcement that negotiations were already on foot with a view to another reciprocity treaty with the United States has been received with a great deal of satisfaction. Our friends opposite would like to have us tear down our tariff walls without getting anything in return. While it is true that by that policy some immediate relief would result in some sections of the country, we must not lose sight of the fact that Canada must have access to the markets of the world. This is the one essential point that must be borne in mind in the revision of our fiscal policy. Trade negotiations have become a factor of the greatest importance, and I sincerely express the hope that they will be adhered to for generations to come. Suppose, for instance, that one of our western farmers, or a farmer in this province, for example, woke up one morning to find the fences dividing his farm from that of his neighbour so constructed as to allow the neighbour's herds to pass to his farm and pasture, so that they could graze in his pasture with the farmer's own herd, and that there would be no possibility of the herds passing to the other farm and, of course, no chance of the farmer receiving reciprocal advantages; would not the farmer who was placed in that position consider it a very unjust state of affairs? I do not believe he would tolerate it. With this Canada of ours, with the large imaginary boundary between our country and the large country to the south of us. I believe that we must establish some sort of a treaty, or business arrangement, by which we can have access to the markets of the immense population of that country. Our geographical situation is a unique one. We cannot compare our situation, as has been done by my hon. friends at the other end of the room, with that of the British Empire. Others have tried to compare our situation with that of Australia. While our industries may resemble one another, yet there is this one inevitable reason why we should establish a different national policy; there is our geographical situation. It has been known that the trade of a country can hardly move from east to west, but there is a natural tendency for traffic and immigration to move from north to south. Therefore, all those circumstances have to be overcome and we must adhere to the national policy of the country, a policy such as has been established in Canada.

I desire to crave the indulgence of this House in expressing my view in regard to Canadian sea ports on which I have already made some remarks in connection with the British preference. The hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Kellner) the other day had a dream. He undoubtedly was dreaming about an era of prosperity in Canada, and

in his dream he inquired of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) as to the possibility of opening up new ports in eastern Canada in view of the announcement made in the budget speech. There are times when dreams come true, and if there was the realization of one dream which would be for the benefit of the Canadian nation as a whole, it would be the realization of that part of my hon. friend's dream which conveyed his mind to the Atlantic seaboard of Canada. We have on the Atlantic coast several natural ports awaiting development. We have at the entrance of the Bay of Fundy several ports which are still undeveloped. I was going to dwell quite extensively on those ports; but I was glad when I came to my seat the other day, to find that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Grimmer) had discussed the very point which I had intended to bring before the House. I can assure my hon. friend that I heartily concur in everything he said. The development of ports on both the eastern and the western coasts of Canada should constitute a part of our national policy. There is in my constituency, the constituency of Gloucester one of the finest seaports on the Atlantic, situated as it is at the entrance to the Baie des Chaleurs and at the terminus of the Caraquet railway, a line that is now owned and operated by the state, the harbour of Shippigan offers splendid facilities for development.

Many hon. members have said that the Hudson Bay scheme should be adhered to. While I admit that the accomplishment of this scheme would be to the great benefit of the western farmer, provided always that this scheme could be made feasible, yet I must impress upon this government the importance of giving this matter all due consideration. In view of the fact that it would involve navigation in the icy waters of Hudson bay, I am of opinion that this scheme is too dangerous for our nation to indulge in. If the farmers of the West consider the disadvantages of the Hudson Bay scheme, they will soon find that they have nothing to gain, In the first place I am told that the expenditure of vast sums of money would be required to construct that part of the road which is not yet completed. If we consider the great amount of money which this country would have to invest in the building of such a road; if we reckon the interest on that amount; if we add to this the cost of equipment and maintenance, the cost of improving the harbours in Hudson bay, the extra cost of vessels specially built to navigate the icy waters of Hudson bay, the extra ocean freight rates and—this is a most important item for our friends of the West—the extra insurance which they would have to pay on their shipments; if all these extra costs to be borne by our farmers and the extra expenditure of money which would be necessary on the part of the government are put together and given to the western farmer in the shape of a reduction in freight rates as against the high rates; if the farmers were to consider the expenses of the other route. I believe that, after all, it would be seen that it would pay the wheat grower of western Canada to ship by way of eastern harbours.

Someone may tell us that our harbours cannot handle the western wheat; that the equipment in eastern harbours will be inadequate to handle such immense quantities of wheat. As I have already said, we have on the Atlantic coast numerous harbours which are still undeveloped. Montreal and Quebec already have up-to-date equipment, and during the summer time they can handle a great deal of freight. Halifax and St. John also have splendid facilities for shipment. Why should we plunge into such a scheme as the establishment of a Hudson bay route?—a route, which, after all, could be used for only five or six weeks, possibly two months at the utmost with convenience, and perhaps, in the face of exceedingly uncontrollable difficulties, for three or four months of the year? As against this project, if our eastern harbours are inadequate, we can use some of our undeveloped harbours, and while I am speaking of these harbours, I want to put before this government the advantages offered by the port of Shippigan. In the first place, there would be very little if any construction of new railways; these would only consist of spur lines to deep water terminus. The road is already built and it is operated by the state. Little or no dredging is required. There will be found in that locality plenty of labour at a low rate; the insurance is not high, and this harbour offers the shortest possible route to the European coast.

To show this House that this scheme has been long thought of, I want to read an extract from the report of our famous national engineer Sir Sandford Fleming, a report which dates as far back as 1865 or two years prior to confederation. This report is a fairly lengthy one, and it deals very extensively with the different proposed routes to the European market. As regards the port of Shippigan, Sir Sandford Fleming says in part:

Under these circumstances, it is too apparent that the Intercolonial railway may find in the United States route a formidable rival for Canadian passenger traffic to and from Europe, by way of Halifax.

It will be noted here that at that particular time the question of passenger transportation was one which was receiving the most careful attention of our statesmen, and there was speculation as to whether the port of Halifax would be used, or whether American ports would be resorted to. The report continues:

Fortunately, with a view to counteract this difficulty, a line by the Bay Chaleurs would offer special advantages, which may here be noticed. The chart which accompanies this will show that the entrance to the Bay Chaleurs is so situated, geographically, that while it is about as near Europe as the entrance to Halifax Harbour, it is, at the same time, several hundred miles nearer Montreal and all points west of that city.

Some of the projected lines of railway touch the Bay Chaleurs at Dalhousie and at Bathurst; the latter place is not admitted to be suitable for the purposes of steam navigation, and the former, although in possession of a fine sheet of water, well sheltered and accessible at all conditions of the tide, is, nevertheless, from its position at the extreme westerly end of the Bay, farther inland than might be wished. In order to reduce the steamship passage to a minimum, it is desirable to have the point of embarkation as far easterly as possible, and, therefore, the existence of a commodious harbor near the entrance of the Bay is of no little importance. A place named Shippigan—

It will be recalled that in those days Shippigan was hardly on the map; to-day it is a fishing port with a population of some 5,300 persons.

A place named Shippigan, on the southerly side of the entrance of the Bay Chaleurs, appears to have many of the requisites of a good harbor. It is thus spoken of in the reports on the Sea and River Fisheries of New Brunswick, published under the authority of the legislature of that province.

Great Shippigan Harbor

This spacious harbor is formed between Shippigan and Pooksoudie Island and the mainland. It comprises three large and commodious harbors; first, the great inlet of Lameque, in Shippigan Island, the depth of water into which is from four to six fathoms; second, the extensive and well-sheltered sheet of water called St. Simon's Inlet, the channel leading to which, between Pookshoudie Island and the main is one mile in width, with seven fathoms water from side to side. The principal entrance from the Bay Chaleur has not less than five fathoms on the bar—

I may point out here that this is the only bar at the entrance of Shippigan harbour, at which at low tide there is five fathoms of water. To continue:

The principal entrance from the Bay Chaleurs has not less than five fathoms on the bar, inside which, within the harbor, there are six and seven fathoms, up to the usual loading place in front of Messrs Moore and Harding's steam saw mill at the village; from thence to the gully, there is about three fathoms of water only.

This is a small entrance to the eastern side of Shippigan harbour and it is used only by our fishermen with their small craft. The main entrance is on the western side, leading into the entrance of the Bay of Chaleur.

Vessels within the harbor of Shippigan have good anchorage, are quite safe with every wind, and can load in the strongest gale. The rise and fall of the tide is about seven feet.

"The noble haven called St. Simon's Inlet, the shores of which are almost wholly unsettled and in a wilderness state, runs several miles into the land, maintaining a good depth of water almost to its western extremity.

Duncan McNeil, an old pilot, frequently employed on the government steamers, when calling at New Brunswick ports, describes Shippigan as a good harbor, with plenty of water, regular soundings and tough blue clay holding ground, indeed where vessels would be perfectly secure in any storm. He says that he could take a ship of heavy draught into it in any weather, by night or by day; that in dirty or dark weather, he would go entirely by the lead.

Of course, these are the views of an oldtime mariner and it is not likely that the lead would be used nowadays; they follow gas buoys and other modern signals.

Others describe Shippigan Harbor as unobjectionable. The Admiralty Chart seems to agree in the main with the descriptions above given; it shows that the area of the basin, embracing only the water over the three-fathom line at low tide, is about two and a half square miles; a sheet about double the size of Halifax Harbor between St. George Island and the narrows to Bedford Basin. The only objectionable feature seems to be the channel at the entrance, which is about three miles long, to the basin, a little crooked, and at present without leading marks.

As I have pointed out, the engineers make mention of the eastern entrance, but that is used only by our fishermen.

It is, however, about half a mile in width, free from all obstructions, the depth varying from five to nine fathoms at low water. There is good warning by the lead in the channel and the approaches to it.

It would appear from the above, therefore, that Shippigan Sound presents a favourable opportunity for forming a traffic connection between the Intercolonial Railway and Ocean Steamers.

As to the geographical situation of the harbour, I have already stated that it is situated at the terminus of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway, which now forms a part of the Intercolonial. The distance from Shippigan to Liverpool via Belle Isle is 2,318 miles, whereas the distance from Halifax to the same point by Cape Race is 2,466 miles, or a difference in favour of Shippigan by the Strait of Belle Isle, of more than 148 miles; and via Cape Race from Shippigan, the distance being 2,493 miles, there is a difference of 27 miles in favour of Halifax. As against these ocean distances we find that Shippigan harbour is situated 419 miles from Quebec whereas Halifax is 685 miles from that point, or a difference of 266 miles. The report then goes on to show the distance between Halifax and points west via Bangor, Maine, but I do not

believe that these routes are utilized at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have adopted a national railway policy and I believe that we should observe its real intent and purpose. Our railways cannot be made to pay if they are used to divert traffic to other roads and to foreign ports.

This question of seaports suggests to my mind something else. It has been said that the Fordney-McCumber tariff has rendered the market of some 110,000,000 people inaccessible to our fishermen in regard to many varieties of fish. Furthermore, consequent upon the removal of certain war-time measures, our American friends have closed their ports tight to our fishing vessels, also as a direct result of the Fordney-McCumber tariff our dried fish are excluded from the Porto Rico market. We in the Maritime provinces have some $20,000,000 invested in the fishing industry, and many thousand families depend upon the industry for a livelihood. Our situation is somewhat abnormal at the present time, but if we are to outlive these difficulties we must guard our industries against protected competition. I have no desire to call for drastic measures against our American friends, but I feel that the time is now opportune for the revocation of the modus vivendi which was established in 1880.

Conditions in the Maritime provinces are not perhaps just as we would like them to be to-day. Of course we deprecate irresponsible talk of secession, but, after all, this talk is caused by unrest, and I believe we should adhere, in so far as the status of the Maritime provinces is concerned, to the provisions of the British North America Act; in other words, I believe the terms of confederation should be held sacred in the shrine of this nation. It is only in this way that we can hope to maintain the firmness of our aspirations, the integrity of our manners and customs, and joy and felicity of our social life.

Mr. L. W. HUMPHREY (West Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty to contribute a few remarks to this debate. First, because otherwise I would be remiss in my duty to my constituents; secondly, on account of several questions that have been disposed of by this House and to which I might be considered as tacitly assenting; and thirdly, on account of the geographical position of my constituency, I think a better understanding will result by my bringing to the notice of the House some of the local conditions, and thereby I shall be doing a duty not only to my constituency but to the Dominion at large.

[Mr. Robichaud.]

I wish to associate myself with all the complimentary remarks that have been extended to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). As a young member of this House I can say that he commands the highest esteem and respect of every member, and I trust that he may be long spared to enjoy the comforts and pleasures of this life which he has so well earned and is so abundantly entitled to.

Since becoming a member of this House I have felt that there is perhaps a lack of knowledge in the eastern and central provinces regarding the westerly provinces. I am strongly of opinion that every member should have as intimate a knowledge as possible of the whole Dominion, but particularly of the far westerly provinces, because many times in
5 p.m. the course of debate in this House I have been struck by the fact that some members did not fully understand the conditions that exist in the far West. Perhaps this is because a good many people in the East have not had the opportunity of visiting the West; on the other hand, a large percentage of the population of British Columbia, for instance, is made up of those who originally lived in the East, and through business and holiday trips to their old homes they are fairly conversant with conditions in the other provinces. Therefore, I feel that it is the duty of every representative in this parliament to give the closest personal study to conditions throughout the whole Dominion.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps a few of the remarks I am about to make may be in a somewhat different tone from those of my good friends with whom I am associated, but in what I am going to say I believe I shall express the sentiments of my constituents. I shall speak in a somewhat optimistic vein, but this optimism I hope to demonstrate is well-founded and I trust my remarks will not be considered as in any way too provincial or too sectional. In reviewing for a moment a few of the assets and resources of British Columbia I wish to emphasize their diversity. It has been many times expressed in this corner of the House that the West is entirely a wheat-growing country. This, of course, applies in great measure to the prairie provinces, and while we all recognize the vast importance of the wheat production of the West, we must also realize that the province of British Columbia contributes its share of the national wealth in other forms. We in British Columbia are fully aware of the unsatisfactory conditions existing in Canada to-day, particularly in respect to agriculture, and believing that the producer and the consumer have very much in common, it is the wish of the

people in my constituency to co-operate as far as we possibly can to bring about legislation that will be beneficial to both, and at the same time develop our national resources for the benefit of the Dominion as a whole.

Let me review very briefly some of the assets of the province of British Columbia. We have a wonderful climate, fertile land, minerals, timber and fishing resources, water powers and many other assets that go to make up not only a farming but an industrial province—not forgetting the seaport of Vancouver that is available for shipping the year round. Although the per capita debt is very high I feel sure that 99 per cent of our population are looking forward to the future with every confidence and a spirit of hope, and they are ready and willing to co-operate with the other provinces of the Dominion with a view to making Canada more prosperous and a better country in every way.

I would like to touch on a few features of national legislation. The statement has been made in this House that the British Columbia members are a unit on all questions that arise here pertaining to British Columbia. That is quite true in some cases, but not in all. The one topic on which the members for British Columbia are unanimous is the question of Asiatic immigration, or the exclusion of orientals. This is a question that has already been passed upon by this House, which has given assent to a bill affecting the immigration of Asiatics, and I know that that action will meet with the approval of the people of British Columbia. I believe as do all other British Columbians that it is a step in the right direction, one that will lead eventually to the exclusion of Asiatics.

Before going on to discuss the budget, I should like to refer very briefly to some of the questions that pertain particularly to the province of British Columbia. There have been quite a number of questions discussed in this House and bills passed, and at times it has been impossible for the members from the different provinces to be present in the House and take part in all the discussions. In that way one may perhaps be taken as having given silent assent to the legislation that has been passed and to the disposal of these questions, whereas if one had been in the House he would have been able to explain the position he takes on any question on behalf of the district he represents. British Columbia, particularly the district I represent, is a mountainous country, and our towns and cities and villages are situated at varying altitudes, some as high as five and six thousand feet, others at an altitude of one thousand or twelve hundred feet; but being situated in the heart of the Rockies we are labouring under difficulties that differ from those of other parts of the Dominion, particularly the prairie provinces. For the past few years the federal government have seen fit to give aid to the provinces in the building of highways, the aid being given in proportion to the population of the province. The aid that has been given in that respect has been welcomed by the province of British Columbia. It has been a means of opening up and developing the province, providing better communication perhaps than could be had by railways. It has enabled the province to build highways that will eventually connect up with our national highway. It has been of great advantage to the farming community, and particularly to those settled in the outlying districts. This federal aid has now been eliminated, and I wish to urge upon the government that every consideration possible should be given to assisting the province of British Columbia in this regard. I understand that some provinces have not used up their quota of money provided for this purpose, but British Columbia's quota was used up some time ago, and the federal aid that has been given has proved of great assistance particularly in opening up a southern international road extending to the boundary line and the state of Washington. This was referred to, I believe, last year by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie). In respect to the action taken by the electors in that district I can only say that although the plans and specifications for that particular highway were not sent on to Ottawa in time to receive the federal assistance, nevertheless the province has taken upon itself to go ahead and complete that highway. It is expected to be opened up this year and will connect up with many other roads in that district and provide communication into other parts of the province. While on this point I should like to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for New Westminster in this connection last year. I am sorry he is not in his seat. In his remarks in the budget debate the hon. member for New Westminster referred to certain action taken by the electors of Revelstoke and Nelson and went on to say in Hansard, 1922, p. 2238:

> They absolutely bribed the electors of that country. I do not like to go too far. There are a lot of other things I could say in this connection but I will let things go just as they are as to this particular matter.

I resent those words of the hon. member for New Westminster. As the representative of that district I feel that the electors in the vicinity of Nelson and in the vicinity of

Revelstoke have not at any time been bribed upon any question. I believe they are perfectly capable of judging on the merits of each question as it arises, and that they are competent to judge for themselves. I resent the suggestion of the hon. member that they are capable of being bribed.

I would like to refer for a moment to Bill No. 43, an act to amend the Canada Temperance Act. I wish to dissociate myself from the views expressed upon that question by my hon. friends to my right. I was unable to be present when the discussion on this bill took place, a measure which affects the entire province of British Columbia, but speaking for my own particular district, I believe the people there will commend the action of this House in passing that measure. The people of British Columbia have already decided to place the handling of the liquor question in the hands of the provincial authorities; and the residents of my district, particularly the farmers and labouring classes, feel that any legislation that will assist in curtailing the illegitimate sale of intoxicating liquors will be a step in the right direction.

British Columbia is a young province and its population is, as yet, very small. Therefore I think public sentiment in that province favours a policy of immigration. I can only speak for my own district and public opinion there is in favour of immigration, because in that part of the province there is a great deal of fertile land available for settlement. In that connection I may be asked whether the present condition of the fruit growers of British Columbia is satisfactory. As far as my knowledge goes that condition is not as good as it might be but I believe that matters will right themselves shortly and that the fruit growers will work out a system that will be beneficial to themselves and to the consumers in other parts of the Dominion. In the district which I represent there is an abundance of good land available for settlement, and there are many openings and opportunities for settlers. I should explain that the fruit growers do not confine themselves exclusively to farming or fruit growing but extend their activities in other directions. They will, I think, before long be working under more settled conditions, and a sagacious policy of immigration will be welcomed by them as likely to promote the settlement of the vacant lands and aid in the further development of the province. The machinery necessary is already in existence in the Kootenay district. Railway communication has been provided, there are good opportunities for settlers, and a sane and sound policy of immigration will undoutedly be productive of the best results.

It is unfortunate that in the discussions that have so far taken place here this session no reference, or very little, has been made to questions affecting our returned men. Last session a special committee was appointed by the House to deal with these matters, and I believe such action met with the approval of the country as a whole. During the recess a royal commission was appointed to investigate and report upon many complaints in regard to the treatment of the ex-service men. That commission has reported on certain phases of the inquiry, and has made a number of recommendations. Nevertheless a feeling of dissatisfaction exists throughout the country. I believe the case of the ex-service men should be seriously considered by this House and such action taken as the facts call for. In view of the prevailing discontent in the country, not only on the part of the ex-service men but in the mind of the public as a whole, I deem it desirable to place on record one or two resolutions. I deem this to be only an act of justice to the organizations that have forwarded them. For example I have here a resolution forwarded by The Canadian Legion, Victoria Post, No. 1, Victoria, B. C. which reads as follows:

> Whereas since the sittings of the Royal Commission on Pensions, the Pension Board has, if possible, acted in a more arbitrary and unfair manner than ever before, and whereas many deserving cases have been refused pensions or other relief asked for:
>
> And whereas it is creditably reported that it is the avowed intention of the Pension Board to challenge the report of the Royal Commission;
>
> And whereas such an attitude shows a total failure to appreciate the extent of the wrongs being committed against ex-service men and further is contrary to the spirit and intention of the Pension Act;
>
> Resolved that this meeting of the ex-service men do most strongly resent and protest against the attitude of the Pension Board generally, and more particularly in regard to its avowed intention to challenge the report of the Royal Commission.
>
> Resolved that the protest entered by the secretary of the Dominion Alliance at Ottawa against the present actions of the Pension Board be and is hereby fully endorsed.
>
> Resolved further that in the opinion of this meeting the chairman and members of the Pension Board should resign and persons capable and willing to administer the act fairly and justly be appointed in their place subject to some proper control.
>
> Resolved further that copies of this resolution be sent to the members of parliament for British Columbia at Ottawa, and to all federal cabinet ministers.

The foregoing resolution is dated Victoria, B. C., May 10, 1923. I believe it has been the desire of the people of Canada as a whole that the Pension Commissioners should consider honestly and fairly the cases of ex-service men presented to them and that they

should administer the Pension Act in a fair and equitable manner. From my own observations I conclude the returned men are justified in the protests they are making.

Speaking of those returned men from my own district, they want nothing but what is right and fair; they wish to be re-established under the provisions of the act passed by this parliament and to be given a fair show. But, on the other hand, if we find upon investigation that we have a board of pension commissioners who are not administering that act according to the intention of the members of this House and the members of the different committees that amended the act, I feel that it is the duty of the House to make thorough investigation and take whatever action is necessary to provide a board of pension commissioners that will administer the act honestly, fearlessly and according to the intentions of those who were instrumental in framing that act. I do not bring out that point with the intention of prejudicing the Board of Pension Commissioners, but in a spirit of absolute honesty and sincerity. I bring this point to the notice of the House with the view of impressing it upon the members in such a way that, after the results of this commission are brought to the attention of hon. members, they may understand the seriousness of the question and give it every consideration.

Passing on for a moment to a particular question that appertains to the district I represent, I ask, Mr. Speaker, the privilege of again referring to a sectional point. I wish to commend the government on the action taken in the district I represent in regard to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In the past few months the government has seen fit to withdraw the mounted police from my district, and I believe I am voicing the sentiments of 95 per cent of the people of that district in expressing myself as I do. There have been one or two protests—one particular protest—entered against the action of the government in that connection, and I take this opportunity of explaining the position of the people I represent in that connection. It has only been in the last few years that it has seemed necessary to maintain a force of mounted police in that district. For many years, in fact since confederation, the point of having mounted police in the interior districts was not considered, and it was only within the last few years that they have been established at those points. The people of those districts have always considered, in common with many others throughout the Dominion, that it was an unnecessary expense and an overlapping of service, and that they were absolutely unnecessary. I am glad to see that this government has seen fit to recognize that contention. In that connection I would like to explain my own position and to voice the opinion of those whom I represent in this House. A telegram which was sent by the Board of Trade of Nelson, British Columbia, and was published in the press and otherwise, reads as follows:

> Advised orders have been given to close immediately Nelson office Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and that office now stationed here will be removed. Members of this board strogly protest against proposed action being taken. The Dominion police have rendered excellent service throughout this district. Opening of the international thoroughfare south, increased mining activities and presence of professional agitators make it of great importance that local force be maintained. Trust orders will be rescinded and police retained.

I think it is my duty as the representative of that district to explain to this House and to the government some points in regard to that telegram which was sent to the press. I wish to resent the wording of it, and to state that I am thoroughly in accord with the increased mining activity and the opening of the international thoroughfare south, but I cannot agree—and I think the parties sending the telegram are wrongly advised in so stating—that there are present in the district any professional agitators. I do not know whether the parties sending this telegram were referring to labour or not, but I can honestly say, from my knowledge of that district, being thoroughly acquainted with the conditions as they exist at the present time, that I know of no professional agitators there. As far as the labourers are concerned, there is no better regulated body of men in the Dominion than in that district. We have no labour troubles, and I can sincerely say that I think the country is entirely free from any professional agitators. Being a representative of labour I feel that it is my duty to explain the position.

I would like to refer for a moment to one item in the budget before making my position clear. That is in connection with the action taken by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in regard to providing a cent and a half per pound bounty for copper products. As the minister said in his speech, this bounty will only apply to products of Canadian copper, produced and manufactured in Canada, and to be used in Canada, and is not to apply to copper for export purposes. Having the honour and privilege of representing the district to which this bounty applies, I can say that the residents of the West Kootenay dis-

trict practically depend to a great extent upon their mining. A great deal of the copper that is obtained from the province of British Columbia is refined and turned out from a smelter situated in the district I represent. At the location of this smelter, which is a very large institution employing very close to 2,000 men at the present time, outside of their employees in connection with their different mines and property, there is a small city of nearly 5,000 inhabitants, which is kept up by this concern. I do not wish to go into the principle of providing this bounty, but I wish to point out the facts that have occurred through the action of providing a bounty of one cent and a half upon copper products. In the past few years nearly all of the copper that has been used for the producing of copper rods and wire has been obtained from the United States. The providing of the bounty of one and a half cents a pound on copper products will be the means of opening up, according to reports that I have received since the delivery of this budget, a copper rod mill that has been built in that district at a cost of very close to one half million dollars. It will create employment for from three to five hundred men, and instead of $3,500,000 yearly going to the United States, as it has in the past—and I believe those figures are correct that the Dominion of Canada has sent $3,500,000 to the United States for their copper—the providing of this bounty will keep this money within the Dominion and particularly within British Columbia. The information I have is that within thirty days this rod mill will be operating with the number of men increased to from three to five hundred.

In expressing the views of the constituency which I represent, I can state them only in a spirit of optimism. There exists among the people a willingness to meet the conditions of the future in a spirit of confidence and good will, believing that there is a future for British Columbia. I am well aware that this does not quite meet with the views of the friends on this side with whom I have the privilege of associating, and the people of British Columbia are cognizant that conditions throughout the prairie provinces are not as they should be and not as they would like to see them.

It is only right and fair that I should make my position clear respecting the action taken on this budget. Since becoming a member of this House, I have followed with a great deal of interest the remarks made by the different leaders of our parties and the remarks made by the different individual members as regards platforms. Some have spoken about the platforms that they were elected upon; others have spoken about the platforms that they are standing on. I feel that I would perhaps be slighted or slighting the House if I did not place my platform before hon. members. In that respect, I might say that I was elected a member of this House, not supporting the platform of the Liberal party, not supporting the platform of the Conservative party. I was not elected a member of this House to support the platform of our Progressive friends so far as it pertained to tariff questions. I believe it is only fair to the hon. leader of this party (Mr. Forke) that my position should be made clear. I realized in the past and I realize now very fully the situation which has arisen. The people of my district feel that they have a great deal in common with the members of this party on many questions, but as a member who was elected on a platform which was drawn up as an Independent platform by a joint conference of farmers and labour representatives, a platform which had in it the recall, I believe, together with a plank stating that I could not commit myself to low tariff proposals, under those conditions, and with all respect to the leader of this party, to members of this group and to the House generally, I feel that I can point out the platform on which I was elected and confine myself to it in respect to supporting this budget. As one of the planks of that platform stated that I could not support the hon. leader of this party as respects tariff questions, I cannot support him in respect to this amendment. I feel that this explanation is due to the leader of this party and to the members of this House, and I consequently must govern myself accordingly. As long as I am a member, I shall consider it my duty to follow out the pledges made in that platform as it is practically a platform pertaining to my own election.

Mr. L. J. LOVETT (Digby-Annapolis): Mr. Speaker, representing as I do a constituency in the province of Nova Scotia, adds to my pleasure in associating myself with those who have already taken part in this debate in offering congratulations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on this, his seventeenth budget, and also personally to express the hope that he may be spared to bring down many more budgets in this House.

I think it is a recognized fact that no matter how fair or moderate a budget may be, it will not always meet the wishes or be wholly acceptable to the many diversified interests in this country, nor will it satisfy each and every province in this Dominion. But

speaking generally, I think the people of this country, taking into consideration our present financial condition and the need of revenue, will look upon this budget as one admirably suited to the needs and aspirations of the Canadian people. True it is that Canada for the past few years has been labouring under a period of depression and things are not as we would like to have them. But if we, as loyal Canadian citizens, realizing as we should, the great heritage which is ours, with a country unsurpassed for its great natural resources, with an industrious and, in the main, a frugal people, maintaining and standing steadfast by that spirit of optimism which, I believe, is inherent in the people of Canada, we cannot help but emerge from these trying days of depression into the brighter days of renewed prosperity. If our trade returns are an index—and they certainly are—they indicate that we are again on the eve of more prosperous times. Perhaps prosperity will not blossom forth in a day; and better not, for if it comes gradually, we can congratulate ourselves that we are on solid ground, that we are not building on an artificial foundation which would destroy stability, but that we are laying the stable foundation for enduring national prosperity.

As I have already said, I believe this budget will be generally acceptable to the people of this country. If I had any criticism to offer, it would be a desire for further downward revision; but taking into consideraion the present financial condition of this country and the need of revenue, I fear such a step at this time would be attended by very grave consequences. I believe, Sir, one should consider all matters from the broadest possible viewpoint, not seeking to force his individual opinion in direct conflict to those whose wisdom, experience and legislative ability have made Canada what she is, but more in the spirit of suggestion, with a mind open to conviction, to the opinions of those who have had wider experience in guiding our national affairs. I do not wish it to be understood that one should sink his own individual opinions on any great national question; not at all I am only trying to convey the thought that our individual beliefs and opinions should not be adamant, but should be amenable to the arguments of those who, as I have said before, have had wider experience.

The member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) during the course of his remarks a few days ago, suggested the reduction of the postage rate as it affected British mails, and with that suggestion I am heartily in accord. But I would go further. I believe that a return to the old 2 cent postage rate under the Laurier regime would find favour with the mass of the Canadian people. It may be thought that this reduction would seriously interfere with the revenue of the Post Office Department. But when we take into consideration the surpluses under the 2 cent rate of the Laurier administration and contrast them with the deficits of the 3 cent rate under Conservative rule we are bound to conclude that the reduction in the rate would not lessen the revenue but would on the contrary augment it through an increased volume of business. Let me illustrate. Many business concerns in this country, and in fact the people generally, would use the mails to a greater extent if the rates were reduced. A prominent business man who was in the habit of sending 40,000 letters to his customers annually informs me that he had abandoned the practice and was now reaching his patrons through other channels than the mails. I imagine that there are many other large business concerns that are doing the same thing. Can we not logically conclude that the reduction of the postage rate to 2 cents would at least not impair the revenue, while it would relieve the people of this country of a tax that bears equally on poor and rich? I would submit this matter to the government for their careful consideration.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak for a few moments in reference to the fisheries of the Maritime provinces, more particularly as they affect my constituency. At the same time I would take this opportunity of paying a tribute to the fishermen of that part of our Dominion who have proved themselves heroes in contributing a large share to the wealth of this country. We whose activities are confined to the land do not stop to realize what the fisherman endures in his hazardous and perilous calling. Day and night alike he has to venture forth to earn his bread, a prey to sudden storms which threaten life and property. But even all these difficulties and obstacles which he encounters cannot daunt that splendid courage and pluck which these people possess. Therefore, if there is any class of the people in Canada that deserves consideration and concessions of a government, it is the fishermen of the Maritime provinces. Never during forty years Mr. Speaker have the fishermen of the Maritime provinces encountered such extreme weather and ice conditions as they have done in the past year. Loss of gear and lack of fishing opportunities have put these men deep in debt; as they often buy their outfits on credit and this handicaps them for the following season. Impaired credit and loss of gear is

a deadly combination, and it has placed the fishermen of the Maritime provinces in serious financial straits. Surely some relief must be afforded these men. I therefore strongly urge upon the government not only the desirability but the necessity of granting the fishermen of the Maritime provinces a reduced freight rate in order that they may place their products in the markets of central Canada at a fair and reasonable profit. Why should the farmers of the West be granted reduced freight rates on wheat, which is not a perishable product, and the farmers and fishermen of the Maritime provinces be refused the same privilege, when their products are in the main of a perishable nature? Fuel, we find, has been granted a reduced freight rate, and with this I have no fault to find. But why should not the fishermen and the farmers of the Maritime provinces receive a like privilege? Surely whatever loss might be incurred by the reduction of their freight rates would be more than compensated for by an increased volume of business. Then again as has been alluded to before in the debate, the fishermen of the Maritime provinces are denied through the Fordney tariff the privilege of the United States market, which is their natural market. This increases the necessity of access to the central markets of Canada, and if they are not available these men will have to find a different means of livelihood, and the industry, one of Canada's greatest assets, will languish. I am trying to place before the government the facts as they actually exist. I do not want to leave the impression that the fishermen and farmers of the Maritime provinces are a lot of professional mourners like the farmers of the prairies. They recognize adverse conditions and ask for amelioration, but they go their way with courage and with an abiding faith in the future prosperity of this Dominion.

I want at this point to commend the provisions of the budget which permit free entry into Canada of machinery for the manufacture of fish waste into fertilizer and other products. This opens up a new avenue of profit to the fishermen; it provides for the establishment of new industries and the employment of more men—much desired results. I also strongly commend the reciprocity offer to the United States as embodied in the budget.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LOVETT: Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned at six o'clock, I had finished presenting the claims of the fishermen of the Maritime provinces for amelioration of their financial difficulties, and I urged upon the government reduced freight rates for their products in the central markets of Canada.

We people of the Maritime provinces are still optimistic concerning Canada's future and have no use for a pessimist—he is a blot on the landscape. I believe the spirit of pessimism that has been poured forth by the farmers of the prairies during this session has had the effect of seriously discounting Canada's resources in the eyes of the world, and defeating the objective which is of paramount importance to this Dominion—the attraction of desirable settlers. I am afraid, Sir, that Canada's enemies are as much within as without, none the less harmful because the damage done is not intentional. What is the use of our immigration department embarking on an immigration policy which holds out strong inducements to prospective settlers if those now living in that section of the Dominion most widely recommended to these settlers, the great Canadian West, is described by those already in possession of the land of promise as "the unhappy dwelling-place of the impoverished farmers" who "refuse to see the sunshine because it does not shine down in every way and every day on every blessed one of them." I fear it will take a long and expensive advertising campaign to reassure prospective settlers and offset the complaints that have been voiced in this House.

A number of criticisms of the budget have been voiced in the press. I shall refer to only two, one credited to the leader of the Progressive party in this House (Mr. Forke) and the other to Mr. H. W. Wood, president of the United Farmers of Alberta. The Ottawa Citizen of May 12 last contains the following:

> Robert Forke, Progressive leader, questioned by a Canadian Press representative last night, declared that Progressives did not consider the budget satisfactory. "I do not think," he said, "that the tariff changes in the budget will be of any benefit to western farmers. Furthermore, the finality of the reductions as announced in the budget speech was extremely disappointing."

In the Ottawa Journal of the same date the following appeared:

> Head of Alberta Farmers thinks Budget good one. Pleased With the Reference Made by Mr. Fielding to Reciprocity
>
> Says removal of tariff would be great boon.
>
> United States the logical market for cattle from Canada. Canadian Press by direct wire
>
> Calgary, Alta., May 12.—General satisfaction with the 1923 budget brought down in the House of Commons yesterday by W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance, was expressed by H. W. Wood, president of the United Farmers of Alberta, in an interview here last night.

Looks pretty good to him

"It looks pretty good on the face of it, although I have not studied it carefully," Mr. Wood said. "I don't see anything the matter with it and, speaking generally, I am satisfied with the budget; it appears reasonable.

"I am pleased to note the first step towards reciprocity with the United States, which was mentioned by Mr. Fielding in his budget speech," the Alberta farmer leader said. "The removal of the tariff would be the greatest thing that ever happened to Canada, in my opinion, and I wish heartily to commend Mr. Fielding on this step that has been taken.

The logical market

"I believe it would be more important and would have better results on the prosperity of the west as a whole to have the tariff on cattle removed rather than the tariff on wheat, for instance. The United States is our logical market; she is in a position to import our product.

"The United States grows wheat for export. On the other hand, I observe that there is a decided movement among farmers of the United States to obtain the removal of the tariff on cattle, for this would be of mutual benefit to both countries.

"However, it will come ultimately," Mr. Wood concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I have given you the views of the hon. leader of the Progressive party as outlined in the press, declaring his and also his followers dissatisfaction with the present budget; and this dissatisfaction has been further emphasized in the amendment which he has placed before this House. I have also quoted the views of Mr. H. W. Wood, president of the United Farmers of Alberta, which are exactly opposite to those expressed by the hon. leader of the Progressive party. Their respective views clearly indicate the divergency of opinion in western Canada regarding the budget.

I would ask my Progressive friends, particularly those from the province of Alberta, how they can support the amendment of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) against the opinion of their constituents as voiced by Mr. Wood, who presumably voices the opinion of one wing at least of the western Progressive party. If by supporting the amendment of the leader of the Progressive party they condemn the budget which has been declared by Mr. Wood as generally satisfactory, will they not incur the danger of a sharp reprimand from their constituents?—a reprimand which may focus its force in defeat when next they face the electorate? Is it not well to remember that we as elected representatives of the people are not here to voice our own personal views, but to present and urge the viewpoint of our constituents? For we should always consider ourselves servants, and not in any sense masters. It will be extremely interesting indeed to watch which horn of the dilemma our Alberta friends will take, whether they will follow the Progressive leader of this House, who expects the millennium at once, or the saner opinion of Mr. Wood, a man who recognizes that changes must come gradually and appreciates all efforts in that direction. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the present government is doing everything possible in the interest of agriculture, particularly as it affects western Canada, without discriminating against other business interests, and yet in spite of the concessions made the attitude of our Progressive friends in this House is one of rank ingratitude, an ingratitude crueller than a serpent's tooth.

As to the criticisms made of the budget by the official opposition, they are undoubtedly within their rights as are all others, but as yet they have not made much headway. Fair and honest criticism is always appreciated, but when they undertake to play politics and descend to carping criticism and insinuations they will not find favour with the people of this country, who have an abiding faith in the masterly ability of the present Minister of Finance, and feel assured that he is the man who will eventually place Canada on her feet financially and restore the prosperity of days gone by.

There is one matter that I hoped the government would treat in a more comprehensive and direct way than is indicated in the budget. I allude to forest conservation. To realize as we must from the exhaustive and conclusive data placed before the government and every member of this House that the great wealth of our forests is fast being dissipated through fire, insect pests, destructive lumbering and the exportation of large quantities of raw forest products, and that the time has arrived when positive steps must be taken or this great source of our wealth and national credit will be a thing of the past. True it is that both the Dominion and provincial governments are doing a wonderful work in extensive and improved methods of forest fire prevention and protection, but in spite of this thousands and thousands of acres of our best timber are being destroyed annually until we have reached the stage when it is incumbent upon the Canadian government, for they are the custodians of Canadian interests to realize that a further depletion of our forests from these causes I have already named will leave us barren of what was a great national inheritance. No matter what precautions are taken in regard to forest fire prevention and protection we can never entirely eliminate this great menace, and it is a drain on our forest areas that will have to be reckoned with for

all time to come, and must be recognized as a constant factor in forest depletion.

It is a well-known fact that the United States has reached the stage where she has no longer sufficient pulpwood to supply her own demands An American forestry expert states as a positive fact that in ten years or less the great American pulp and paper plants will have to remove to Canada or else go out of business. Canada's forests are being robbed of thirty-five million trees annually in the export pulp trade, fifty per cent of which goes to the United States. American operators are already buying up our timber limits, corralling our supplies of pulp, and shipping them to their own mills there to be manufactured into the finished product, giving employment to their own workmen, and thus conserving their forest reserves. In proportion our Canadian workmen are deprived of employment. Our existing mills are feeling keenly the pinch of market competition in buying wood, and culminating disaster of all, our forest reserves are being rapidly depleted. I ask you, is this good business?

Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact that you cannot build up a country if you allow her raw material to be shipped to a foreign country there to be manufactured into the finished products. It is not a narrow or selfish policy to restrict and conserve the use of our raw products to the upbuilding of our own industries and the employment of our own workmen, and I would earnestly urge the government to apply this policy of restricted export of pulpwood before our sources of supplies are further depleted. I know of no greater work that can be done to sustain the future financial credit of Canada than that which Mr. F. J. D. Barnjum, the apostle of forest conservation, is doing to-day. He is unsparingly devoting his wealth, his energy and his great business ability to the task of arousing the Canadian people to a recognition of the great forest wealth which is theirs—but which, alas, they are allowing to slip from their grasp. He is a prophet whose warning voice should be heeded, or Canadians unborn, and even those of this generation, will have to mourn the loss of one great source of wealth—the forests of Canada. It has been truly said, Mr. Speaker, "that every square mile of forest in the Dominion is an incubator of new industries, and new population. To kill the forest is to strike a death blow at our future development." I would earnestly and respectfully urge the government to take a more direct and quicker method for immediate conservation than that foreshadowed in the budget by the proposed commission.

I am concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, without specially referring to many outstanding economically beneficial provisions of the budget such as the reduction of the stamp tax, the bounties to encourage struggling industries and the admission of free machinery to encourage the establishment of new ones, the reduction in sugar duty, the improved form of collecting the sales tax, increasing the British preference and the effort to divert more trade to Canadian ports, and the holding out of the open hand for reciprocity with the United States. I do not do so because these things have already been discussed before the House. The budget, I believe, is a credit to the financial genius who produced it, who was evidently guided in its framing by a stern sense of justice to all classes and conditions of Canadians and to Canada's present financial requirements.

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John City and Counties of St. John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I desire to take the opportunity of discussing some of the subjects that have been raised during the debate on the budget, and first I will refer to the subject of the British preference. The Minister of Finance proposes that there be a 10 per cent discount allowed on duty payable under the preference. There are two important qualifications of this reduction, one being that it shall not apply in the case of articles when the duty is not above 15 per cent and the other that the discount shall only apply when goods are brought to Canadian ports. To effect this change it is proposed that the customs tariff of 1907 be amended by repealing section 5. What is section 5 of the customs tariff? It reads in this way:

Preference to Canadian ports

On and after a date to be named by the Governor in Council, in a proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, the British preferential tariff shall apply only to goods brought into Canada by ship direct to a Canadian seaport.

The customs tariff was introduced by the present Minister of Finance in 1907, and section 5 was placed therein to enable the preference to apply only to Canadian seaports by order in council at any subsequent date. Section 5 has remained in the customs tariff for sixteen years without action having been taken upon it by any government until the past few days. The subject has frequently been discussed in parliament and out of parliament. Much public opinion has been expressed in its favour, and only last year a resolution was brought forward by the hon. member for

Cumberland (Mr. Logan) urging that the provisions as contained in the section be brought into effect. What has happened? The proposed resolution restricts materially the powers made available under the present section. The British preference will still apply to goods brought through all ports but when they are passed directly through Canadian seaports they will have a 10 per cent discount if the duty exceeds 15 per cent. The essence of section 5 was the preference to Canadian ports, and the British preference would apply only when trade is through these ports. The proposed resolution, therefore, is a shadow of the ideal as presented in the customs tariff of 1907. But the minister has done something. No doubt he did the best he could. He has given vitality to the principle. Credit is cheerfully given him for what should be regarded as a very important step. And the consequences will be very considerable. No loss will be sustained by the country. Indeed, the increase to trade through our ports and over our railways will be found to be a gain. One looks forward to the time when the British preference will apply only when Canadian ports are used, and then the whole country will obtain the full benefit. It is more than a party matter; the principle which is involved is a national one. So far as the principle of preferential trade, as contained in the resolution to be brought down, is concerned it will receive my support. It is fair to recognize that the severely criticized French treaty has a bright spot, in that it shall only apply when Canadian ports are used, and that will also include all favoured nations availing themselves of its provisions. The minister has stated that it will also apply to the Italian treaty, and while I trust it is a correct interpretation I do not feel fully convinced of this. The Chairman of the National Railway Board recently said:

> The truth is that we have too much mileage and not enough traffic, and that is what is wrong with the C.N.R.

Very well, the mileage may not be easily diminished, but the traffic can and should be increased. The British preference amendments will help to give it; the treaties which were just referred to will help to give it; the bringing of coal from east and west to central Canada would help to give it; the shipping of grain and goods over Canadian railways and through Canadian ports will give it. For the seven months ending March 31, of this year there were over 130,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain shipped overseas via United States seaports while 38,000,000 bushels of American grain went through Canadian ports. Whether or not the government puts forward a general policy regarding transportation there will still remain the obligations regarding Canadian transportation taken over with the railways and they will need to be observed.

On the entrance to this building the words are carved:

> The wholesome sea is at her gates.
> Her gates both East and West.

Gates which are wide open and ready to pass trade in increasing amounts outwards and inwards to the enormous advantage of our transportation service and our country. One may well exclaim "Wake up, Canada!".

In reference to the subject of petroleum bounties it is proposed to amend the Petroleum Bounty Act of 1909 by providing that the bounty shall be payable only on crude petroleum now produced in Canada and that it shall apply at the present rate for one year. The next year it will be reduced one-half, and the following year cease. I have a telegram from the manager of the New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields which says:—

> With reference to Finance Minister's proposal pay present bounties crude oil during this year, only cutting it in half next year, and thereafter discontinuing altogether urge you oppose this measure to the utmost as calculated to strangle the industry in Canada unless an equal or heavier tariff is imposed on all importation.

It may be wise to make provision in the event of large developments of oil wells as is proposed by the minister, so that enormous bounties would not be entailed. But this large development of oil wells has not yet happened, and in the meantime the prosperity of the oil industries now being operated will be seriously affected, and I urge upon the minister the propriety of extending this bounty as now proposed over a considerably longer period.

The subject of immigration has already been fully discussed during the present session, but I would again wish to emphasize that the immigration policy should be more comprehensive and more fully organized. The important officials in Great Britain should certainly be representative of different parts of the Dominion. I have an article which recently appeared in the public press calling attention to a report in the Isle of Man Weekly Times of an address on Canada delivered by Mr. F. W. Kerr, immigration official of the Dominion government. The article says:

> The chairman of the meeting, which was very largely attended, was the Governor General of the island and the most important part of the whole address, so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned because of the effect which it would have on the audience

among which were many prospective immigrants, is that the lecturer started at Quebec and went westward. So far as he was concerned, the Maritime provinces did not exist, and he left with that audience a wrong impression of Canada. At the conclusion of the address a show of hands was called of all those that had relations in Canada and the result shows that fully one-third of the large audience had relatives in this country. Yet there is one Manxman in New Brunswick, and little wonder when the immigration agents of our country, whose salaries we help to pay, not only ignore our province, but described Canada as a place in which New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have no existence.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is the name of the person who made that statement?

Mr. MacLAREN: I am quoting from the Daily Journal of St. John. The name of the official is Mr. F. W. Kerr. The article goes on to say in reference to these Manxmen:

But they are told nothing of these provinces. Most of these prospective immigrants, who are just the kind of stock these provinces need, are hustled off to the West. The Maritime provinces should demand some explanation when a federal immigration official describes Canada by beginning at Quebec, as the report says he does.

Then the report goes on to describe a series of pictures which were shown of Niagara Falls and the Rocky Mountains and other thrilling scenery of the Dominion. Would it not be well to get down to some commonsense treatment of the subject and give information suitable for immigrants?

Mr. COOTE: I did not catch the title of the article. I wondered whether the literature was designed to attract tourists or immigrants.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am referring to an account of a large meeting held in the Isle of Man, at which meeting the Governor of that island presided, and the paragraph that I have partly read gives an account of the meeting. He describes Canada by beginning at Quebec and going west, and he gives beautiful pictures of Niagara Falls and the Rocky mountains as well as a description of the prairies and the West. The comment is that he has made no reference to the Maritime section of the country which was regarded as particularly important, in view of the class of immigrants which we might obtain from the isle of Man, such as men who are accustomed to small farming and fishing. My question was: Would it not be as well to come down to some commonsense treatment of such a subject and give to the immigrants information bearing on the occupation of suitable portions of the Dominion?

Recently a considerable number of people from the Hebrides have been brought to Ontario and one of the prairie provinces. They are a most suitable class of immigrants and will no doubt be successful wherever their lot falls. They are a sturdy, frugal and industrious people who have been engaged in mixed farming and sea fishing. The salt air is the breath of their life and the roar of the sea is music to their souls, a class preeminently suited by their heredity and environment for settlement on the sea coast. A familiar poem speaks of the Hebrideans who previously came to Canada in this way:

From the lone shieling of the misty island
Mountains divide us, and the waste of seas—
Yet still the blood is strong, the heart is Highland,
And we in dreams behold the Hebrides:
Fair these broad meads—these hoary woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our fathers' land.

Those who might dwell at the sea coast would not only behold the Hebrides in their dreams but might see something like them in their daily life.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): There are plenty of them in this House. I am one of them.

Mr. MacLAREN: While it may not be possible in some cases to place immigrants in Canada in surroundings similar to those they have lived in, it is submitted that this should be kept in view in determining our immigration policy.

The proposal to organize certain naval units throughout the interior of the country, however novel and weird it may be, I trust will not be regarded as a precedent in our reversing the order of nature, but let us have the people placed, as far as practicable, in surroundings suitable for them.

With reference to forest conservation, it is noted that it is proposed that a commission shall investigate the subject of the exportation of pulp-wood. Let me urge that the matter be dealt with promptly, for, whether an embargo be placed upon pulp-wood or an export tax, the government has a powerful instrument in its hands to benefit the country, and I trust will exercise it. Forest conservation is now becoming of increased importance, and as it largely lies within provincial management, there is difficulty in obtaining general or concerted action regarding the many forestry problems. I would think that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) might well constitute himself convener on the subject of forest conservation, and so facilitate general conference and co-operation amongst provincial authorities.

A favourite subject of exhortation, but an unpopular one, is economy. We shall all agree that a very large sum is required to be

spent to meet our obligations; but it is not agreed that so much money should be spent as is now being done. I do not think the general opinion of the House is that economy is being practised in a way that our present position demands. There is no evidence of a firm grasp being taken by the government to exercise economy. I do not mean economy that would interfere with or retard trade and the vital needs of the country; but surely non-essentials might be controlled or delayed. The civil government is so top-heavy that it needs revision and curtailment. Works of doubtful or problematical character, such as the Hudson Bay railway, might be deferred for an indefinite period. I do not suggest that the budget should have been balanced this year, but I do say that it should have been more nearly balanced than it is. I believe the feeling of the country is that economy should receive at the hands of the government greater attention than is now the case. Let the government put as much effort in controlling expenditure as is now exerted in raising revenue, and then a substantial improvement in the finances of the country will be obtained.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish with other members who have preceded me, to tender my hearty congratulations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who has brought his seventeenth budget into the House. I am minded to say that I believe just as great congratulation would be tendered to the hon. gentleman if he were now bringing in his fifteenth budget, for to me, and I believe to the majority of the members in this corner of the House, the last two budgets were a disappointment. I sincerely believe that, and I also sincerely believe that ninety per cent of the people in the country consider this budget and the last budget to have been disappointing, more particularly when they have in mind the great promises given to them in 1919 as laid down in the Liberal platform. I have been somewhat amused when my mind has gone back to the old House, that is, the House at the time of Union government, when our worthy friends who now occupy the treasury benches sat in opposition, and I have recollected the words of fire which emanated from them in denunciation of all and sundry things that the Union government did at that time, the promises, tentative and otherwise, that were held out and the predictions as to the benefits that would come to the people of Canada if they would only again repose power in the Liberal party.

We have now had for two years an opportunity of reviewing what these hon. gentlemen have done for the country since the people reposed confidence in them in 1921. Whether or not we are justified in looking back over history, back as far as 1896, perhaps, when my first recollection of political things in this country took form, I recollect very well the campaign that was carried on prior to 1896, the victory that was achieved by the Liberal party at that time, and the promises by which they achieved that victory. There is a great similarity between the tariff proposals then and the tariff proposals placed in the tariff platform of 1919. Very positive is it in the minds of the people who remember those incidents, that the tariff proposals of the Liberal party in 1896 were not carried into effect as was promised by the politicians of that date. According to the record of the last two budgets and according to the speeches that were delivered last year and those that have been delivered this year by hon. members opposite, which speeches, I must say, appear to me to be only apologies for their not putting into practice the policies which they presented to the country, we are right in assuming that it is their purpose to go back all the time on their pledges as regards the tariff planks in their platform.

I recall the elections of 1904 and 1908 when our western country was being opened up and the railway policies were dangled before the people of Canada, so that they in a measure might forget the action of the party after the election in 1896. Then we had the platform of 1911 containing what was known as the offer of reciprocity with the United States, and the Liberal party at that time had hopes that the people of Canada had forgotten. Evidently—and I point this out—although it has been said a thousand times in this House that the people of Canada repudiated reciprocity at that time, what happened is not, to my mind, any proof that reciprocity was the real cause of the defeat of the Liberal party in 1911; but most people who remembered that the Liberal party had gone back on their promises of 1896, took that opportunity of telling that party that they did not believe in the pledges they were making. The only recourse that the people of Canada had then was to place in power the Conservative party, which had been defeated in 1896 upon its tariff policy. In 1914, the war broke out, and for some years political conditions were disturbed. But again, in 1921, the people were appealed to upon practically the old platform of 1896, and by a very slender majority they said: "Yes, we will endorse

the Liberal party in regard to that platform." In the meantime, however, a large faction had been created in Canada who really believed that the Liberal party was not constituted so that it could carry out the pledges of the platform laid down in 1919. Again I say that the last two budgets and the apologetic speeches made by the members of the government prove conclusively that those who believed the Liberal party would not carry the pledges of 1919 into execution, were justified, and I cite that as a reason why there are to be found at the present time sixty-four or sixty-five members in this part of the House.

Reciprocity is again held out in the budget speech of to-day as a reason why the Liberal party should be perpetuated in power. To me, reciprocity is a fetish. I supported reciprocity in 1911, and if the day ever should arrive when I have again an opportunity of supporting reciprocity, I promise now that I shall be quite prepared to do so. But in the meantime there is no excuse for the government to hide behind the fetish of reciprocity, and to let the things which pertain to-day go unchallenged and unwarranted. Every government speaker in this debate has been telling the people who live in the West and, indeed, people throughout Canada who have been proclaiming the truth with regard to agriculture, that we should hide the truth; that we are pessimists and so on. I maintain that if we are ever going to have a Canada worthy of the name, we must tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and let the people judge for themselves. When we tell the truth, we wish to be heard, and to have remedies applied to the evils of which we complain.

I have often thought, as I have sat in my place in this House and listened to the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, whether any of those speeches were in evidence when their platform was made in August, 1919. That was the year after the close of the war, and surely at that time hon. gentlemen opposite must have been perfectly aware of the fact that we were overburdened with a debt. They knew very well that if they were returned to power they would have to find the ways and means of meeting that debt. And in the face of that certain knowledge, what did they do? They gave us to understand that they would eliminate the tariff upon the implements of production immediately. That was one of the first things that they promised to do; they preached it incessantly throughout the West, and during the campaign of 1921 they emphasized the pledge that by this means they were going to bring relief to those who were suffering from an unjust burden. All hon. gentlemen opposite who campaigned in the West were very positive in this regard, but we had particularly a strenuous champion in that part of the country. The people of the West desired the reduction on these implements, because it was their belief then, as it is now, that the tariff in this respect weighs heavily upon every individual who lives in that part of the Dominion. So that when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) made great promises of what his party would do in this matter, the people naturally listened with great attention to what he had to say.

I have many extracts from the hon. gentleman's utterances in the West; we all listened to the speeches he made in western Canada, in which he told us of what would be done when he came to Ottawa. Why, Mr. Speaker, we were led to believe, from the hon. minister's statements, that the tariff would disappear practically overnight. Yes, Sir, the Hon. Frank Carvell's scalp was to be put into his belt in a very short time. But we have not seen any results since the hon. gentleman came here. The other night, however, speaking in this debate he took the opportunity to give the Progressives in this part of the House a severe lecture, the while admitting that in 1901 he was going up and down the province of Saskatchewan, protesting against the enormities that were being practised to the detriment of agriculture. The hon. gentleman would have the House and the country believe, I suppose, that all those evils of which he complained so strenuously in those days are now utterly eliminated. He deplored the fact also that while he had entered the field of politics the present member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Hopkins), whom he mentioned as one of his colleagues in the early days, had no right to do likewise nor refer to the difficulties under which the western agriculturist labours. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that while I was not working exactly in his company at that time, I likewise was working in the interests of agriculture, while thousands of others were doing their utmost, in their own small way, to try to bring to the powers of the day the disadvantages against which we were protesting. Those disadvantages to-day are as acute as they were at that time and I think it would be very much better for the Minister of Agriculture to stand up in his place to-day and endeavour, with us, to fight

those evils against which he spoke in those days, and try to have adequate remedies provided, rather than get up and give curtain lectures to the Progressives who are honestly trying to remove the evils that are complained of.

I would ask the Minister of Agriculture, in all seriousness, this question: Would the farmers, in the province of Saskatchewan, say, complain of the conditions to which reference has so frequently been made if those conditions did not in fact exist? The Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan has stated that 261 municipalities, according to the returns for the year 1922, showed an average tax deficit of $33 per quarter section. I stated the other night that it was $37; it should be $33. The same gentleman in giving evidence before the Agricultural committee last year stated that $90 was the average tax on a half section of land, which would be $45 per quarter section. This year he states that the sum of $33 out of that $45 is in arrears. I ask all hon. members, therefore, would any agriculturists in Canada, either in the West or in the East, desire to have a tax record against them such as that if the conditions did not warrant it? In the past, when we had the means of preventing such a thing, it never occurred. But these conditions are forced upon us, and when hon. gentlemen get up in this House and presume to lecture the representatives in parliament of the people of the West on account of circumstances such as these, they are, to say the least, speaking without any knowledge of the facts.

We are told to work a little harder and to go more into the raising of stock; hon. gentlemen kindly advise us to take up mixed farming and to do various other things. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is very kind of them indeed; but really, a man does not need to be told this sort of thing. I listened the other day to a lecture of this kind from the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) who comes from a province where the rainfall is 112 inches per annum. If he came to Saskatchewan and visited the district in which I live, I think he would have reason to modify his remarks somewhat, for in the past ten years we have not had much greater precipitation than 10 inches per annum. We have not had enough water to water our cattle, and I have been in such straits many a time; on two occa-

9 p.m. sions I was obliged to sell the whole herd of cattle because I could not find water to water them; and I had to sell at a sacrifice at that. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to tell us these things, but I think that we know best, who live in that part of the country, just the conditions that prevail there. We do not need to be told, either, what it is best for us to do. Under the conditions that we have to cope with, wheat growing must be the bulwark of our activities until such time as we can find enough water to ensure the profitable raising of cattle.

I have figures compiled by a statistician which show that there is nothing the matter with the West so far as the producing of wealth is concerned. A comparison of the exports of the various countries of the world for the year 1922 will reveal the fact that Canada exceeded by a considerable sum any other exporting nation. The nearest to the Canadian exporters were those of the United States; the figures in relation to that country showed a per capita export of $65, while it was $98 in the case of Great Britain, and $150 in the case of this country. Why do hon. gentlemen stand up and tell us to work harder and save more? What possible ground have they for abusing us and concluding offhand that we have been indulging in extravagant expenditures? Let me emphatically assure this House that this is absolutely not so. I may tell hon. gentlemen here that I know a man in my district who some years ago had thousands of dollars in the bank, but who last year was compelled to borrow money from the banks, although his land and everything was clear. These conditions have been getting worse and worse gradually, and if matters do not improve in the very near future I am not prepared to predict what the outcome will be. Certain it is that when hon. gentlemen stand up and undertake to lecture us, notwithstanding that we tell the positive, the plain and the simple truth, their attitude is not likely to appease our minds or to produce that manner in us which gentlemen would like to display.

Mr. PUTNAM: The hon. gentleman gave certain per capita exports; were they the total per capita?

Mr. GOULD: Yes. The Minister of Agriculture informed the House that he had kept certain notes of some of the remarks that he had made at Regina . I want to tell the hon. gentleman that some one else has been keeping track of his remarks as well, and I wish to give two citations to prove this. I regret that the minister is not in his place to-night, although I am quite sure that he knows that I would say the same things in his presence. I have done so before and possibly may have occasion to do so again. In Prince Albert on November 2, 1921, the hon. gentleman stated:

It is contended by the Farmers' party that the eastern Liberals will make it impossible to carry out their tariff platform.

Well, who was right? Why, the Farmers, absolutely. Has it not been proven by the past two budget speeches that the Farmers are absolutely right. But here is another extract from the hon. gentleman's remarks. The Regina Leader of December 2, 1921, quotes the minister as follows:

There is one outstanding question upon which I feel I should insist, and that is a substantial removal of the burdens and iniquities of the present protective fiscal policy that has been crushing the life out of western agriculture and conditions generally for so many years.

All this is very nice, you know, and it goes well on the platform; but hon. gentlemen who heard the minister the other night, as he stood in his place and lectured the Progressives, noted very well that his remarks then did not accord with what he said out in the West in 1921, and there was absolutely no fight in him to uphold the convictions he then expressed. Oh no; instead of fighting for western agriculture he rather undertook to give us of the West a curtain lecture, notwithstanding that we are proclaiming in this House the very same things that the hon. gentleman so fervently put forward himself out in the West.

The hon. gentleman has achieved the position which he sought, that of Minister of Agriculture, and it is my opinion that since receiving his portfolio he has forgotten the people back home, he is not fighting their battles as we know he was capable of fighting them in the past twenty-five years in western Canada. I was going to make further references to the hon. minister about a certain by-election in 1919, of a personal acquaintance I had with him on that occasion, but I do not wish to go into it now.

But we know what is the matter with agriculture—there are too many combines, which are a law unto themselves in taking whatever toll they choose. A report was laid on the Table a few days ago as a result of the investigation of our charges that a huge combine existed to keep up lake freights. I do not wish to discuss that report, but I am sure hon. gentlemen who have read their newspapers lately will agree with me that we in this corner of the House were justified in making those charges. Those unduly high lake freights were taken out of the western farmers. And yet when we protest against this and similar injustice we are called alarmists and pessimists.

From 1912 to 1917 we had a somewhat similar condition in regard to our terminal elevators. The matter was investigated by Price, Waterhouse & Company and reported upon. Why that report was not published I do not know. In this connection I was very pleased this afternoon that the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) urged that the report laid on the table with respect to the lake shipping combine should be printed and published. The people who have been filched of their hard-earned coin by this and other heartless combines should be given an opportunity to study such reports. Then I am sure the efforts that have been made by us in this corner of the House to portray the actual conditions will be supplemented a hundredfold by the public. I have been studying the Price Waterhouse report and from the computations I have already made—and these are not final—I find twelve terminal companies showed a profit of $15,003,265. Remember, this was over and above the huge salaries paid their executives and over and above all expenses except the business profits tax which was then in force. At the present time we have twenty-five terminal companies, and so far as I have studied the figures they disclose a profit of $7,217,503.20. We have protested against these huge profits and have received a promise from the government to appoint a commission to look into this and cognate matters. It is the exactions of these combines which have caused the western members to stand in their places here and protest. As I have said before on many occasions, these combines are a law unto themselves to extract for their own benefit whatever proportion of the wealth of the country is created by the farmers and other producers, and yet our governments, both past and present, sit idly by and will not take these exorbitant profits from their hands.

There is another point which occurs to me in connection with the Price Waterhouse report, but I want to refer particularly in passing to an address made the other night by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault), when he discussed very lucidly and effectively means of getting further revenue: that is, by taxing unearned income. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in 1920, when I first had the honour of addressing this House, I referred to this source of revenue. Again I say that from a study of the Price Waterhouse report I have received a fresh stimulus along this line, and with your permission, Sir, I should like to supplement the remarks made by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères and demonstrate to the Minister of Finance and to the government the fact that there are further means of raising revenue

apart from the tariff. When I am told that the tariff is the only means of raising revenue, I reply that there is no justification for such a statement until all other possible fields of revenue have been explored.

I think in 1920 I tried to draw the attention of the House to our harbour facilities, and I cited more specifically those at Fort William. I find that the Price Waterhouse report corroborates the statement I then made, namely, that certain companies had acquired sites along this waterfront free of cost. What is the result? Away back in the country the people—the state—creates wealth, and those companies, perhaps with more discernment than the people generally, or even the government, having possessed themselves of this waterfront are placed in a peculiarly advantageous position. The Price Waterhouse report distinctly states that many of these institutions in Fort William received their sites free of charge, and they include the capitalized value of these sites among their assets. And do not forget also that our government dredges the harbour, as occasion demands, and every time this is done an additional value is given to these sites. Therefore it amounts to this, these companies expect to earn dividends upon the capitalized value of something which cost them practically nothing. And this feature relates also to vast areas of land, particularly in western Canada, because there we find a large amount of real estate held out of use by speculators who oftentimes live in foreign countries. These land holdings the people residing in the locality make valuable by their enterprise. Therefore after our people have created this wealth, that is, after they have settled the country and their labour and enterprise have caused land values to rise, the holders of these vacant lands are able to sell their property at greatly enhanced prices and take this unearned wealth out of the country. I maintain and insist that the government should take a substantial portion of such unearned wealth by way of taxation. That is something that I would recommend to the government and to the Minister of Finance as worthy of their attention, and after they have investigated this source I do not think they will continue to tell us that our only source of revenue is the tariff.

Speaking of the tariff reminds me of the speech of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) a few days ago when he complimented the Minister of Finance upon having reduced the duty on stumping machines. Now, the hon. member being a Conservative is according to all precedent, a strong protectionist, and yet we find him complimenting the Minister of Finance for this reduction of duty, and therefore we may conclue that he realizes how necessary it is to have the cost of the implements of production brought down to a minimum. I for one, Mr. Speaker, would be too proud to stand in my place and thank the minister for something that would benefit my own district only while the rest of the Dominion continues to suffer under burdens similar to those of which we, as agriculturists, complain. I recommend that thought to the hon. member for Fort William in his solicitude for stumping machines. By a tariff tax the implements of production are made more expensive to the individual, and such a tax is a dead weight on production. All the people of Canada require woollen garments, shoes, in fact all the necessaries of life in common, and on these we are taxed in like proportion. As an agriculturist the first thing I must have is a capitalization of approximately $2,000 to work a half-section of land. What do I find? That the average tariff tax of 14 per cent on my agricultural implements, plus 6 per cent sales tax, represents a 20 per cent handicap on my capitalization, or $400 before I can start in to produce a commodity which I have to sell in competition in a free trade world. It is absolutely unfair. We are quite justified in my humble opinion in keeping up this fight for a square deal.

In the amendment that has been presented reference is made to a special committee of the House to look into tariff matters, It is my humble opinion that a special committee of this House is not sufficient. In reading over the evidence given before the special Agricultural committee it is very difficult for me to believe some of the evidence given. I do not wish to make reference to any specific case, but it does seem to me that a commission should be appointed with power to enter into these institutions, to ascertain the value of their plant and all the necessary facts. The government at the present time, if they question the veracity of any individual or corporation in making out an income tax return, despatch a man who goes into the office of that company or individual, makes an inquiry and tells the individual or corporation just how much his income tax amounts to. Then why not have a man or a commission armed with the same power and authority to go into the organized industries in this country and say: We want to see your books, we want to find out your overhead; we want to know how

much watered stock you have, and exactly what it costs you to produce your product.

What has been the procedure in the past? Regardless of what government was in power we have simply had the say-so of the beneficiaries of the protective system. They come to this government or some other government and say: We must have a tariff; we cannot live without it; organized industry in the United States will put us out of business if we are not protected. And the government will say: Yes. We will give you protection. How much do you want? The answer may be 25, 30 or 35 per cent All right, says the government, we will give you that protection. But that is not the policy we want. When an institution will come to any government and give positive proof of just what amount of protection is required for any legitimate industry, I do not think the Progressive party would refuse to give it to them, but we are not prepared to accept their say-so. We have good reasons to doubt, we know the huge amount of watered capital on which we are being asked to pay dividends, and that is the ruination of Canada. I am shortening my remarks somewhat, but I might state that I have in my office upstairs one page of a newspaper which shows twenty-three companies, some paying quarterly dividends and some annual, and on the same page appears a letter from a certain farmer in the West who subscribed to this paper but was not able to continue his subscription, but the paper was going to continue him as a subscriber just the same—and on the same page, I say, there were twenty-three companies listed that were all paying dividends. That is what is the matter with Canada. These companies are a law unto themselves, and we cannot get away from that patent fact.

We also receive lectures on other things. Hon. gentlemen say: Why the per capita debt of Canada is not nearly as great as that of the United States or Great Britain. Or the Saskatchewan per capita debt is not as great as Ontario's. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why it should be? Saskatchewan was not formed a province until 1905, and we had not one solitary cent of debt at that time; we had money to the good. Yet to-day hon. members and ministers will come along and say that our per capita debt is less than Ontario's—Ontario, which is years and years, yea, almost a century older than Saskatchewan.

Take the Dominion itself. We are a comparatively young country. Yet hon. gentlemen will say: Our per capita debt is not as great as that of Great Britain. It has no reason to be. Accumulations of centuries of wars and everything else hang over the taxpayers of Great Britain. We have not that, thank God, and that is one reason why hon. gentlemen should not compare our per capita debt with that of Great Britain, although, Mr. Speaker, if we continue at the rate we are going, before we are one-tenth the age of Great Britain we are going to have four times as much debt, and it is time we called a halt right now.

It seems to me that the present government and governments of the past have always been afraid to tread new paths in taxation. Yet when we look over the history of the past twelve or fifteen years we find that they have gone into new paths, but not until they have been forced to do so. It is the same thing with our railways. I can recollect fifteen years before the nationalization of railways became a fact in this country, we people in the West said we knew that it had to come the way things were going. We predicted it, and it came about. Again, when we called attention some years ago to the possibilities of direct taxation, we were called dreamers. Oh yes, but we have direct taxation to-day. We were told by the politicians of that day that it was an impossibility, yet to-day we are collecting the greater part of our revenue through direct taxation. We were told the same thing about government ownership. We were called socialists for advocating it. Hon. gentlemen will remember the day when we in the West advocated government ownership of interior terminal storage elevators, and the word hurled at us more often than anything else was socialists. But to-day we have government ownership of elevators all over the country; we have government ownership of railways; we have government ownership of steamships. I might mention, too, that the Conservative party were the ones who most loudly denounced the principle of public ownership in those days, yet to-day they stand as the champions of government ownership, showing that they are capable of learning something; and there, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive party stand side by side with them on the principle of government ownership.

It was also a very dangerous thing some years ago to advocate the taxation of unearned increment, yet the other night we had the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) standing in his place in this House, four years after the member for Assiniboia had advocated the theory, and urging it upon this government.

Bonuses—that is something that sounds very much like tariffs. If it be that the bonus to be granted to the flax industry in the West is intended as a sop to the Progressives, and hon. members have spoken of concessions given to the agriculturists of the West, they need not count on the member for Assiniboia, because in my opinion that is not any concession at all. I do not believe in any sops whatever, for capital will always be found for any legitimate industry. I do not anticipate that the individuals who will grow the flax or hemp will receive any benefit from this bonus. No, the capitalists will absorb all that themselves; I question very much whether the grower of the hemp will benefit. I also question very much whether at the expiration of the supposed term of the bonus these same people will not be back again to the government asking that the subsidy be renewed. We have had that happen before. It reminds me of the Crowsnest pass agreement and the license to manufacture oleomargarine in this country. That was a privilege given during the war period because of the high price of dairy products, but what happened after the war? Selfish interests came along and said: We want the privilege continued, and it was continued. I predict that the same thing will happen in the matter of these bonuses. These young industries will only treat this understanding as a scrap of paper, I am afraid.

The Minister of the Interior speaking in this debate made the statement that he did not know why protected industries in Canada required so much protection. That is the only note that has come from the Liberal party so far which has a ring at all similar to what we might anticipate took place when the Liberal platform was framed in 1919. This is the only note of the kind that has come from the whole of the Liberal party up to the present time, and yet the minister concluded with a remark that he wished the Progressives to have the opportunity of taking charge of the affairs of the nation. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that if we did not feel like taking that responsibility when the election occurred in 1921 we are quite prepared to assume it to-day. I feel sure also that the people of Canada will have more faith in a Progressive policy formulated by the men who come here and back up the things they have advocated outside of parliament, who are prepared to go ahead and take a chance at it. I question whether the Minister of the Interior was very sincere in that remark.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You will never see that.

Mr. GOULD: That is mere conjecture on my hon. friend's part; I venture to assert nobody will be prepared to bet any money on his statement. However I wish to state that if the people of Canada would only take a serious view of the offence—I was going to say —committed against them by this last budget speech they would rise in their might and turn the offenders out when the roll is called the next time.

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): I wish to speak very briefly to-night upon a few aspects of the budget as delivered by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and to discuss some phases of the announcements contained therein which are of direct interest to my own constituency. I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gould) who just preceded me. In spite of his denunciation of the principle of protection I am not yet convinced that it is wrong. The party to which I have the honour to belong have always believed in adequate protection. They have always maintained that our industries should be protected from undue competition with the highly organized industries of other countries, and that they should be protected against the product of the cheap labour of those countries. In so far as the budget affords this protection to our industries and to our business interests, whether they are commercial or agricultural, it is to be commended; but in my judgment there are many respects in which it does not go far enough, nor is it the revenue producing factor that it should be if foreign goods continue to come into our country at the rate they are doing.

The Progressive group who sit to my left were no doubt led to hope for a more material reduction in the tariff than has been granted, and I do not wonder that they cannot reconcile the present tariff with the platform of the Liberal party in 1919 and with the pre-election pledges of that party. It seems to me that one of the needs in all lines of production at the present time is a profitable market: Production in many lines is exceeding the demand and all countries are looking around for markets that will afford a constant and consistent demand for their products.

The British preferential tariff has been again increased, although many of our factories at the present time are not running to full capacity because of lack of orders. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in this House is in favour of British connection. We are proud of our place in the Empire, and we are fully aware of the benefits which we derive from our British connection. But even so, it is surely a mistaken policy to penalize

any Canadian industry to satisfy our obligations in that respect. If we have a duty to perform for the Empire by all means let us discharge that duty; but each and every citizen of the country should bear a fair share of the burden without imposing too heavy a load upon a few. The increase in the preference will bear very heavily upon the woollen industry and unfortunately many of our factories engaged in that industry are not running to their full capacity owing to lack of orders. Their operators are not being employed, and they are leaving Canada to get employment in other countries where there is more work to be had. Orders for woollen goods are being taken by British and French manufacturers at prices which labour costs in this country make it impossible for us to compete with. The small margin of safety which these companies had under the old British preference has been removed by the present increase. This will create even keener competition, and may possibly force some factories to close entirely. I do not think that the Minister of Finance contemplated anything so disastrous to the welfare of such an important industry in this country.

Every time we purchase from outside we send our money to build up industries in other countries, and to encourage them to compete with our industries more keenly than ever. If we are to prosper as a nation we must stop this flow of wealth out of our country. I think we should, as far as possible, become self-sustaining. As it is, we are building up industries in other countries which are enticing our young men and women out of Canada by reason of the opportunities which they offer.

A duty of 15 per cent has been placed on artificial silk. The principle of protection is being applied in this instance with a vengeance. If I may use a contradictory expression protection is being afforded to an industry which does not exist. In the meantime the users of artificial silk in this country are being penalized to the extent of $15 on every $100 to encourage the establishment of this artificial silk industry. If I might I could give the House a concrete example of how our industries are suffering. I could tell of one order for ladies' knitted sweaters, principally of artificial silk, amounting to $40,000, which was placed in France just the other day, and owing to the depreciated currency of that country they are able to land these goods at Toronto cheaper than they can be produced in Canada. If our knitting factories in addition to this have to labour under an extra duty of 15 per cent for their materials they can see nothing ahead but absolute ruin.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, 300 names which have been appended to a petition protesting against the increase in the British preference and the alteration in the sales tax. The prayer of that petition reads as follows:

> We are your constitutents and are engaged in working in the woollen and knit goods mills. We have seen with great alarm that the British preference has been increased 10 per cent and that the sales tax has been altered. Some of us can remember, and those who do not have been told, of the hard times in our mills which followed the increase of the British preference in 1900.
>
> We know that the wages paid in British mills are about one-half that are paid in ours, and we fear that the present reduction in the duty will bring disaster to our industry in Canada.
>
> Our wages go towards buying food from the farmers, to storekeepers who buy food from the farmers, and to trades which buy food from the farmer. We therefore submit that you thoroughly investigate conditions and use your best endeavours to have the 10 per cent increase removed from woollen and knit goods.

I wish to urge as strongly as possible upon the Minister of Finance that this extra duty of 15 per cent should not be applied until the Canadian product is on the market. The copper and hemp industries are being encouraged by a system of bounties, and it would seem to be the better way to adopt that system in this case.

The minister has renewed his offer of reciprocity with the country to the south of us. If I understand the term reciprocity as applied to trade, it means equality in trade relations. It means that if an article of Canadian origin is admitted free of duty into another country, we make similar concessions with regard to goods from that country. It is surely only reasonable that if duties are imposed on Canadian products that a corresponding duty should be placed on goods coming into the country. The Candian customs tariff in reality is much lower in many instances than the American tariff. This is particularly apparent when we consider farm produce. I have taken the trouble to compare the duties imposed upon a few of our farm products going into the United States with our own customs tariff, and I find the duties are as follows:

Canadian tariff—	American tariff.
Butter, 4c.	8c.
Cheese 3c.	5c.
Eggs 3c. per doz.	9c. per doz.
Hay, $2 per ton.	$4 per ton.
Clover seed 10 per cent. (70c to $1.50 per bushel).	$2.40 per bushel.
Potatoes 20c. per bushel.	30c. per bushel.

Imports for 1922, of these artitcles amounted to—

Butter	6,078,882 lbs.
Cheese	1,883,013 lbs.
Eggs	9,377,769 dozens
Hay	29,008 tons
Clover seed	3,547,080 lbs.
Potatoes	429,543 bush.

The total imports of farm products amounted to $66,890,766 for the year 1922. In the case of potatoes the minister has seen fit to add to the duty. There has been an increase of 15 cents per bushel in the duty on potatoes. If the principle is sound for potatoes why not follow it in all other lines of farm produce? By the imposition of that extra duty the minister has admitted the principle as well as the necessity of protection for our farm produce. There is no reason why a country such as Canada, with a surplus of butter which must be sold in the markets of the world, should import a quantity equal to that surplus. We imported last year nearly $6,000,000 worth of fresh meat when we have a surplus which must be cured and sold abroad. We also imported nearly $4,000,000 of cured meats. Last year we exported $24,000,000 worth of cured meats to find a market abroad. The weakness of the present budget lies in the fact that no further attempt is being made to retain our home markets for our own produce, either manufactured or from the farm. I contend very strongly that if we are to provide adequate protection of our own products there can be no justification for any increase in the British preference. There can be no good reason why a duty should not be imposed high enough to ensure our markets to the Canadian producer.

Mr. PUTNAM: Will the hon. member permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SENN: Certainly.

Mr. PUTNAM: As the matter stands, are we to understand that the hon. member opposes the present increase in the British preference?

Mr. SENN: In certain lines, Mr. Speaker, the increase is not justifiable. I was looking at some of the items and giving my reasons for taking the stand I have taken.

Mr. PUTNAM: I would take it from the hon. member's remarks that he considers that none of it is justified.

Mr. SENN: I would not like to go that far, but I think that in the instances I have mentioned it is not justified.

The announcement of the Finance Minister that it is impossible to balance the present budget and that he did not hope to be able to do so for some time to come is cause for alarm. The fact that Great Britain and the United States have both been able to do so should lead us to consider carefully if the attempt should not be made by the government at all costs. There is urgent need for economy not only by the government but in every walk of life. If we are to prosper we must ultimately get back to the old system of working and saving. We must keep our expenditure within our income. During the war our standards of living gradually became higher because money was plentiful. The great difficulty to-day is in the fact that these new standards and new conditions are making such demands upon our earning power that we find ourselves unable to meet them. It is peculiarly disturbing when the Finance Minister states frankly that he could not keep our expenditure within our income, and that the national debt must go on increasing. It is high time that our governments, our institutions, our business concerns and our private citizens realized the necessity of living within their income and acting accordingly, and only when that time comes will our national prosperity be assured.

Mr. W. J. WARD (Dauphin): It is with a great deal of, shall I say reluctance, that I rise at this late period to take part in this annual family squabble, the budget debate. I feel that practically everything has been said that can be said, but as I have listened with a great deal of interest to the various arguments that have been put forward both for and against protection, which seems to be the hub of the debate, the argument has taken a somewhat zigzag course. My hon. friends to my right argue that the tariff is not high enough. We in this corner of the House argue that it is too high, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has told us that he has taken the middle course. I am not going to worry the House to-night with very much in the way of argument on the tariff. I think there are other matters of greater importance than the tariff, great and all as it may seem.

There is a matter that has been little referred to, yet possibly it took a greater toll from the western producers last year than any other single economic wrong that has been perpetrated on the farmers in the last few years. I refer to the high freight rates that were charged on the Great Lakes last year. I accepted the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) in the early part of the session that it was not within the jurisdiction of the government or of his department to suspend the coasting laws last October when the congestion took place. In

looking up the orders in council I find that in 1912 the Minister of Trade and Commerce of that day did suspend the coasting laws without calling the cabinet council together, and that action has never been questioned up to the present time. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce simply remained inactive last October and quietly looked on while the shipping barons of the Great Lakes took from the western grain producers something in the neighbourhood of $20,000,000—at least that statement has been made. I doubt very much if even the excessive tariff rates that have been applied to food and clothing and implements of production in this country for the last 12 months took $20,000,000 of a direct toll from the pockets of the western grain producers.

The explanation given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) is not a sufficient explanation why the coasting laws on the Great Lakes were not suspended last October. I have under my hand the figures of the normal rates, and the rates at which boats were carrying grain in the early part of last summer from Fort William and Port Arthur to the eastern ports. The rate was 2 cents per bushel; yet in the congested period, that is during October and November, a rate of 8 cents a bushel was charged between Fort William and Port Colborne. There was also colected an excess tariff of 15 cents between Port Colborne and Kingston so that it seems to me that there is still due to this House and to the people of Canada an explanation from the Minister of Trade and Commerce why he did not take some action at that time. It appears to me that the shipping barons of this country are running the government, because we find that the government did attempt to take some action in this matter, and immediately the shipping barons of the Great Lakes notified the government that they would contest the ruling of the department. Evidently they frightened the Minister of Trade and Commerce; he conceded their demands, and the coasting laws were not suspended.

I should like to draw the attention of the House to a side of this question that I have not heard mentioned so far in this debate, and that is that Canadian boats were carrying wheat from Fort William to Buffalo for 2 cents a bushel—

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Is my hon. friend not aware that a minister of the Crown cancelled the coastal regulations in 1912 without an order in council?

[Mr. Ward.]

Mr. WARD: Any western member will remember that in the fall of 1912 we had a late harvest, very late threshing, and that very little grain came forward until late in the season, this necessitating a great deal of grain being stored at the head of the lakes. On application being made to the then Minister of Trade and Commerce, the coasting laws were suspended in October of 1912, and they remained suspended until the following June. If my hon. friend will look up the orders in council of that date, he will find that those statements are correct.

As I was saying, while our Canadian boats were carrying grain to Buffalo for 2 cents a bushel, they were charging 3¾ cents a bushel to Canadian ports. Last year 120,000,000 bushels of our Canadian wheat were milled in bond in the United States; going on through the United States; and were exported to the European markets, and there competed with our Canadian-milled flour, thereby placing our Canadian millers at a disadvantage of from 1½ to 1¾ cents a bushel on the grain they milled as against their American competitors.

There is still another side of this question. It has been estimated that the advantage which the American railways received from transporting this flour from Buffalo to New York amounted to $12,700,000. That would have paid a great deal of wages to our Canadian railway men, and it would have considerably relieved the deficit on our Canadian National Railways. In adition to that, it is estimated that $20,000,000 was, may I say, bled from the western grain producers. The Canadian ship owners have stated that they paid the excess freight, which statement, of course, any sane man knows to be pure buncombe; they simply charged it back to the grain shipper, who was naturally the grain producer. Therefore, this $20,000,000 of excess freight that was paid to the shipping barons of the Great Lakes was a direct loss to the wholesalers, retailers and general manufacturing people throughout Canada. Had that amount been returned to the pockets of the producers, it would have been $20,000,000 more money to have been spent, which would have helped a great deal towards keeping our factories open and our workingmen on the job.

This is the point that my hon. friend (Mr. Robichaud) raised a minute ago. Expert legal opinion decided that the cabinet had not the power under the act to make this suspension. However, from reliable sources it is understood that the cabinet, in view of the emergency, determined to take the risk of suspending the coasting laws. This was last October.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Therefore those regulations were cancelled without an order in council, just by order of the minister himself.

Mr. WARD: I am now referring to October, 1922. Let us see what happened. The shipping barons of Canada promptly notified the cabinet that if the coasting laws were suspended they would get out an injunction to prevent American vessels from trading from one Canadian port to another Canadian port. They, of course, graciously intimated that they would not, however, oppose American ships coming into Fort William and Port Arthur ports to load grain for storage last fall. That, however, had very little effect, because that order came through so late that only some four or five vessels were loaded. This, of course, was not permitted until some 75,000,000 bushels of our grain had been handled from Fort William to eastern ports at this excessive freight rate. In view of what has taken place during the past season, it is up to the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the government to see to it that, if the laws of Canada are not such as will permit this government to control shipping on the Great Lakes and if the shipping barons of Canada are running this government, laws are enacted that will permit the government and not the shipping barons to run the affairs of this country. I bring this matter to the attention of the government in the hope that they will see to it that this cannot occur again. We went home from here a year ago with high hopes that we had again restored the Crowsnest pass agreement as regards grain and grain products, and we had thought that this would go a long way towards saving the situation in western Canada. We see, however, that practically every dollar that was saved through the application of the Crowsnest pass rates, was taken from us through the excess freight rates charged on the Great Lakes.

Statements have been made in this House without very mature consideration by hon. gentlemen opposite and also by some hon. members to my right, that western agriculture has been most selfish in its demands, and so on. Perhaps we are, but I think it would be a good idea if hon. members would come West and study western conditions. Since I have come to Ottawa I have taken advantage of every opportunity to visit eastern Canada and I have gone to nearly every city in this part of the country in the last two years. I was born in Ontario and moved to the West when still a boy; I was one of those emigrants who went out to the West and hewed out a home in the bush. But I have tried to educate myself to eastern conditions, and I think that if hon. gentlemen living in eastern Canada would reciprocate and come West and study conditions out there it would tend to bring about a better mutual understanding. I have often asked myself whether it is going to be possible for this country to be governed by a spirit of compromise long enough to enable us to come to a realization of the situation and be able to keep Canada in one confederation. I notice that hon. gentlemen, from both the East and the West, while conversing in privacy, speak a great deal about secession from the union. I do not know why they should refrain from mentioning these matters on the floor of this House, because this is the place where all such questions should be raised. I, for one, stand absolutely for one solid Canada, for I think that we have the prospects of making this the greatest country in the universe; and I should be very sorry indeed to see anything happen to disrupt the confederation of Canada. But we must take cognizance of the facts, and one of the facts is that there are whole sections of western Canada made up absolutely of English-speaking people and British-born who are talking secession. Why is this? It is because we do not understand one another. It is because eastern Canada does not understand western Canada, nor does the West appreciate the conditions and the circumstances of the East.

It is high time that the governments of the country, and the responsible men in this Dominion, should study the situation as it really does exist with a view to offering some solution of the problem. I believe that the good people of this Dominion will unite and will surmount the difficulties that face them to-day, and that with the help of Providence this great Canada of ours will go forward and be the greatest country in the world. I do think that the people of Canada will yet unite into one great harmonious family so that this shall be the happiest country in the world to live in. When this is the fact then we shall not need any Minister of Immigration or any immigration agents; people will come in without any invitation. But, I repeat, we must take cognizance of the situation.

I have here a paper—I did not send for it, it came to me the other day incidentally—from which it will be seen that over 200 quarter sections in one municipality in Manitoba are to be sold for taxes. It is not one of the best municipalities of the province, nor is it by any means one of the poorest, for they get a fair rainfall; and one would suppose that people ought to be able to make a fair living there. The fact remains, however, that over 200 quarter sections are to be

sold in the month of June for taxes. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place; I was going to say the misrepresentative of agriculture. I listened with some astonishment to that hon. gentleman's speech the other night as he referred to conditions in Saskatchewan, and I challenge him to prove many of the assertions he made then. Conditions in Manitoba are no worse than then they are in Saskatchewan. I am not very familiar with conditions in Saskatchewan but I do know that the freight rate on wheat is 4 cents less in Manitoba than it is in Saskatchewan while the freight rate on cattle is very much less, as well as on other natural products from Manitoba. So that in turn they must pay higher freight on manufactured goods shipped into Saskatchewan. I am quite sure, Sir, that conditions are very similar in Saskatchewan to what they are in Manitoba. We have the greatest country in the world in western Canada; no part of the universe produces so much wealth per capita as that portion of the Dominion. But what is the matter? I was speaking a few months ago to a business man and I asked him whether he was aware that 85 per cent of all the farms of western Canada were operated under mortgage, and he replied that he knew that 90 per cent of them were mortgaged. Now, if 90 per cent of all the farms in the West are being worked under this handicap, and we are paying 10 per cent interest on our money, can any hon. gentleman not appreciate the position that we are in? Sir Henry Thornton on his first visit to western Canada, speaking in the city of Brandon, said: "In spite of my very short visit and my limited opportunity of studying conditions, I appreciate this fact, that the people of western Canada will never successfully compete with the more fortunately situated peoples of the world so long as they are hemmed in 1,500 miles from tidewater." That is only one of our problems. The problem of carrying on agriculture and paying 10 per cent interest is the greatest one that we have facing us to-day; and while the institutions of the country, the manufacturers, the banks, the mortgage companies, the insurance companies, in fact all big corporations, all tell us that they cannot operate and pay more than 6 per cent on working capital, although they are highly profitable, how in the world is agriculture, which is much less profitable, going to survive and pay 10 per cent interest on the money it owes or on its working capital.

If we make agriculture prosperous, it will follow that the other industries will take their places; make agriculture prosperous and you cannot keep prosperity away from the doors of the other industries of Canada. Personally I would be loath to say anything that was not respectful and that did not 10 p.m. show a regard for our Canadian industries. But I do think that agriculture and the other industries must go hand in hand. They are like a four or six horse team in front of a plough. If one of the horses is unable to keep up his end, the whole works go wrong, and that is what is wrong with agriculture in Canada to-day. Agriculture is one of the team that must take the country forward to prosperity. I think that all we need is equity and concerted action and prosperity is assured.

There is another matter I want to refer to of which I have heard very little. Possibly I was responsible for bringing it to the attention of parliament in the first place. I refer to the gratuities that were paid to the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern directors and officials. I did not think that the explanation given by the hon. gentleman who was then acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) was all that parliament had a right to expect. He made the statement, in reply to a question by one of the Progressive members, that the information had been forced upon parliament. The facts were they were forced to give the statement to parliament. Five months had elapsed between the time the gratuities were paid and the time the information was submitted to parliament and no action had been taken; and I have no hesitation in saying that no action would have been taken had the matter not been brought to the attention of parliament. I noticed that while the Minister of Railways took to himself, or rather to the government, the credit for bringing the information before the House, a little pamphlet which I read with a great deal of interest, entitled "The Mirror", also claimed the credit for having brought the matter to the attention of the country. It might be of interest to the minister to know that I could have given to the House all the information that we did get long before I asked the question. I think that a government which was elected pledged to economy should have shown a greater interest in the affairs of the country than to allow nearly $400,000 to be paid out to men who may have thought that they had earned it, but who certainly were not entitled to it. However, I see the government has decided to appoint a commission, and I hope its personnel will be such as to ensure a real investigation and bring the guilty to task.

A week ago I visited Montreal and had the pleasure of seeing a ship loaded with cattle. In fact I saw the super-structure built on the ship for the accommodation of these cattle. It will be recollected that immediately cattle were offered for shipment to the British Isles the freight rate went up $7.50 per head. On my return from Montreal I went to the trouble of figuring out the cost of building the super-structure and in conversation with the agent I ascertained the operating costs. I shall not weary the House with detailed figures, but in my judgment cattle could be transported from Montreal to Liverpool at a profit at $12 per head; and yet we are paying $22.50. I was informed that this particular boat was expected to make six trips during the season. Of course, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) told us that he did not carry shipping space in his vest pocket, and perhaps that is all the interest he has in the matter, but I think this is something that might well be looked into. Of course, if $22.50 a head is the lowest possible rate we should not kick very much, but, in my judgment we are paying $10.50 too much.

Turning to another subject, it seems to me that we have a right to expect something more from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) than that he should throw up his hands and say that he is hopelessly stuck, that nothing more can be done. For that is precisely the attitude he has taken in saying that Canada must expect to go on for a number of years getting deeper and deeper into debt. I think the government should accept full responsibility for bringing about drastic economies. It is not possible for the average member to intelligently criticize the estimates. The government brings them down and must be responsible for their reduction to the lowest possible point. I think that we had every right to expect the government to bring down a balanced budget this session in view of the enormous taxation we are burdened with to-day. The total debt upon which we are paying interest is something over ten billion dollars. It is a tremendous sum. The interest charge alone last year amounted to something over $800,000,000. In addition to this heavy burden, the taxes of all kinds paid by this little handful of people in 1922 amounted to practically one billion dollars. I ask the serious thinking business men of this country, do they think it possible for us to continue doing business on this basis? At the present rate of increasing, our national debt in twenty-five years will have reached the staggering total of twenty-five billion dollars. I am sure that few of us can really comprehend such enormous sums, we speak in terms of billions without really understanding their serious import; but at the same time I do think the Minister of Finance should change his attitude of despair, take the bull by the horns and bring about such economies in administration as will at least balance the budget.

I would like to refer to the loan floated in New York last April. My suggestion may seem somewhat radical, but I make it for what it is worth. Many schemes have been put before the Banking and Commerce committee, most of which have been scouted as ridiculous and impracticable. But all the same, certain facts are basic, and I should like the Minister of Finance and the business men of this country to give me their opinion on this suggestion: What would have been the effect if instead of floating that loan a year ago and pledging the real credit of Canada—that is, the ability of the people to produce—to foreign money-lenders in order to get a United States certificate with ten figures on it, and upon which at the expiration of the term of the loan we will have paid $157,500,000 in interest,—I ask, instead of doing that what would have happened had we issued a Canadian certificate to ourselves and saved that interest charge? I direct that question more particularly to the Minister of Finance, and I hope at some later date he will give the House his explanation, because to me there is only one hope for the country, and that is to utilize our own wealth for our own development. We must stop borrowing money by the hundreds of millions of dollars or we can never expect to get out of our present financial difficulties. Failure to produce the bare necessities of life for the last two or three years is not the problem that is facing Canada to-day. The spectre that haunts us by day and disturbs us by night is Debt. We have all acquired the pernicious habit of doing business with borrowed money—governments, municipalities and individuals are alike guilty; they have all gone astray in that regard. Not long ago I read an article written by Douglas Terstoile in which the writer pictured the effect of debt upon individuals, "How it carves the open countenance into a wrinkled face, what meanness what deception, and how like a knife it stabs the dishonest heart!" I know many men who two or three years ago you could not have persuaded to lie or be guilty of double dealing or any other meanness, but who to-day will lie to their bankers and their merchants and be guilty of double dealing with their neighbours. If that is the deplorable situation that is developing in this country, again I ask

every thinking man and woman: Do you not think it requires the most serious consideration on the part of our business men and especially of the governement? In the face of this deplorable condition of affairs I should like to see a more serious attitude taken towards the solution of these grave problems, I should like to see the government attack them with vigour instead of throwing up their hands and saying, "We are hopelessly stuck in the mud."

Mr. J. F. WHITE (London): In continuing the debate I do not wish to cover all the points in connection with the budget. I shall touch on only a few which I consider of particular interest.

I think the budget is a source of disappointment to the country in general in that it does not come more nearly to being a balanced estimate. Last year the Minister of Finance in his budget speech referred to the situation as a very serious one indeed, and said he would soon have to make plans for the reduction of our debt. Now the taxation which we are bearing at the present time is as much as our people can stand, as much as they are willing to stand. It is as high as international competition will allow it to go. There therefore remains the alternative of reducing expenses.

At this date, four and a half years after the armistice, we are not reducing our debt. We are feeling the disappointment of adding this year from fifty to sixty million dollars to our debt, while other countries are improving their condition. The United States is reducing its debt somewhat, and Great Britain in spite of all her woes has reduced her debt considerably. A year ago the estimated expenditure out of consolidated revenue was decreased in round figures by about $128,000,000, while this year the decrease is not quite $47,000,000. It is some reduction, I admit, but not much considering the circumstances. I would also point out that last year there was an estimated increase in civil government of $51,000, and this year it is further increased by $266,000. There is also the item of superannuation, which increased last year by $68,000 and this year by the further sum of $225,000. I am not objecting to the principle of superannuation, but I fear that many public servants are being superannuated while they are still capable of rendering many years of good and faithful public service. These conditions do not indicate the drastic retrenchment which the times demand. The items quoted, of course, may be small, but the trend is in the wrong direction, and the organization of all government departments might well be scrutinized so that further retrenchment could be made in our expenses.

I notice that the minister proposes an increase in the duty on raisins and dried currants. That increased duty on the basis of our importations for the year ending March 31, 1922, will mean an additional cost to the Canadian consumer of $813,000 per year, while the change will probably mean quite a decrease in the customs revenue. I understand that this change in duty is proposed on account of Australia making efforts to establish a market for her goods within the Empire. I believe we should make every effort to foster trade within the Empire, not only with the Mother Country but with the other dominions comprising the Empire; but it will take considerable trade development with Australia to offset this addition to the Canadian cost of living occasioned by this duty, and we look to the government to secure conditions, either after the session or during the Economic Conference in October, which will be of benefit to Canadian trade with Australia. No doubt, if these conditions are secured, it will be along the line of an extension of the sale of our manufactured goods. May I express the hope that the arrangement with Australia will be of greater advantage to Canada than the French treaty is likely to be.

It is interesting to note that despite the famous Liberal platform, the minister is proposing to encourage the establishment of industries by means of imposing a tariff. It is also interesting to note that the minister, in his endeavour to establish the artificial silk industry, levies a customs duty, while to encourage the hemp industry a bounty is the means adopted. He has not explained why a bounty will not serve the silk industry development as well as that of hemp; neither has he explained to the House to whom this bounty on hemp is to be paid, whether to the farmer who grows the hemp or to the manufacturing firm which makes the yarn or twine. I would judge, from reading clause 3 of the resolution, that the cordage firm is to receive the bounty.

The minister has expressed the opinion that binder twine and other products will be ready for the market by July, 1925. It would seem that he is desirous of retracing the steps taken by the Liberal government in abolishing the duties levied on binder twine. If the manufacturer of hemp or binder twine is to receive a bounty, in what position will the present manufacturer of twine be placed? Given an equal output of hemp per year for the five years in which the bounty is to be paid, the manufacturer will receive an aver-

age of one cent per pound for his output. This will put the present manufacturer, who has neither bounty nor customs protection, at a disadvantage of about 10 per cent.

I have been wondering if the member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) will rise in his place in committee and protest against this unjust discrimination against a manufacturing firm in his own constituency. It is to be noted that the limit suggested by the minister to be paid in any one year on account of this bounty is $200,000, which on an average will provide for a bounty on 20,000,000 pounds of twine.

Last year Canada imported 50,000,000 pounds of binder twine. Why is it limited? Is this provision for the benefit of one firm only, or otherwise? What guarantee has the minister that this industry will be self-supporting in five years, or is it the hope of those who are interested in its establishment that the bounty will be extended?

The manufacture of binder twine in Canada has a tragic history. This article prior to 1897 bore a duty of 12½ per cent; that duty was reduced in 1898 to 10 per cent and in 1899 wiped out altogether by the Liberal party then in power. At that time Canada had twenty-four or twenty-five factories making twine but as a result of the free entry all went out of business but three. Two of these are branches of American industries, I understand, and have other lines and the binder twine business is a very small part of their turnover. Those factories which disappeared did not sell out to a larger company or a trust; eleven went into liquidation; eight dismantled their plants and went out of business, and two or three were destroyed by fire. In spite of the abolition of the duty, prices did not decline, but advanced instead.

I have figures furnished me by a hardware merchant in central Ontario, who deals in twine in a large way, which show that the average retail price of binder twine for the seven years prior to the removal of the duty, that is from 1892 to 1898 inclusive, was 8½ cents per pound, while for the next sixteen years, between the abolition of the duty and the war, the average price was 12¼ cents per pound.

It may be argued that all commodities increased in value to the same extent, but that is not the case. Take for example, iron and steel, which being one of the basic materials is generally recognized as a pretty safe trade barometer to follow. Bar iron and steel was quoted in Ontario in the seven year period, previously referred to, at an average of $1.71 per 100 pounds, while in the sixteen year period referred to the average price was $1.93 per 100 pounds. These prices show an increased price on iron and steel of 11·4 per cent, while binder twine, when competition was largely eliminated, rose 45 per cent in price. I believe similar destruction of competition in any line of manufacture will produce price inflation.

In conversation with a friend who came from the Philippine Islands last summer, he told me that the raw material for twine was last year a drug on the market, and the price paid for it was extremely low, yet the price of twine is still high. Now it may be asked by some how it is that the one concern which makes most of the twine manufactured in Canada is able to continue in business. In almost every line of business there is some one firm which is more efficient, perhaps, as to buying and selling, and in the management of its plant, than any other, and is thus able to produce at lower costs than its competitors. This may be the case in connection with the firm in question. The only other reason I know of is that there may be some understanding between the manufacturers in the United States and the Canadian manufacturers as to division of the market and the price charged for twine, which enables the Canadian firm to continue business and, at the same time, by that very action to allay any criticism or fear on the part of the consumer that he is not getting the lowest price at which the commodity can be sold. If that is the case evidently the scheme has been very successful, because I have not noticed any mention made of binder twine at any of the deliberations of the special committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions.

On inquiring into this matter of binder twine, I secured some figures from the Bureau of Statistics which may be interesting. In the year ending March 31, 1923, Canada manufactured 31,864,000 pounds of twine, valued at $3,483,000, or 10.9 cents per pound. We imported from the United States 46,927,000 pounds to a value of $4,820,000, or 10.3 cents per pound; from the United Kingdom, chiefly from Ireland, over 3,000,000 pounds, valued at $379,000, or 12.4 cents per pound. We exported 7,520,000 pounds which figures, when worked out, show that Canada produced 43 per cent only of the binder twine used during the year. In previous years the percentage has gone as low as 26 or 27.

I have heard hon. members of this House grow eloquent on more than one occasion when discussing our export business, particularly with reference to agricultural implements,

claiming that the Canadian manufacturers sold their goods for export much cheaper than they did for home consumption, the argument being that the tariff protection under which they operated was excessive and enabled them to overcharge the Canadian consumer. I have figures from the Bureau of Statistics which show that the same price conditions existed in the case of binder twine on which there is no duty whatever. The Canadian production of binder twine in 1922-23 was valued at 10.9 cents per pound. The United States imports were valued at 10.3 cents per pound, and imports from the United Kingdom at 12.4 cents per pound. Canadian exports of twine to Argentine in the same time were one million pounds sold at $90,000, which is 9 cents per pound. Canadian exports to Denmark amounted to 251,000 pounds, also valued at 9 cents per pound. There were some exports to the United Kingdom at less than 9 cents per pound. Evidently the critics of the customs tariff will have to look elsewhere for the cause of this difference between the price for home consumption and the export price as far as binder twine is concerned, and, I think, other commodities as well.

Now, the Minister of Finance in the budget speech has declared for tariff stability. He says that "broadly speaking it is possible to have reasonable assurance of stability of tariff. That this assurance is desirable as business men do not care to embark on enterprises which may be imperilled by frequent changes of tariff." This statement is a correct one, but as I listened to the speeches of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of the Interior, I came to the conclusion that there were various grades of stability. These two gentlemen seem to think that stability for this year only was all that was desired, and I suppose that if we were to hear a number of speeches from the government side of the House on this question there would be as many definitions of stability as there were interpretations of the Liberal code of ethics in the campaign of 1921. In this connection I would like to quote from a speech delivered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at a meeting in Toronto in 1906. That statesman said:

> It is absolutely essential to the capitalist, to the working man, to the business man, and the industrialist that he should know exactly the conditions under which he invests his capital, that he should know that it will be invested under a condition that will not likely be overturned, but I am able to say that in our regime the manufacturers all sleep soundly, and never fear interference with the tariff. We have made very few changes in the duties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe that the manufacturers of this country will be lulled to very sound sleep by the assurance of the Finance Minister that the tariff is now stable, particularly when so many members of the present government are not of his opinion. The Minister of Finance proposes to insert two clauses in the tariff resolutions dealing with the prospect of reciprocal trade with the United States. Ever since the United States abrogated the original Reciprocity treaty in 1866—although after eleven years of the treaty Canada had an adverse trade balance of over nine millions—it has been impossible, for one reason or another to make such an arrangement with the United States. Time after time Canadian ministers went to Washington with this end in view, but returned empty handed, till on one occasion Sir Wilfred Laurier stated there would be no more pilgrimages to Washington. He did sanction one more pilgrimage, and out of that came the proposed reciprocity agreement of 1911. That agreement, however, did not receive the endorsation of the Canadian people. Even last year, I believe in February 1922, the Minister of Finance himself visited Washington and made another attempt at an inter-trade agreement with the United States, but he did not receive any encouragement. The Fordney-McCumber tariff was passed by the United States government last year without any consideration whatever for the interests of Canada. It was passed largely at the behest of the American agricultural interests, and this measure practically ended the possibility of any large amounts of Canadian produce going to the American market. The United States government, of course, had the right to establish their tariff at any elevation they saw fit. If the Minister of Finance would word his resolution to the effect "that if the United States will reduce the tariff against Canada, particularly on food stuffs, to something approximating the Canadian tariff, we will take it as an indication that the United States are willing to do business with us on a fairly equitable basis," then the resolution would be much more deserving of support. It is time the Canadian should give up passing pious wishes, give up the idea of dependence on the United States, and act as though he could take care of his own affairs. That course of action, will, in my judgment, have the desired result—the securing of better trade relations—and get it by the shortest route.

As to the amendment moved by the member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) I cannot support it as I consider the principle involved is detrimental to Canada's interests. I fear, too, that the one who draughted the clauses with refer-

ence to providing the revenue that would be lost in the event of the policy embodied in the amendment coming into force, did not give very serious consideration to the situation in regard to the income tax. Canada's present tax on incomes is about the same on the smaller incomes as the United States tax. It is much higher on the larger incomes, however, and there is no surer way to drive capital to the United States than to tax the Canadian income at a higher rate than obtains in the country to the south.

As to "unearned incomes," that is a new phrase to me. I have heard of "unearned increment," but I will have to get a better definition of "unearned incomes" than I have at present before I shall be able to understand it, unless it means the indemnity paid to members of parliament. It would appear that there are at least two members of the Progressive party who are quite willing to have their indemnity reduced, but only to the extent of 12½ per cent.

The House has been treated from time to time to certain Socialistic utterances which I consider do not make for solidity and progress of business enterprises or business conditions in this country, and to those who have made these speeches, and particularly to the member for Centre Winnipeg, I would commend the words of Abraham Lincoln on questions of this kind:

> Capital has its rights which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is and probably will be a relation between labor and capital producing mutual benefits.
>
> "The strongest bond of human sympathy outside of the family relation should be the one uniting all working people of all nations, and tongues and kindreds. Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor, property is desirable, property is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise.
>
> "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own sholl he safe from violence when built.

Mr. A. E. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): In common with other hon. members who have spoken on this subject, I wish to convey to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) my congratulations on the presentation of his seventeenth budget. We may differ in regard to some features of the budget presented by the hon. minister, but I think we will all give him credit for sincerity of purpose in his long political career and on this as on former occasions all will concede that he has done his very best, or what he believes to be his best, in the interests of Canada as a whole. We have heard considerable criticism of the budget along different lines. To my mind a great deal of this criticism has been more for political purposes than with the idea of presenting something really constructive. We have heard the financial aspect of the budget attacked, and we have been told on different occasions by members on the other side of the House that we have no war burdens at the present time, and that the statement of the Finance Minister that the deficit of this country had been reduced from some $674,000,000 in 1920 to $47,000,000 at the present time did not indicate a good showing. We were told that the budget should balance and the great argument was that we had no war burden.

I want to take exception to that statement, and to place on Hansard figures which I think will convince the House and the country at large that the greatest burden we are carrying to-day is the result of the war debt. In the matter of interest charges alone, we find that in 1914 our total interest charges were $12,893,000. At the present time we find our total interest charges are $138,000,000. I got the information direct from the Finance department to-day that over $100,000,000 of that interest is due directly to our war debt. How hon. members on the other side can say we have no war burden at the present time is more than I can imagine. Our total war indebtedness is the staggering sum of $1,688,000,000 due directly to the war, and there are interest charges going on yearly, and will go on till this generation passes away, no doubt, and still we are asked to-day by an amendment to wipe out a source of revenue which is yielding us now the round sum of $135,000,000 or practically enough money to take care of these interest charges on the war debt. The situation is a very serious one and, I think before we cast our votes on this budget we should give it very careful consideration.

Apart from the large amount of interest that we are called upon to pay on that tremendous debt we have the soldiers' civil reestablishment to take care of and we find that, including the care of patients, treatment, pay and allowances, vocational pay and allowances, salaries, unemployment relief and cost of living bonuses, we have a yearly expenditure of $12,463,081. We find that we pay out in pensions $32,612,243, or a total of $45,168,029, which is paid yearly directly in pensions to our soldiers and in the running expenses of the offices, and so forth. This $45,168,000 added to the $100,000,000 of interest makes a total war expenditure from these items alone of $145,168,000 yearly. Those are staggering figures, and it is a debt that it is impos-

sible for us to get away from. Nobody is complaining, Mr. Speaker, of the pensions to the soldiers or the soldiers' re-establishment, in taking care of our men who served overseas. We are only too glad to pay to those heroes this amount of money and I am sure we would be willing to increase it if we possibly could.

When, Mr. Speaker, hon. members on the other side of the House tell us that to-day we have no war burden, I wish to contradict the statement, and I think I have successfully refuted it in the figures I have placed before the House. In view of those facts, and under present conditions, I consider the budget in its financial aspect makes a mighty good showing, and I believe, as I said at the outset, that the Finance Minister, in presenting the budget, has done the very best he can, taking into consideration the diversified interests of our country and the obligations we are called upon to meet. The budget may not meet the views of a lot of Liberal members on this side, and, speaking personally, there is possibly no one in this chamber who would wish to see a greater reduction in the tariff, if it were possible, or to see a greater measure of reciprocal trade with the United States, than myself. But those things, to my mind, are not possible under present conditions. Still we must admit that since the present Finance Minister assumed his responsible position the tendency has been for a continuous lowering of the tariff, with a strong desire for reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States. Now, while some hon. members may make light of this move, it is a move in the right direction, and we do not know what good may come of it. It is a standing offer, made in good faith, and the New York Times speaks of it as follows:

> New York, May 15.—The Times, in an editorial on the reciprocity proposal made by Hon. W. S. Fielding, Canadian Minister of Finance, endorses reciprocity between Canada and the United States and says "there is every reason why it would be absurd for Canada and the United States to embark upon a tariff war."
>
> "There is no geographical barrier between the United States and Canada," the paper continues, "and the facility of intercommunication is such that the free and uninterrupted interchange of products between these two nations is to the advantage of both. America needs Canada and Canada needs the United States. During the year 1922 nearly 40 per cent of Canada's exports went to the United States and more than 65 per cent of her imports came from this country. Canada can well absorb more American goods and the United States can offer Canada a much greater market for certain of her products.

This coming from such an important newspaper as the New York Times must not be passed over lightly, and no doubt it conveys the impression which is prevalent to a large extent in the United States. As I said at the outset, we do not know what good may come from this standing offer which has been put into the budget, and which we are to vote on in the course of a day or two. What more could a Liberal or a Progressive ask than the offer that has been made to the United States in the hope they will before long see as we do, that it would be to the benefit of both countries for us to have reciprocal trade? We might go on and discuss the question at some length, and some might contend that immediately upon the opening of the doors, our country would be flooded with the farm products of the Uinted States. I could never see the matter in that light. We cannot ship products into a country where there is no demand for them, and the very fact that we grow largely our own foodstuffs, I think answers that question, and proves that there would be really no market in Canada for American farm products. Another feature that has possibly been overlooked is that a large amount of the profits of the Canadian farmers is used up in the long haul over our railroads, whereas with reciprocal trade arrangements north and south, both eastern and western Canada could have an interchange of trade with a very low cost of transportation charges. Therefore. from every angle, I think this standing offer that has been made is to our advantage, and why our friends have moved an amendment along the same lines when this offer is made in the budget, is really more than I can understand.

Some splendid points have been brought out by different speakers. One thing in the budget that has been emphasized by members from the Maritime provinces is the benefit that will accrue to maritime ports through the ten per cent increase in the British preference on goods coming into Canadian ports, when the duty is over fifteen per cent. This should mean greatly increased business for our maritime ports, and it should greatly enhance our railway earnings in transporting these goods to the different centres throughout the Dominion.

The reduction in the tariff on sugar has been reflected very quickly in the sugar market, and we find to-day that sugar is being sold at from 40 to 50 cents a hundred pounds less than it was before the budget speech was brought down the other day As was pointed out by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), this will mean a saving of over $2,500,000 to the consumers of this country.

A great deal has been said with regard to the expenditure of our country, and very little has been said regarding economy, although some speakers have referred to it. There is room for economy all along the line in the

different departments of our civil government. I am not criticizing this government; every government is guilty of the same mistake; but we are trying to develop too many activities that, in my humble opinion, are not needed, and we are doing work years before it is needed and possibly work that will not be needed in our generation. Let the departments get down to actual needs and not do work in useless experiments. In this way we shall save the country millions of dollars. No man would think of running his business in the way in which every government runs the business of the country, and we as elected representatives of the people should be just as careful as if it was our own business, and even more so, when we have to tax the other fellow to pay the bill. We should have a regular stocktaking in all the departments, and see if a tremendous saving could not be effected for our country. At the time when these activities were started, the revenues of our country were, perhaps, able to stand the expenditure; but now that we are in a different position and until our finances are greatly improved, every effort should be made to curb expenditures on every side.

I trust I may be pardoned if I refer to a few expenditures on which I believe a saving could be made. My viewpoint may not be correct; but in the Maritime provinces we look with some suspicion at the large expenditures that are made in the different departments in connection with some provinces of western Canada. In passing the estimates, we were asked to pass an item of $261,475 for irrigation purposes. This is a very large sum of money. In the eastern provinces we wonder why the government is called upon to expend such a large sum of money. Why should the provincial governments not do this work themselves? I am not in a position to say whether, under some prior arrangement with the western provinces, this government is bound to carry out schemes of irrigation for the different provinces; but I just wish to point out that apart from the small subsidy that we received for Prince Edward Island, we get very little assistance along any of the lines that are indicated in the Auditor General's report. Take, for instance, the surveys for water powers alone. On measuring streams and rivers in this country, streams and rivers which, I venture to say, will never be developed, we spent last year $319,885. If the streams and water powers of this country are to be developed, why not let the organizations or business concerns that are going to use this power make these investigations themselves? I do not believe any good business man would think of promoting any large business without making a thorough investigation of the water-power himself. He would not take any government report. Those are items which, to my mind, might be pared down, especially during those years when we are called upon to pay the huge expenditures which I have just mentioned in connection with our war burdens.

I am also informed that on those large water-powers that have been developed to some extent by this government, not one dollar has yet been collected by way of revenue. There is under way, I believe, a proposition whereby some fifty cents per horse-power is to be charged, or some other similar small charge is to be made, but as yet no revenue has accrued to this government from the development of those water-powers.

As regards the question of immigration, I do not believe forced immigration is or ever will be of any value to any country, and still the Auditor General's report of last year shows an expenditure of $251,896 for immigration purposes. Are we justified under present conditions in spending such a large sum of money in that department?

The sum of $194,189 has been spent in connection with reclamation of land. I am not well enough posted to discuss this question of reclamation of land; but I understand that no practical results have accrued from it. A number of the men employed in these departments, the moment they are appointed by the Civil Service Commission, immediately surround themselves with a staff of officers and engage a large number of officials to do work whether it is necessary or not. In my opinion the time is coming when a real stocktaking of these departments will have to be made in order to see that not one dollar is spent that is not absolutely needed.

With regard to the question of immigration, I have already stated that I do not believe in the principle of forced immigration; I do not think that such immigration is of any use to a country. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, we spent last year $932,000 to take care of the unemployed in this country, and in the face of that expenditure we are asked to vote large sums for immigration purposes. I venture to say that nearly every dollar of that $932,000 has been spent west of this city; I am sure that not 5 cents of it was spent in Prince Edward Island. Yet, in view of these facts, we are asked again to go into a large immigration scheme.

Mr. MARTELL: Who got the benefit of it?

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): I believe that in the Maritime provinces there are people who, owing to the almost depleted condition of the fisheries, would be willing to try their fortunes in western Canada if they were given some assistance by our Immigration department; but as matters stand to-day no native of this country who wishes to emigrate to the West can receive any such assistance. I think that provision should be made in connection with our immigration regulations that a man in eastern Canada who desires to try his fortunes in the West might be afforded some assistance in this direction. We have as good a class of people in the Maritime provinces as can be found anywhere, and I know they would make good. I know that a large number of our men in eastern Canada are going to the United States just because they have not the wherewithal to make a start in western Canada.

Another matter we look upon with suspicion is the Air Force. Is it really necessary for this country to spend $1,660,822 in experimenting with flying machines which have not yet proven of commercial value to the country? In the event of war, I venture to say that the experiments carried on in the United States and Great Britain will have provided means that will be ample to give us any information that we may stand in need of. We all hope that the day is far distant when flying machines for war purposes will be needed, and I submit that in the meantime such a heavy expenditure as this is not justifiable. I do not wish to be misunderstood; but we have heard a great deal about economy, and I have endeavoured in a brief way to indicate some instances in connection with which I believe that some measure of economy might well be practised. In a return brought down in this House this year there appears some valuable information. This return is dated February 12, 1923, and gives the total number of employees in the inside Civil Service up to March 31, in each year from 1900 to 1922. The Civil Service Commission, I believe, is an institution that is growing away and beyond the dimensions ever dreamed of by its founders. I have no quarrel with the Civil Service, and I believe that the Civil Service Commission is a body that is needed; but I do not believe that it can be defended in its present status. Do we realize that whereas in 1908 there were only five employees in the commission, to-day there are 220, and that in the former year while there was an expenditure of $4,329 to-day it is $342,000? I do not think it was ever the intention of any government of this country that this organization should attain such proportions. As I said before, immediately upon any branch of work being taken up, the commission as well as other branches of the government service begin to organize a staff and fortify themselves with officials; they entrench themselves in a position in which they think they will be secure. Now, in the evidence submitted to the committee inquiring into the Civil Service, Sir Joseph Pope, Under-Secretary of State, said—

11 p.m.

The Acting SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil): I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the rules of the House do not permit of reference to the evidence taken before any special committee before such committee's report has been submitted.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): I regret the transgression, Mr. Speaker; I will refrain from quoting the evidence. However, we know that a great deal of information has been gleaned which will be at the disposal of the House and of the public in a short time. Now, the different departments of government have greatly increased in cost, within recent years. The Department of Labour in 1910 had some 24 employees; in 1921 there were 105; and the increase in dollars and cents has been from $34,000 to $256,000. All along the line it is practically the same. I am glad to know, however, that since the present government has taken office there has been not only a reduction in the staff, but a large reduction in the expenditure of each department. In the Department of Justice there were 42 employees in 1900; to-day there are 208; and the cost was $36,000 then as compared with $270,000 now; and as I pointed out before, the number of employees in connection with the Civil Service Commission has increased from 5 in 1908 to 220 at the present time. The Department of External Affairs shows the same results. In the Department of the Interior, the Mines Branch, the number of employees has increased from 51 to 250, and the expenditure from $65,000 to $605,000. My object in submitting these figures is to show the tremendous cost of the expense of government in the different departments, which to the ordinary layman appears to be beyond all the necessities of these departments. I firmly believe that a reduction in the staff and in the cost of operation could be made in every direction. We have a great many committees in parliament, but I believe that we want an economy committee in this House to look carefully into the different departments and to submit a report, with a view to ascertaining whether

some saving cannot be effected in the directions I have suggested.

With regard to the Canadian National Railways, we believe in eastern Canada that there is already a decided improvement in the situation. The railway situation to which we took great exception regarding the management for the past few years has been greatly remedied in the past year. We in the Maritime provinces were united in our request that we should have more control and the eastern division placed back at Moncton. We are pleased that this has been done, and that Mr. L. S. Brown, one of the most competent railway officials in the entire service, has been placed in charge, with the result that already a great measure of relief has been given and a confidence restored that argues well for the future of the road.

Now in passing, just let me say that if our officials will realize the responsibility of their positions and that the success of our railway lies largely in their hands, we may hope for a fair measure of success. I remember reading a motto that the owner of a railway had posted up in all his cars--"Courtesy costs nothing." It might be well for the officials of the Canadian National Railways to place a similar notice all over our system, as we are competing with a company that has given a great deal of attention to this phase of the operation of its lines.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does the hon. gentleman say that the officials of the Canadian National Railways are not courteous?

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): No. I said at the outset—

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Then I do not think the hon. gentleman should have expressed the opinion we have just listened to, because the experience of this House and of the people generally is that there is just as much courtesy on the Canadian National Railway as on any other line.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): I quite agree with my hon. friend, but I do not think that a suggestion for even more courtesy will hurt. I think the success of our National Railways lies largely in the hands of the officials, and I have every confidence that they will not be lacking in courtesy; but, as I have said, courtesy costs nothing, and undoubtedly the travelling public demands it more and more.

I may be pardoned here if I make reference to a remark that appeared in the papers, attributed to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) to the effect that any concession that was obtained by the Crowsnest pass agreement was forced on the government by the Progressive party. I wish to take exception to this remark. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman himself, who was a member of that committee, the true situation. He knows that it was due to the vote of the Liberals on that committee that they were enabled to obtain the relief that was given on the rates, not because they were forced by the hon. members of the Progressive party, but because they believed it was only fair and just that some relief should be given. I think if the hon. member made the remark attributed to him he owes this side of the House an apology, and I would be glad to give him the opportunity now of doing justice to the Liberals who assisted him and his colleagues on that occasion.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this matter was brought to the attention of the House on a former occasion, and therefore I may be allowed now to offer a few words of explanation. During a sitting in camera of the Transportation Costs committee last session, after a Conservative member had spoken for some time explaining the change of ideas in regard to the Crowsnest pass arrangement, I whispered to him when he sat down—I was close beside him—"We forced you to it". I said this in a jocular tone, but unfortunately his temper got the better of him, for he jumped to his feet and immediately announced what I had said. I think the member for Prince Edward Island was present, but he did not hear me make the remark, which was intended only for the ear of one gentleman. I hope there will be no further misunderstanding. It was an unfortunate remark and I admit I should not have made it, but it was made as an aside and never meant to go any further than that particular gentleman and would not have gone further if he had not lost his temper for the moment and spluttered it out to the whole gathering. That is the explanation I have to make of the incident referred to. In regard to giving credit to the Liberal members who assisted the Progressive members from the West on that occasion, I am prepared to make this statement on the floor of the House: During the recess at no time and in no place did I ever speak in connection with the Crowsnest pass agreement and what took place in committee and in this House without giving credit to the members of the Liberal party who stood by us at that time. Not only so, but I think I mentioned specifically three Liberal members—I cannot remember their constituencies for the moment—who stood

with us all through and assisted in getting the matter brought before the members in such a way that they were inclined to support our motion.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): I think the hon. gentleman is willing to admit that so far as I am concerned my stand on that committee was fair and above board.

Mr FORKE: Undoubtedly.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): I thank the hon. gentleman for his explanation and I accept it in all good faith.

Last year in making a few observations on the budget I referred to the natural resources of the western provinces. We are still of the same mind in eastern Canada. We believe that we have an equity in the natural resources in the West, and we believe that when this matter is finally adjusted we shall receive just treatment. I could go into this matter more fully but I think sufficient has been placed on Hansard in the last few years to show that we have claims along these lines, and I have no doubt that the matter will be satisfactorily adjusted when the time comes.

As representing a farming community I wish to say that the farmers of our province have passed through just as trying a period possibly as the farmers of western Canada. We have been forced to take very low prices for our products, and transportation has been so high that it has been almost impossible to place our products on the market at a profit. However, we have a very industrious people and our farmers who take up diversified farming pay a great deal of attention to dairying, to the production of pork, eggs and different products of the farm that will find the best market we have, and in that way they are able to tide over a period of depression such as we have experienced for the past few years. They are also endeavouring to put on the market the very best products that can possibly be produced, and I think it is up to the farmers of all Canada at this time to use their best endeavours along that line. The lower your market goes the better the product required and too much attention cannot be given by the farmers of this Dominion for putting our finished products on the market in the very best possible condition.

The matter of our fisheries has been taken up at greater length by other speakers than I propose to deal with it at the present time, although I am greatly interested in that industry. This year will be an exceedingly hard one for the fishermen on account of the late spring, which has made it impossible for them to begin operations with the opening of the season, and unless some consideration is shown to them by extending the season this year there will be serious losses among them. I sincerely trust that when this matter comes before the cabinet later on in the season, the fishermen of eastern Canada will be given every consideration.

We talk about reciprocity with the United States, but I believe there is a reciprocity along other lines which we should try to develop. I believe we want great reciprocal or freer trade within our boundaries. If there is one thing needed more than another it is the reduction of the cost of distribution from the factory to the farm, and from the farm to the factory. The city people need the products of the farm, and it is to the advantage of the farmer that he use his best endeavours to see that the man in the city gets the very best articles he can procure anywhere, and gets them at as low a cost as possible: that is, that the price be not doubled by the middleman.

Then again it is up to the manufacturer to see that his goods go to the farmer and labourer at the very lowest possible price. Cut out the middleman as much as possible, and let there be a freer trade between the consumer on the farm and the consumer in the city.

Let us get away from this idea of one trying to do the other for all he can, and let us get down to the essential truth that the more we can help one another the better it will be for all. Let us establish confidence in one another: get away from suspicion: do not try to set town against country, and country against town. One cannot exist without the other. Let us co-operate along the lines indicated, and I will venture the assertion that we have gone a long way to reduce the cost to each other, and at the same time give as much or more in return to the producers. Let us forget our differences and take each other into mutual confidence, and we have gone a long way towards a better understanding of each other's difficulties.

I think the evidence brought out in the special committee on agriculture will be very beneficial, and will give to the public more confidence in the business man and producer on the farm and in the factory.

I think that a great deal can be done along those lines to reduce the cost not only of manufactured articles to the man on the farm but also of farm products to the man in the city. I do not think any farmer will object to the city man getting his food products at the lowest possible price providing that the man

on the farm gets the highest market price that is going for his products.

Any criticism I have offered is offered with the best intention. I believe that a substantial saving can be made, and although personally I would have preferred very much to see a greater reduction in our customs tariff, still I feel that for the past two years we have accomplished something in tariff reduction, and I predict that notwithstanding what construction may be placed on the word "stability" in the Finance Minister's remarks, still the people of this country, especially the Liberal party, will demand a constant downward revision from year to year.

I am going to support the budget because the government showing is good. The deficits have been reduced from 674 million in 1920 to 47 million in 1923, and if it were not for the war burden left us, a surplus would have been shown—to say nothing of the railways.

I am going to support the budget because there has been an honest effort to reduce the tariff duties in the past two years, especially on the most important items, and to assist any industry that may start in Canada that all believe would be a benefit to us. I am going to support the budget because I believe the standing offer of reciprocal trade with the United States is a move in the right direction, and will yet be accepted by that country. You might as well try to keep the tide from coming in as to stop trade flowing in its natural courses. I am going to support the budget because I believe that out of his large parliamentary experience in dealing with the fiscal policy of this country, the Finance Minister believes that the budget as presented is the best in the interest of our people, having regard to our diversified industries and callings, and to our financial obligations.

I am going to support the budget in preference to the amendment because it contains now nearly all that is asked for in the amendment and proves conclusively that our Progressive friends are fast becoming adepts at playing politics. I am going to support the budget because the greatest era of prosperity in Canada was under Liberal rule and it will come again if we give Canada's Grand Old Man, the Minister of Finance, a fair trial in this critical period of our country's history.

In closing, I would say: Let us have faith in this great country of ours. We have the best laws of any country in the world. Our people observe those laws better than any people in the world. The observance of the seventh day as a day of rest, which is the bulwark of any nation, is better observed by Canada than any other country in the world. We have the richest country in the world in natural resources in comparison with our population. We have open ports on the Atlantic and Pacific all the year. We have the most diversified occupations; we have everything that makes for a great country. Let us give our best to this country in the way of legislation, not for selfish or political reasons, not for one section as against the other, not for one calling as against the other, but for Canada—Canada, the fairest of the dominions that form the British Empire, that Empire to which we as loyal Canadians are proud to belong.

Mr. J. D. F. DRUMMOND (West Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on the budget mainly because it has been said during the past two sessions that the Progressive members from Ontario seem to be very little interested in the tariff matters which are brought up in this House. But before saying anything about the budget, or other questions I want to refer, briefly to a resolution which it was my privilege to move this session regarding the marking of woollen goods. The resolution was opposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, referring to me said "What he is asking for is in the last analysis the highest degree of protection." Now, I have been of the opinion that it was beyond the dignity of any minister of the Crown to impute to any member of this House motives which were not contained in the resolution moved by me and which were not implied by one single word that I had uttered. If it is necessary for me—for the information of the House or for the information of the country, to state my position on protection I am ready to do so. It is my firm and honest belief that any system of protection which saps the very life blood from one basic industry for the purpose of building any other is economically and fundamentally wrong.

Members of all parties in this House join together in congratulating the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon presenting his seventeenth budget. But there are some of us who are not so anxious to compliment him upon what that budget contains. During the last session, and also during the present one, I have been much amused at the taunt which has been flung across the House first from one side and then from the other —I must admit not so much from the government side as from the Conservative side—of repeated violation and breaking of promises made to the electors before the election. If my recollection serves me right, and I can go back a good many years, this peculiarity, if peculiarity you call it, is not confined to

one political sect. It may be that one party have been greater sinners than the other; but I think we can safely say that both, at one time or another in their career, have committed the same sin.

It has been said here during the present session that the measure of prosperity which the country enjoyed in 1896 and for some years after was due to the policy which had been adopted—I cannot say inaugurated—by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government. Looking back in our history we find that the Liberal party fought every election on the issue of protection from 1878 to 1896. That fact is very vividly imprinted upon my mind. I well remember some of those elections and the issue that was before the electors on those occasions. At one election the issue was free trade as they have it in England. At another it was unrestricted reciprocity. Again it was a tariff for revenue only; until we come to the time when the change of government occurred in 1896. I well remember that the tariff question was not an issue in that election. That contest was fought entirely uopn the Manitoba School question, and after the Liberal party got into power they were blamed—I think rightly blamed—for robbing the Conservative party of their much loved protection policy.

I now wish to refer for a moment to a part of a speech that was made by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). You will find it on page 2852 of Hansard of the present session. In that speech the hon. member made the following statement:

> Perhaps it may shock some members on this side of the House—

I was greatly surprised to hear any hon. gentleman on that side of the House make the statement—

> —when I say that I have very little confidence in the making of platforms, anyway. I do not believe that a government or members elected to the responsibility of a seat in this House should necessarily be asked to accept what may be ill-digested planks in any platform imposed upon them by people who come from various parts of the country and whose suggestions probably are as much dictated by political expediency as anything else; I do not believe that men who represent the public should be expected to carry out such ill-considered behests on the floor of this House. So that speaking for myself, Sir, I would say frankly that in the public interest the platform of 1919 should not be permitted to shackle the government responsible to all the people, whether it be a matter of tariff or anything else.

I want to ask, as briefly as I possibly can, that if the sentiment expressed in the foregoing extract from the hon. gentleman's speech is going to prevail in the public life of this country what is going to become of political honour? If there is one thing more than another upon which the people of this country depend at the time of an election it is upon the principles that are advocated, upon the policy that is laid down by a political party, and which they say they intend to follow if put into power. It seems to me that the statement I have quoted is one that would drag the honour of any political party in the mire.

I now wish to make reference to an utterance by the Prime Minister before the last election. Speaking at Bolton on the 29th October, 1921, as reported in the Toronto Globe, he said:

> I believe in doing all possible to further the legitimate interests of agriculture, as such a policy was going to help all industries in Canada. The Liberals did not propose to continue to help a few men to become multi-millionaires.

He went on further to say that he was in favour of the most drastic measures of economy, and retrenchment in every direction. No voice rang out with louder denunciations throughout the land, no voice gave a greater promise of economy, than that of the present Prime Minister. No statesman before the last election made, with greater emphasis, promises of retrenchment than the leader of the government to-day; and when declared successful at the polls he boastingly heralded the dawn of a new era that would speedily put the country upon its feet financially and cure all the ills that are in every case the aftermath of war. But two years have gone by, and notwithstanding the repeated protests of the Farmers' party for economy and some legislation that would be of assistance in remedying the grievances which they complained of, and which were undoubtedly real, the same need for economy exists to-day and their grievances remain unredressed.

I do not want to be partisan, because that is one of the greatest crimes any Progressive could be guilty of, but I wish to refer for a moment to something that took place in the Conservative party which I hope will prove the assertions I have made that pledges and promises have been violated by both parties in the past. In the year 1911 the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), speaking in favour of a reduction of the duty upon agricultural implements said, Hanasard page 1917:

> But the charge I have to make, and which I hope to bring home to the government this afternoon, is not that one though it is the most serious,—

That is the one that they have made false pretences.

—but it is this that in their attempts to continue the National Policy which had obtained for years before, they have overlooked, they have neglected one essential feature of that policy, they have quite forgotten its guiding principle, namely the principle that as our industrial institutions advanced in strength, as they were able with every advance to acquire a hold of the home market, the import duties were to be diminished and adjusted in order to meet the evolving and changing conditions.

Then follows the wonderful statement made in that speech that the government then in power had helped themselves into power by maintaining themselves behind ramparts of gold.

Also in the same Hansard and at page 1919 the present leader of the Opposition stated:

As everybody knows in 1896, and for two years previously, the duty on agricultural implements of all kinds stood at 20 per cent and the same rate of duty was maintained by this government for eleven years subsequently, or until 1907. In the meantime the insidious work of the officials of this government in increasing the valuation for duty had got into play, and while the nominal duty was maintained at 20 per cent, the actual duty was very seriously increased. . . Other regulations were made by the government which afforded the manufacturer a greater protection than the 20 per cent set out in the Customs Act would indicate.

Now to prove the assertion that the Conservatives after having obtained power in 1911 did the very same thing they charged the Liberals with doing, I quote the following figures obtained from the Bureau of Statistics regarding the duty on agricultural implements from 1912 to 1915, and the duty on the same implements in the year 1921, the last year in which they held office. It is not necessary to go through the whole list of agricultural implements, and for briefness I will take binders. The duty on binders in 1915 under the 17½ per cent tariff was $18.96. I may say just here that this is to some extent at least an answer to the question that was asked the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. King) by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sinclair) on Friday, I think. The duty in 1915, under the 17½ per cent tariff was $18.96, according to the information furnished by the Bureau of Statistics for the year 1919. The valuation for duty purposes of that binder was $108.35. In the year 1921 the valuation on the binder for duty purposes was $182.60 and under the reduction which they boasted of from 17½ to 12½ per cent the agriculturist who bought the binder was obliged to pay in protective tariff the sum of $22.82.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Could the hon. member give us the tariff under the reciprocity arrangement of 1911?

Mr. DRUMMOND: Twenty per cent reduced to 17½ per cent, and in 1915 or 1916 it was reduced to 12½ per cent. Now again let me make reference to the home markets that have been boasted of by some of those who are in favour of a protective tariff. Those who stand committed to a protective tariff as being in the best interests of the people of Canada are fond of boasting that the home market is provided by the industries which are brought into existence or kept in existence by that protective tariff.

In that connection I want to quote a few figures which are also obtained from a report of the Bureau of Statistics issued in 1920, and giving the statistics for the year 1919:

Number of implement manufacturers in Canada in 1919, 86.

Total capital invested in implement manufacturing industries, $83,276,450.

Total value of products of said implements manufactured in Canada during that year, $37,715,331.

According to this report there was exported from Canada in 1919, $8,831,803 worth of manufactures, leaving a balance which was either purchased by the agricultural people of Canada, or retained in stock to the value of $28,883,528. That was the amount of goods left over after $8,000,000 worth had been exported. While the average duty at that time was 12½ per cent, under the tariff introduced by the government last session, the protective duty upon agricultural implements was reduced by 2½ per cent, which was boastingly held up as something that the Progressives should be eternally thankful for, we will therefore strike 10 per cent as the average duty. Ten per cent upon the sum of $28,882,528 means that the Canadian agriculturists who bought those implements paid in duty to the manufactured industries of the Dominion of Canada the sum of $2,888,352.80.

Now the number of men employed in the agricultural implement factories of Canada in that year was 10,808 and the wages paid to those employees was $11,715,331, or an average salary per employee of $1,084. If you will divide the number of employees, 10,808, into the total amount that the users of agricultural implements in Canada were required to pay in duty, you get the sum of $265.80, which is the amount that it cost the purchasers of agricultural implements for each employee who was engaged in the manufacture of these implements, or in other words, the Canadian agriculturist who purchases implements is charged $265.80 for each employee for the home market which such employee provides.

I will leave hon. members to draw their own conclusions as to whether every employee in the implement manufacturing companies is

worth $265 to the agricultural people of this Dominion.

I wish to say a word or two about the Canadian National Railways. While I am one of those who would wish to see the Canadian National Railways placed upon a basis that would avoid a deficit, I cannot understand how such a thing is going to happen when we have such instances as the Chateau Laurier, one of the Canadian National's own hotels here in the city of Ottawa showing an annual deficit of $351,000. If that is the basis upon which our National Railways are going to pay, it will be a long time before we ever reach the desired end. From the report that was given, the hotels in the other parts of the system also show large deficits.

Mr. STANSELL: What is the deficit in connection with the Chateau Laurier? I did not catch the figure?

Mr. DRUMMOND: The figure given to me was $351,000 for the Chateau Laurier, and I am led to believe that that is correct.

Some members in the two old political parties have lovingly spoken of the Progressive party, but they have not chosen just the right words to give expression to their love. As nearly as I can remember, this was started by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) before the last election. The leader of the Opposition in his manifesto published before the election of 1921,—and you will find this in all the papers of that period—after referring to the policy of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), used these words:

> But a stronger and more menacing enemy has arisen. For some years past there has been growing up, first on the prairies of the West, and later through selected parts of eastern Canada, a party backed by a costly and persistent propaganda, the purpose of which is to reverse the tariff policy of this country.

I should like to ask my right hon. friend, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat to-night: Whom is the Progressive party menacing? Whom are they the enemy of? If there is any degree of citizenship, those at present engged in the pursuit of agriculture are the most distinguished of any. They are the men and the women on whom the hope of the future of Canada depends. They are the men and the women who must be depended upon to fill cars for their precious railways and precious merchant marine which are standing monuments of the want of foresight of both the old political parties. They are the people above all others who, if they moved away, would leave Canada bankrupt.

Looking at the matter from the standpoint of what has been attained or what has been received by the occupation of agriculture from any government that has ever sat on the treasury benches of this House, I do not think there should be any doubt in anyone's mind as to the reasons why sixty-five Progressive members were elected at the last election. Perhaps I should correct myself a little as regards those sixty-five, because by a natural process of elimination known as the survival of the fittest, we have been reduced to sixty-three. But I think I am safe in saying, as regards those sixty-three, that notwithstanding the fact that we have not received very much yet, we who form the Progressive party will still continue to go forward and onward, firm in the belief and strong in the hope that there is somewhere in the distance, be it far or near, a hill top radiant with the sunshine of something for the agricultural people, a hill top radiant with the glory of equal opportunity to all and special privileges to none.

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, talking seems to be catching; my hon. friends all around have been talking; but I do not intend to cover the whole country from Vancouver to Halifax, nor to make any lengthy speech. While representing one of the largest ridings in Canada, I may say the second or third largest, unlike my hon. friends to my left, I have no complaints to make; I am at peace with all the world. My riding is asking for nothing; it expects nothing, and it will get nothing. Anything the government can pass over to my hon. friends from the prairie provinces, let them hand it over to them to appease their hunger.

I hesitate in rising to-night to say very much after what has been said so ably by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. I must confess that I am not an orator, and I have never developed my oratorical powers. My life has been a busy one in the business world, and I am trying my best to give service to the people who entrust their business to me, so that speaking has not been my forte. When I entered Parliament I expected to meet big men discussing big things; instead, I find one-half of our time wasted discussing erratic resolutions and economic questions which are of no account whatever.

I want to make some observations, from a business man's standpoint, with reference to certain things in connection with this parliament, and if I err or get out of order, I hope you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to discuss the budget at any length other than to say that I cannot support the amendment to the budget, because

it means a lowering of the tariff and possibly, free trade. I do not intend to support the budget itself, because reference has been made in it to reciprocity. In my humble opinion, the producers of the soil in this country cannot compete with our friends to the south of us, particularly as regards fruit and vegetables—and I have a long experience in those lines—on account of climatic conditions and the extensive markets to the south as compared with climatic conditions in this country, which are much colder, so that more energy and everything else are required in order to produce our stuff. Are hon. members aware that from Florida to North and South Carolina, truck gardeners can raise from two to three crops a year? That cannot be done in Canada. Take the eastern shore of Virginia alone, the greatest producing country on this continent, particularly in potatoes, where they have thousands of acres of potatoes raised by a co-operative organization that supplies the greatest part of the United States and this country during the latter part of May, June and July. After that, we have invariably sold them our old Ontario potatoes, and they replant another crop for their home market in the winter months with great success. Can that be done in Canada? I say, no. I am in favour of more protection for the tiller of the soil, apart altogether from any question of the manufacturing industries of the country. Why should the ingredients that go to the manufacture of oleomargarine, or why should oleomargarine itself, come into this country without paying a duty? I do not know whether or not there is a slight duty on oleomargarine, but at any rate I would put a tariff on these products equal to the Fordney tariff on similar Canadian products.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: One hundred per cent.

Mr. SPENCE: I beg your pardon? I did not hear what the hon. member said. However, I want to assure my hon. friends to my left that they have my sincere sympathy in their difficulties. But they cannot expect to bring about an improvement in their conditions without some sacrifice on their part, such as the business men have had to make in the past few years since the close of the Great War. I would suggest to those hon. gentlemen that they stick more closely to their business. I would advise them to remain on their farms and exercise a continuous supervision over them just as the business men of this country have to do in connection with their various enterprises. That after all is the only way in which any business can succeed; and if that is done in connection with the farms of the West I think that my good friends will make a great success of their farming. In any event, we wish them luck and prosperity.

It gives me much pleasure to compliment the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) on the optimism he displayed in the course of his speech the other day in his discussion of matters in the West. I think that speeches of that kind go to inspire confidence in the people and help to build up the country; it is that kind of speech that we need, which is very different from the calamity howling that we have been hearing from our hon. friends to the left, who have been talking of secession and things of that sort that cannot but be detrimental to the interests of the country. Those hon. gentlemen seem to me to be troubled with "imaginitis." They seem to think that the members in this parliament from the East are not sympathetically disposed to them. Let me assure my hon. friends that that is not so; I want them to believe that they have our deepest sympathy and that we are willing to make any sacrifice that we possibly can to improve things so far as they are concerned. One hon. gentleman the other evening in his speech, after complaining of everything conceivable, made this statement: "If we cannot get along together, let us part good friends." I do not take that view of things at all; I say that we must get along together not only in the interests of Canada, but because I am sure we all have the welfare of the Empire at heart. Let us determine that there shall be no secession. Another hon. gentleman to my left, after threatening parliament with every imaginable ill, said that if we did not listen to his groans and cries we might have reason to regret it. This is what he said, and it is something that in my opinion should not be tolerated in this House of Commons:

> Hon. members may not believe this;—

I may say, we had not the impression before, but what I am about to read would, if possible, confirm it if it did exist:

> —some hon. members are inclined to laugh and say: "Oh, the agriculturists are always whining," but if hon. members keep on saying that, I assure them that they are taking a dangerous course. We may not always whine. We have in this country a strong foreign element, and sometimes it is necessary to keep them in curb. If the House and the country continue to take that attitude, an attitude of, as I said before, cold-blooded insolence, we may come to a time when there will be more unrest and more real trouble than we have had in the past. I would just give hon. members fair warning. Hon. members may laugh at this if they like; but that will be the effect.

Now, speeches of that kind are positively detrimental to this fair country and should be discouraged, at least on the floor of the House. Let me tell my good friends to my left that they know nothing to-day about hard times. Let them go back to the days between 1892 and 1897 when pork sold at 3½ cents to 4 cents per pound, eggs from 8 to 10 cents, butter from 10 to 12 cents, and beef at any old price; when geese sold at from 3 to 5 cents a pound, turkey from 7 to 8 cents a pound, and when there was scarcely any demand for chickens, these being from 15 to 20 cents per pair, with potatoes at 10 cents a bag. I can substantiate every statement I make in this connection, because I bought all these commodities in those days.

Mr. KNOX: And I sold them.

Mr. SPENCE: Yes, and I sympathize with you; and if you keep on talking in the strain in which you are talking to-day you will soon bring back the conditions that existed then.

Mr. KNOX: But sympathy is not worth much; what would you do?

Mr. SPENCE: We have been doing everything for you. I know conditions in the West just as well as my hon. friends do, for I have covered the prairie provinces. I have travelled all over this country from Halifax to Vancouver and Victoria, and I can say that the conditions in the country from which my hon. friends come were no worse in those days than were the conditions in our part of the country, nor indeed, were they half as bad. I remember that at the same time bread sold at 4 to 5 cents a large loaf retail; I sold tons of it myself.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): A loaf of bread and quart of whiskey would be a cheap meal.

Mr. SPENCE: What would wheat and oats be worth at that time?

Mr. KNOX: We ought to know; we were selling wheat in those days you speak of.

Mr. SPENCE: Then why do you forget those bad times so soon? The life of the farmer, I think, has improved a lot since those days with a few exceptions, and this is due to the activities of the Department of Agriculture under different governments, that department having improved dairying and farming generally. The Agricultural department under every government has done a great deal for hon. gentlemen. It has established cold storages, while private interests have also built similar institutions, enabling the speculator to pay these gentlemen and those whom they represent a reasonable price for their butter, their eggs, their poultry and hogs during the summer season, when the amount of these products coming in could not possibly be consumed. And yet hon. gentlemen growl about not having accommodation, and so forth.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPENCE: Pardon me; I am talking now. When I get through with this sentence you may interrupt me.

Mr. FORKE: I will not bother you any more, I am sure.

Mr. SPENCE: Butter especially has been improved to the greatest extent. I remember well having seen dozens upon dozens, nay, hundreds of barrels, come into our market, some of which was absolutely unfit for food; and when we segregated the good from the bad and got all we could for the best, we had to sell the rest at from 4 to 5 cents a pound. To-day, through the good offices of the departments of agriculture of the provinces there is no excuse for there being any bad butter in the country, and the lady who cannot make good butter nowadays can sell her milk to the creamery or take it to the cheese factory. What else do hon. gentlemen want to have done for them? To-day, I am glad to say, there is a big demand for the woman who can make her own butter. In the fall of the year when the farmers decide to get rid of their stock before the winter season sets in, for one reason or another, generally to obviate feeding during the winter, very heavy shipments come in and the cold storage is again brought into use to save the situation. These gentlemen bitterly complain because they cannot get the prices they want for their stock. But how would it be possible to consume trainloads of half-fed cattle, the scrubs that come into the cities and large centres? How would it be possible at all to make any use of them without cold storages? Again, my good friends are protected by the provision that has been made for them in the different provinces.

12 m.

There are too many people to-day who know everybody else's business but their own. Before entering public life men should have a broad knowledge of their country's needs as a whole and not think their own little part of the country alone needs attention. Thank goodness I have never been that way. All my life I have tried to give the other fellow the best of the deal. When in 1909 I first offered myself as a candidate for the city council of Toronto my wide experience on the water-

front made me realize the necessity and importance of water-borne transportation, and I advocated then, as I do now, the deepening of the waterway between Montreal and Toronto and also the deepening of the Welland canal. I pictured ocean boats leaving Toronto loaded with apples and other merchandise for the Liverpool and Glasgow markets and bringing back return cargoes for delivery clear to the head of the lakes. Can any hon. gentleman tell me that such a water-borne traffic would not build up the central and western provinces? And yet I have heard some hon. members from the West ridiculing the idea of a deep waterway to Montreal. The day is not far distant I think when we shall see the realization of this idea which will mean so much to Canada and the Empire.

The Ontario cabinet has been accused of irresponsible government—government by commission. As I see this administration it is a case of government by committee. The government has refused to accept responsibility for any important legislation introduced this session. The government is run like a six-ring circus—committees sitting in every quarter at a cost to the country in the neighborhood of $500,000, with little prospect of any return commensurate with this outlay. We have been told by the Prime Minister that we are to have a fair and equitable redistribution. Well, on the committee to which the redistribution bill has been assigned we have ten members of the Liberal party, five of the Progressive party and four of the Conservative party. Do you expect to get a fair and equitable redistribution from such a committee? I say. no.

I am not going to criticize the budget too severely. I am glad to see that the tax has been changed on soft drinks and that the cigarette duty has been reduced to its old figure. I wrote a letter last year to the Minister of Finance pointing out just what would happen in respect to the increased duties he then placed on these two articles. I received a very nice answer from him in which he said he would take my suggestions into his very serious consideration—that is what Sir Oliver Mowat used to say—but I do not think he did. However, he has taken my advice at last. Speaking of the income tax, I think the penalties are entirely too high. A friend of mine who was executor of a small Toronto estate forgot to make his return within the specified time, but he did so three days later and paid the tax. In the meantime the income tax department saw fit to fine him $50. Now, could he take that out of the widow's mite? No, he had to take it out of his own pocket. That is penalizing a good, respectable citizen and I say the law should be changed to prevent the repetition of such an injustice.

We should know to-day whether the Post Office Department is being run at a profit or a loss. The sale of postage stamps to-day is enormous. Many of these stamps are placed on cheques and receipts and go to the credit of the Post Office Department. Altogether it is a very badly managed affair. Then the reduction of the maximum stamp on cheques is no help to the ordinary man of business. A wholesale man like myself has occasion to draw many cheques from $100 up to $2,000 or $3,000, and consequently the reduction only benefits bankers, brokers and millionaires. The rate of duty on cheques is extremely high and eats up our profits. There is not a dollar you make that somebody is not trying to get it.

If the hon. Minister of Finance were in his seat I would ask him why was the sales tax taken off newsprint. To my mind it was not taken off in the interests of the Progressive party or of the consuming public; it was bribery pure and simple to get the support of the newspapers of the country. Furthermore, there is no class of business to-day that can afford to pay a 6 per cent sales tax. To my mind some commodities to-day that are free from duty could well afford to stand a tax, and it would be a good way of getting revenue. Take bananas alone, for some reason or other the banana trust, composed of the foreign element of this country and the United States, control our politicians and consequently not a cent of duty has ever been placed on bananas. Bananas to the value of $5,210,000 were imported last year. There is absolutely no reason in the world why a moderate duty should not be imposed on bananas, especially as there is nothing so detrimental to our fruit growers as the importation and sale of bananas in the months of June, July, August and September when our own strawberries, plums, peaches and other fruits come on the market. Oranges and pineapples are free of duty. I am not advocating that they should be made dutiable, I merely mention that they enter free. Grape fruit for some reason or other is taxed too high, one cent a pound being equivalent to seventy or eighty cents a box. Ten times the amount of money would come into the Treasury if grape fruit, oranges, lemons, and pineapples were taxed 25 cents a box, and this tax would never be noticed in the resale price.

If there is any commission in this world that should be appointed—I do not advocate

commissions because I believe the men who are elected to this House should bear the responsibility of legislating for this country—but if there is any commission that should be appointed it is a tariff commission, composed of men who know something about trade conditions in this country, instead of this parliament tampering with the tariff from time to time. The day after the Minister of Finance delievered his budget I read in a Toronto morning paper—I was not able to be here on that day—that the tariff on potatoes had been increased from twenty cents to thirty-five cents per hundred. The public thought that was an awful increase. I do not think it meant from twenty to thirty-five cents a hundred, because the duty was 20 cents per bushel. It was only increasing the duty one and two-thirds cents per hundred pounds, and I do not think the tariff should be interfered with to make a little change like that. Again, we have established the principle of a certain sized barrel, two and a half bushels, or two and three-quarters, or three bushels. To-day we are fighting with the customs officials all the time over the weight of the barrel, and I say it is not worth disturbing trade for such a small amount. I think it is easier collecting duty than anything else, and that would be my system of raising money and having less taxation, but I would recommend strongly to any government that is in power in this country not to make these small changes in the tariff, but appoint a tariff commission composed of men who know the business needs of the country.

Mr. E. N. HOPKINS (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have the sympathy of every hon. gentleman in this House because on some occasion, whether it was last year, five years, ten years ago, thirty or even forty years ago every hon. gentleman has been in the position in which I find myself at this moment. It is a wonderful thing for a man to have the record of forty years in the House of Commons which I believe two hon. members of this House enjoy, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister or Railways (Mr. Graham). But it is a more wonderful thing to be forty years in the Canadian House of Commons and have the respect and love of the entire House.

Mr. Speaker, when a member comes to the House of Commons for the first time, he comes here as you know with just the vision of his own little constituency. He does not just at first get the vision of the Dominion of Canada, or, as I suppose he will later on, the vision of Canada as a nation, the world's vision, for we all believe that Canada is a nation in the building. We believe the day will come when we shall have countless thousands of people in this country to develop the resources that have been bestowed upon us with such a bounteous hand, but just at first all we can do in our maiden effort is to talk about the things back home. All governments say, if they are asked to do anything out of the ordinary: We must first feel the pulse of the people, so I would like for a few minutes to present the pulse of my constituency.

I represent a constituency in the centre of Saskatchewan, in that great granary that is called the bread basket of the Empire. Every year the milling companies of the West just after threshing time send out and get samples of all grains in the different parts of the West and submit it to the baking and milling tests, and when they find the grain that is best adapted for milling they send to that particular district and get that wheat for their mills. The wheat in the northern part of my constituency—it is an old settled district for forty years—has been selected as the wheat the millers want to grind in their own mill. Now we do not get any premium on that.

I say it is an old-settled district, and one of the best. The southern part of the riding is a newer district where some of my people are forty miles from a railroad, but it is a good district, and I was glad to note from the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) the other day that we are going to have a railroad there. Half of my constituents are rural and half of them are urban, and I make no apologies to my urban constituents for discussing the problems of the rural people, for in the West, in the farming district on the prairie, the interest of the city is so connected with that of the farmer that they cannot be divided. We have only two classes of people in that country, the people who can make a living on the farm and make a fair living, and the people who are enabled to live in the city because the farmer makes a fair living. In the early days the farmers were fairly successful before the war and we got a city, but now that the farmers are not doing well their condition is reflected in the city, and I want to say to you that these are strenuous days in western Canada, and I fancy there are going to be strenuous days all over Canada because when the buying power of the farmer is diminished it is reflected in the business of the whole country. Canada was started by a little colony of farmers, and though our commerce has ex-

panded it still remains true that the great industry of this country is agriculture. We in the West have always believed that a high tariff bore unduly heavily on the West.

Let me put it in another way. We will suppose, if you can imagine it, that in place of having the great Dominion of Canada we had an eastern Canada and a western Canada, that these were both British possessions but divided into two separate provinces, and that the people of eastern Canada came to the people of western Canada and said: Let us form a great confederation and have one great Canada. If you will form that confederation we will make this proposition to you. Remember that we have the great bulk of the population east of the great lakes, and consequently we will have the voting power and will make the laws. But we will make this proposition to you: If you will join us in the East we will put a high tariff on all the things you consume. You will be allowed to take all your products of the farm and sell them in the markets of the world in competition with the whole world, but we will put a heavy duty on everything you buy, on your implements, on your clothing, on your boots and shoes. Yes, we will do more than that. We will take your lands, your mines, and administer them for you.

Do you think that would have a tendency to make the West join with the East? I do not think it would. A good many gentlemen here seem to think that we are on the up grade, that we have crossed the Rubicon and are going to climb up. I hope that is the case but I do not think so. Some of the brightest minds in the world to-day believe that the best way to have a reconstruction would be for the different nations to cancel their debts and commence again. The war has been over for a good many years and in my opinion we have not started re-construction yet. Re-construction means to commence at the bottom and build up from the foundation. The only way you will build a permanent structure in Canada is to take a re-capitalization of your debts and then adjust those debts. There are thousands of people in western Canada to-day who are adjusting their debts—the debtor and the creditor—and starting anew. We will never accomplish what we want in this country, in my humble opinion, until we adjust our debts as between the debtor and the creditor. This Canada of ours has lost millions of money during the war, and the trouble is that to-day some people want to make others bear more than their share of that loss. When our people bear their proportionate share of the burden then we will be able to build afresh; and it is a duty of parliament, I think, to do for the people what they are unable to do for themselves. That is to make every Canadian, as far as is possible, bear his share of the burden. When every Canadian realizes his responsibility and is willing to do his part then we shall really commence to build up the country.

Mr. HUGH C. McKILLOP (West Elgin): I am sure the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) must be tired of the congratulations which have been showered upon him from every corner of the chamber and therefore I will content myself with wishing him for the future many years of good health and happiness and freedom from parliamentary duties.

The budget as brought down this year does not display very many changes as compared with the previous budget. True there are a number of small changes. For example, the tariff is reduced on sugar but at the same time it is increased on clothing, so that in the end it works out very much the same. It is just about the same old tariff. Some items are higher, some are lower, but on the whole it is just about the same. This is the second budget that has been brought down by the present government, and it makes one wonder whether they have forgotten altogether the platform they adopted in 1919, which was broadcasted in blazing colours all over this country. Take even their more recent pre-election promises which they made throughout this country in 1921. So far there have not been such changes in the tariff as to give very much encouragement to those who supported them in the last election. It is no wonder, therefore, that the present government have not achieved greater success in the by-elections that have taken place since they came into power. Mr. Speaker, the handwriting is on the wall, warning the present government that unless they change their ways and endeavour to carry out some of their promises their time in office is going to be very short.

Now, I want to direct attention for a few moments to a matter that concerns the bean producers of this country, and in dealing with this subject I will present the facts as briefly as possible. For a number of years past the duty on beans imported into Canada has been 25 cents a bushel while beans entering the United States from Canada have to meet a duty of $1.20 a bushel. I claim that this is not right, and that it constitutes a hardship on the farmers of Canada who have been engaged in the production of beans. Since this condition has prevailed many farmers have been driven out of the industry, while others have so curtailed their production that not over

40 per cent of the quantity of beans that used to be grown in Canada is now produced in this country. Take in the period from 1892 to 1901 the production of beans in Canada amounted to 875,597 bushels. In the latter year the import of beans amounted to 11,003 bushels. Since that time imports of beans have grown by leaps and bounds and at the same time the home production has steadily declined. To such an extent has that been the case that in the year 1920—the last period for which I have figures—the Canadian bean production reached a total of only 388,499 bushels, whereas in the same time the imports had grown to the extent of 444,698 bushels. In 1920 we find the production of beans in Canada was only a little over one-third as much as it was during the ten years that I have mentioned. What is the cause of this? Simply that owing to the low tariff maintained by Canada this country has been made a dumping ground by the nation to the south of us. This is not as it should be, and no self-respecting government should allow such a condition to continue any longer. Then there are other countries. For instance, Austria and Japan send a lot of beans into this country. I do not think it is fair, equitable or just that the farmers of Canada should be called upon to compete with countries where the standard of living is so much lower and where labour is so much cheaper. I have it on good authority that a labourer in Japan does not receive as much in the fields for two weeks' work as the labourer does in this country for one day's work. Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that if this duty on beans coming into this country were put where it should be, and the bean producers given to understand that the home market was available to them, it would only be a matter of a short time when the production of beans in Canada would far exceed any production of the past. It is suggested that the reason the tariff is kept down is to favour the consumer. As to that I will only say that, with all the importations of beans in the past, the consumer is not buying the bean a particle cheaper than he did two years ago, as it is a well known fact that for years the price of beans in small quantities has been ten cents per pound. I am convinced that if the tariff on this commodity is raised the consumer will not have to pay any more than at present, as the production of beans would so increase as to keep the price to the consumer where it is at present or even lower. I hope the government will give this matter their earnest attention and see that the farmers and bean producers have a fair show.

I should like to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to the conditions of the workingmen in this country. We have at present on our statutes, under the Department of Labour, what is known as fair wage officers, and I understand that one of these officers is stationed in Montreal, another in Ottawa, another in Toronto, another in Winnipeg and another in Vancouver. I would have these officers inquire in their respective districts as to the condition under which the workingman is labouring, first as to wages, and secondly, as to the cost of living in his community. It is a well-known fact you may have a labouring man in one place who is doing a certain kind of work and receiving what is termed a living wage, and at the same time you may have, a thousand miles from him, a man engaged in similar work, receiving the same wage, and yet, on account of the high cost of living, hardly able to make ends meet. I claim it should be the duty of the fair wage officer to inquire into the workingman's conditions and to see that he is satisfied and contented, for after all, a satisfied and contented workingman is one of Canada's greatest assets.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I claim that if the workingmen are contented, a great obstacle is placed in the way of the entrance into Canada of Bolshevism. For my part, I have no use for Bolshevists, or Bolshevism, or of any other kind of "ism" except good, sound, strong, loyal Canadianism. I am satisfied that 90 per cent of our working men belong to that class. I do not wish to be misunderstood in this matter. I do not hold any brief for any radical element. The class I am speaking for is the honest, sincere and loyal workingman, the man who wants to give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. I want to be placed on record as being ready, at any time while a member of this House, to suport any sane legislation that has for its object the bettering of the workingman's conditions.

In conclusion, I may say that since coming to this House I have heard a good deal of talk about low tariff, and a great deal of talk about free trade, but I am convinced that neither one of these will ever cure the ills Canada is suffering from. On the other hand, I am just as strongly convinced that what this country needs is a strong national policy, if she is ever going to take the place that she originally intended to take, as one of the leading nations of the world.

On motion of Mr. Stewart (Leeds) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Graham the House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Tuesday).

Tuesday, May 22, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

FISHERIES—ATLANTIC PROVINCES

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE RECOMMEND INVESTIGATION

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): I beg to present the third report of the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries as follows:

Your committee having considered and adopted the following resolution, herewith present the same for the information of the House:

Whereas a number of urgent requests have been made to the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from time to time during the last few years for extensions of the lobster fishing season existing through the Maritime provinces, and as it would appear from representations made to the minister that such changes in the existing regulations are desirable;

And whereas it further appears that much difference of opinion exists among the lobster fishermen, and others engaged in the industry, regarding said regulations;

And whereas it appears to be the unanimous opinion of this committee than an enquiry should be held which shall also include the principal fisheries of the Atlantic provinces;

Be it therefore resolved,—That in the opinion of this committee an enquiry should be held during the ensuing summer into the entire situation with a view if possible of changing the existing general regulations concerning the said principal fisheries to meet present requirements;

And be it further resolved.—That said enquiry should be conducted by seven members of the Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries of the House of Commons, to be appointed by the minister under the Enquiries Act.

EMPIRE DAY ADJOURNMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Graham:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 23rd instant, it stand adjourned until Friday, the 25th instant.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS AND RE-ESTABLISHMENT

PRINTING COMMISSION'S REPORT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved:

That five hundred copies in the English language, and one hundred and fifty copies in the French language, of the first report of the second part of the investigation of the Royal Commission on Pensions and Re-establishment, laid on the Table on the 21st day of May, 1923, be printed forthwith and that rule 74 in relation thereto be suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be adopted by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LADNER: I desire to ask if it is the intention of the government to bring down amendments to the Pension Act, to give effect to the recommendations of the Ralston report with reference to matters requiring legislation.

Mr. BELAND: I have given an answer to a similar question twice before—yes.

SIR HENRY THORNTON

On the Orders or the Day:

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): I desire to call the attention of the government to a despatch appearing in the Toronto Mail and Empire of the 19th, instant, which reads as follows:

Sir Henry W. Thornton is Steamship Director

At a meeting of the board of directors of Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, held to-day, Sir Henry W. Thornton, K.B.E., was elected a director of the company.

I should like to ask if the government has any information on this matter? If not, will it ascertain the facts and inform the House? Also, does the government approve of the president of the Canadian National Railways acting as a director of a corporation which competes with the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Mercantile Marine?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways): The government has no information excepting what it has seen in the newspaper despatch. I will endeavour to get the information asked for. Regarding my hon. friend's second question, I may tell him that the Canadian National railways, as now constituted, has an exchange of traffic arrangement with the Canada Steamship Lines.

Mr. STEVENS: It must be in the combine.

Mr. GRAHAM: So are you, so are we all.

PUBLICITY REPRESENTATIVE IN LONDON

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the government in a position to advise the House in regard to the reported appointment of a publicity representative in London?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I have made inquiries of the different departments of the government and have been unable to find any one who knows anything of the matter. The government has no information as to any such appointment having been made.

PRIVATE BILL—FIRST READING

Bill No. 179 (from the Senate), for the relief of Grace Lees Smiley.—Mr. Boys.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Monday, May 21, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Robert Forke.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has been treated in this debate to general expressions of good will. To these his wealth of years and his long public service undoubtedly entitle him, and in them I am only too happy to join. My comment this afternoon on his course in recent times will, I hope, not lack in courtesy, but I am equally anxious that it do not lack in frankness. I was disappointed in his budget. I say so entirely irrespective of the policies he abandoned and of the policies he adopted. I do not think the budget presentation was a real budget presentation at all. I think the country is entitled to more in a statement on the occasion of a budget speech, than the Finance Minister saw fit to give us as the text of our discussion. What the budget speech contains is a skilful but elusive commentary on the history of tariff discussions, on the unpopularity of taxes, on the undesirability of debt and on various ideas, some accepted and some rejected, which passed through the minister's mind in preparation of his case. A budget presentation should be a great deal more than that, and in the history of this country it usually has contained a great deal more. A budget presentation, I think, should include a close examination of the whole financial position of our country with some retrospection into past years and as well some prospect into the future. By examination I do not merely mean a chronicle of the ascending steps of our debt. I mean an analysis of our financial position. I mean an investigation of the value of our assets, of their revenue bearing properties and of the nature and maturity of our liabilities. It should contain as well a synopsis of our trade, of those vital factors of our commercial life that keep us living and moving, an examination into the sources, the basis and the currents of our trade, and into the policies that best can be applied for its pursuit. It should contain as well an analysis of our means of revenue and of the merits of each, and some comparison between our position in all these respects and the position of other countries comparable to our own. These things are given in the budget addresses of the statesmen of other lands. I commend the Finance Minister to read the speech on a similar occasion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of England presented this year, or, better still, the speech presented last year, and, because a better example cannot be found, I commend all hon. members to read the budget presentation of the present Prime Minister of Australia when as treasurer of the Commonwealth a year ago he gave to its parliament an exhibition and an exposè of the whole financial and industrial situation of his country. I venture to make this remark: that after reading both, —the Australian budget and our own—though unacquainted with Australia and its history to any degree and though having followed the finances, the trade, and all the affairs of this Dominion, and having witnessed its development for fifteen years, after reading both, I knew more of the position of Australia than I did of the position of Canada. This is the purpose of a budget address, and a mere homily on various popular subjects is not justice to the occasion and not justice to the House. We owe to our people a thorough examination of all these elements, and we did not get the text for this examination from the budget presentation of the Finance Minister.

He gave us the figures of our ascending debt since 1914, told us how much it had increased year by year, and seemed to take some credit, or at least some comfort in the fact that we were not increasing our debt so rapidly now in the days of peace as we did in the days of war. His idea was to show that under other regimes we went rapidly into debt, but that now, though we are going further into debt, we are not going at quite so accelerated a pace. This is very true. He was not altogether fair even in that statement. Starting with 1914, when we did add $21,000,000 to our debt, the whole addition and far more due to commitments for the Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific, and the loans we had to make to have them completed, though we did that year add $21,000,000 to our debt for those

purposes, we remember as well that the year before, notwithstanding corresponding obligations, we reduced the debt by $25,600,000. We effected a greater reduction in one year than all the aggregate reductions the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had been able to make in the fifteen years antecedent during which he reigned as Minister of Finance. Yes, our debt additions are, I suppose, diminishing. The debt addition in the fiscal year ending in 1920 was some $674,000,000. That was the year when we paid for demobilization and took care of the cash responsibilities which we thought this country owed to the men who returned from the war. The elements that make up that sum are largely composed of cash gratuities to those men, and of outlay for other policies then laid down, which policies hon. gentlemen opposite have dutifully followed by way of helping to establish the returned soldiers. Though we went into debt huge millions for that purpose, we were met by castigation on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, including the Minister of Finance, and by the declaration that, if returned to power, they would adopt a better method and distribute further cash grants to those men. This declaration they promptly repudiated on attaining power.

The next year, when we had passed from those days of great and uncommon responsibilities, the addition to the debt was some $92,000,000, and in 1922 for which the present government is partly responsible, $81,000,000. This year the addition to debt is $57,000,000, not a very great reduction from the year before. The minister gives it to us as $49,000,000; but he gets that figure by crediting $8,000,000, which was just as much our property five years ago as it is our property to-day, $8,000,000 of exchange which was owed to us by the British government then, but which now is credited merely for the reason that now it is ascertained. These are huge additions to our debt.

In case I might overlook this, let me say that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), in attributing our obligations for revenue to the late administration and to the great war debt which was piled up during its tenure of office, reflected upon us because, he stated, we had not gathered from the pockets of our people during the war and applied on our war obligations, as large a proportion as we should have. He contrasted us unfavourably with Great Britain. This has been a practice of hon. gentlemen opposite and of some hon. gentlemen who are not wholly opposite. I have never heard figures given by any of our critics; but if members of the House will look at the figures given in the budget presentation of 1919 when the war was over, there will be found a statement of the revenues collected during the war, of the war debt, of the whole war outlay, of the capital debt as well, If hon. gentlemen will look at a corresponding statement by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, they will find the British Chancellor of the Exchequer claiming that they succeeded, during the currency of the year, in paying 28 per cent of the war debt, of the war obligations, and having to borrow only the balance, 72 per cent. I went into his figures to ascertain how they were arrived at, and the only method by which they could have been arrived at was this, by taking the total outlay for the war, including interest thereon and resultant pensions, then ascertaining how far their excess of revenue during the war exceeded their other expenses, and applying that excess upon war obligations. If we take the very same method in Canada, we find our war obligations as presented in that budget running to $1,327,000. Add to this, interest thereon and our pensions; then set off against it the excess revenue over the other obligations, revenue over expenditure, which excess was $425,000,000, and it will be found our application against the whole war responsibility was not 28 per cent, but 29 per cent. Nor do I not know that we could have been expected to have reached the percentage of Great Britain. Great Britain was an older and a wealthier country. She had greater resources upon which to draw. Of course her responsibilities were greater; but we were much more comparable with Australia. I have gone into the figures for Australia, and I find that Australia was able to apply, not 29 per cent on her war obligations, but less than 15 per cent throughout the entire war period. Such is the record of Canada.

We gathered those funds from war profits, from a higher scale of income tax; we gathered those funds as well from a well directed additional tariff taxation to the extent in one year alone of $44,000,000, during which period not only industry, but agriculture and every occupation of our people flourished as never before. We gathered them by a higher income taxation than Britain imposed, because Britain's minimum was actually higher than ours, and her maximum was not more. We carried our profits taxation in its full extent throughout the year 1919, after Great Britain had reduced hers by almost one-half. Our profits taxation throughout, higher on certain industries than on others, because certain industries profited more than others, was higher than that of our great com-

petitor the United States, indeed it was the highest tax of its kind in the world. Beyond that our income taxation, though fixed on a scale lower than that of Great Britain until something over $150,000 per annum of income was reached, was on a scale higher even than Great Britain's and higher than Australia's for incomes beyond that amount. It was higher than the level of the United States on all classes of incomes, large and small. We must measure our power to tax in a very great degree, by corresponding taxation across the line. The government then in office went to the full extent it could go in levying from the people during the war period a large share of their earnings to pay the cost of the war. Very well. We got to the end; and though no one claims perfection or anything approaching perfection, nor claims there was not waste, for no war can be fought without waste, I venture to assert this as one conclusion, that we got more war results for the money we spent on the war than did any other country, save possibly Australia or Great Britain. Undoubtedly we got the equal of any country for the money we were able to expend. Let us not, then, bewail the debt of Canada. We are in a better position to discharge it than is any other nation which went through the entire course of the war. It has been shown in previous budget addresses that our debt, though heavy, is less than a third of the per capita tax of New Zealand and little more than half the per capita debt of Australia; and, of course, our debt is very much less per capita than is the debt of Great Britain.

Years ago, even as early as 1919, but more strenuously in 1920, we were prayed by hon. gentlemen opposite, nay, we were demanded by them, to balance the budgets of that time. We were told that the war was past and the period for balancing budgets had come, and hon. gentlemen in 1920 pointed to Great Britain, which that year had virtually balanced hers. In 1921 more vociferously than ever they compared us unfavourably with Great Britain because we had an addition to our debt of some $80,000,000, while Great Britain's had actually been reduced. Those charges were true. But Great Britain had added to her war debt all the cost of her war material and so she was able to reduce her war debt thus enhanced, by the sale of war material to the extent, not of millions or hundreds of millions, but actually of billions of dollars. We on the other hand, though we were possessed of a share of war material, had relatively almost a trifling share. We had equipped our men on a per capita basis from the British government; therefore a large share of war material was not ours. Our debt was never enhanced by that increment, and consequently we could not sell war material to reduce. But with the passage of those years, conditions became comparable. Great Britain's war material has been sold, and for the past two years she has been virtually in the same position as we; but she continues to diminish her debt while we, with a new government in office, continue to increase ours. And this new government consists of the men who inveighed against us in earlier times because, under totally incomparable circumstances, we were not able to reduce. Now I think the time has come when a better showing should be made, and I certainly think the time has come when we ought not to be under the necessity, I had almost said the humiliation, of proclaiming to the world that we are budgeting for a deficit of some $70,000,000 for the year just ahead.

There are ways of balancing budgets. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in his address, thought of only one; the only possibility that seemed to be before his eye was the raising of taxes, as he described it, from new fields. Well, there are other ways of increasing taxes besides entering new fields, namely, the multiplying of taxes in the old fields. But the minister, although he has done that, did not emphasize the fact; the fact he emphasized was that he did not like to venture into new fields in order to balance his budget. It is not very long since he saw another and far better way than either of those plans to balance a budget, and that way was by reducing the expenditure of this country as we receded from the years of the war. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in the Estimates of 1922 it was proclaimed to the people of Canada that a saving of, I think, $137,000,000 was being effected by this economical government for the year just now passed in the way of appropriations for our railways. One would have expected it is true, that concurrently with the completion of two events or tasks, namely, the receding of the war—and necessarily the reduction of after-war services—and secondly, the rehabilitation of our railway systems that we had to take over;—one would naturally have expected I say, that concurrently with these two circumstances, it would be quite easy to reduce our expenditure. So no one was surprised when the government was able to present appropriations to this House less, as to our railways, by $137,000,000. It simply meant that the Grand Trunk, having been

put into shape for service, the Canadian National having been built also into shape for service, those obligations being discharged did not have to be discharged again. But notwithstanding this fact, and notwithstanding the other facts to which I have alluded, what do we actually find the result of last year? What do we actually find in the way of diminution of expenditure as between 1922, nine months of which were ours, and 1923, no months of which were ours? The reduction is not $137,000,000; it is not $37,000,000; the reduction is nine million and a few thousand dollars. The actual expenditure last year as given by the minister in his budget statement, though he did not tabulate and add the figures—why, I leave hon. gentlemen to conjecture—the actual total expenditure, taking into account that charged to the consolidated revenue, the capital charge, the special war and railways expenditures amounted in 1921-22 to $463,305,000. The actual expenditure for this year, an expenditure composed of the same elements, is $454,280,000, or a diminution of $9,000,000. Why has 137 contracted to nine? How is the nine arrived at? Our Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department is nearly $4,000,000 less. I am not criticizing the reduction; the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment has frankly and publicly stated that, having examined into the services we had established, he had made up his mind that he could not improve upon them and so simply carried them on. This reduction is due to the fact that the necessity for the money has contracted; we are getting further from the war. There is a reduction also of $3,000,000 or more in our pensions. I have the exact figures before me from the Department of Finance; the reduction in pensions is $3,300,000. There is a reduction as well in our Soldiers' Settlement appropriations. In those soldier services the government was able, quite properly, I presume, to save this country some $7,500,000. This makes up virtually all of the total sum of reductions from 1921 to 1922; there is only a million and a half to account for besides. But they had nothing at all this year in the way of loans to the provinces for housing; they had nothing at all for unemployment—they let the unemployed take care of themselves. This may be an evidence of selfishness, but it could scarcely be said to be an evidence of economy. Then they did not have the same appropriations for railways. But in all the services where it took real strength of character and will to make contractions, instead of contractions they have made additions, and at the rate they are going they will very soon overtake all they are able to reduce because of diminishing soldier services. At the present rate of additions to civil government, at the rate of additions to many other of the services mentioned in the tabulated statements obtainable from the Department of Finance they will very soon overtake and pass the appropriations of the near-war years.

Such is the financial record of the government. And yet although standing under a deficit for this past year of $57,000,000 the Minister of Finance gives us figures of contemplated expenditures for the current year aggregating $434,000,000, and budgets only for $372,000,000: What is going to be the effect of all this on the name of Canada throughout the world? What is going to be the effect on the operations of business and the securing of money everywhere for the purposes of our industrial expansion? What is to be the effect now on this Dominion which ended the war in strength and virility, which was admitted by this government to have been in the best position of any land when peace was declared, if we have to acknowledge financial defeat, haul down our flag and say "For the life of us though we don't expand we cannot pay our debts"?

The minister proposes some increases and some reductions of taxation. Everybody rejoices in reductions. But what does reduction of taxation mean when it is accomplished by an increase of our national debt? It is all right to talk about taking $2,500,000 off sugar —and, mark you, it is not off the sugar refiner; the protection stands as it was. I am not complaining of that—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I am not complaining, and I did not complain three years ago. Hon. gentlemen will hear me on this subject, and one thing they will not be able to find fault with—they will not find me guilty of apostacy. There is a reduction of $2,500,000, the minister estimates, in sugar taxes—we had a duty of 2·39 cents a pound on refined sugar and 1·69 cents a pound on raw sugar; he takes 50 cents per hundred pounds off refined and a corresponding duty off the raw, thus leaving the refiner just where he was, a reduction on the whole to the consumer of half a cent a pound, and thereby he says he saves the country $2,500,000. Well, is this more creditable than the course of Great Britain? Great Britain has a five cent per pound duty on sugar. She maintains this duty, but she is reducing her debt by one

hundred million pounds. We are cutting down a two cent duty and we are adding to our debt by $72,000,000. Let the government balance its budget and we will all welcome any reduction of taxation; but let no government boast of tax reductions when they are made at the expense of our credit and add to our national debt.

I have a word to say about last year's alterations in the budget. Hon. gentlemen will remember that though in the tariff there was rigid, definite adherence to the principle of protection—accompanied as usual by aspersions on its name—although there was almost an exact adherence to the very schedules of our tariff, the minister made certain proclamations of "reforms" which he said he was effecting. Every proclamation being a change from what had been our policy was received with acclaims of joy by hon. gentlemen of the House in two of its departments. The first I believe was an announcement of a great "reform" in the abandonment of what was called our depreciated currency clause. This clause it was said was merely disguised protection. It raised our protection 1,000 per cent, and if we wanted such protection the manly thing, the minister said, was to put 1,000 per cent protection on and call it 1,000 per cent; But he had looked into the subject of depreciated currency and had determined to sweep the whole mockery of protection away. Well, when the applause had died down there was a little consideration given to the question, there was some debate, and the minister later came down with a substitutive depreciated currency clause which did in another and less efficient way what the old depreciated currency clause which he had denounced had done. His new clause put the duty anywhere from 100 to 1,000 per cent at the will of the minister but disguised its operation. He has operated that depreciated currency clause ever since.

Then he announced that there was a marking clause which had been scorned by many as an abhorrence. As disguised protection it had been claimed we had provided that goods from foreign countries should be marked with the country of origin. He said this would not do, especially as we had not put it in into operation. Neither had we. There had been difficulty in putting it into operation. It was a matter which required regulations difficult to work out. He was going to wipe this plan away as well. But the minister took this precaution; while he wiped the general clause off the statute book he retained full power to his government to put the same clause back or any part of it, and all by that abhorrent instrument—order in council. I told him that he was simply taking to his government power to favour any industry which favoured him, and to penalize any industry which did not meet with the smile of his good will. Well, what has been the result? I asked some time ago, for a statement of the orders in council passed, and I found that two industries, and only two, had got the favour of this law,—one of them was an industry which helped to elect the Prime Minister in his own county of York. Lead pencils now have to be marked with the country of origin; lithographic work has to be similarly marked. These are supposed to be in a class by themselves, these alone have received the favour of the government. It would be interesting to know upon what principle these favours have been bestowed.

Then there was another; the dumping clause, particularly as it was applicable to fruit, did not suit the government, and the minister came to parliament with a considerable flourish of trumpets and announced that this dumping clause had to go. But before the debate was through, the Minister of Customs rose—prompted no doubt by the Minister of Finance—and proposed a dumping clause which for autocratic audacity has never been equalled in this or any parliament. Hon. gentlemen have said that I supported it. I did support it; I had no alternative. We had either to support it or do without a dumping clause altogether. I wanted and want still the dumping clause that was there before. It was fair and right; let any hon. gentleman vote to restore it and I will vote with him and against the autocratic dumping clause which exists to-day. But I am not willing to imperil the industries of Canada, especially the primary industries, because of exception to the character of any dumping clause.

The minister had some other proposals last year which he seemed to think were great reforms—a change from the policy of his predecessors. He announced a new duty on tobacco, an increase of $3 per thousand on cigarettes, and an increase from 28 cents to 40 cents on raw leaf tobacco; and he believed that he would sceure thereby an additional revenue of $5,000,000. Well, again the force of argument was brought to bear; the minister was warned, and warned in all seriousness, that the limit of the cigarette excise had been reached and that if he went beyond he would do harm. He yielded to the extent of 50 per cent; he fixed the excise at $7.50 instead of $9, as he had proposed. Now, what has been the result of this "reform," this variation from the tariff which he found in effect? In one year he has reduced the tobacco business of Canadian pro-

ducers by 22 per cent; in one year as well he has lost to the treasury of Canada $1,327,000. Well, have these twin misfortunes been obtained with an accompanying boon of reduced tobacco consumption?—if such is called a boon. Not at all. The minister admits the fact himself—just as much tobacco used, just as many cigarettes smoked as before, but the Canadian business is impaired, the Canadian treasury is depleted to the extent of $1,327,000—and the only people to benefit have been United States tobacco dealers and producers, and the bootlegger, who has thus been given a return cargo to this country. I venture to suggest that, laying aside the injury to Canadian business for the profit of the United States, the loss to the treasury of over a million dollars is something of a serious price to pay for the privilege of having the present government in power. Such is the penalty of another of the Liberal "reforms" which we were treated to last year.

Then there was one more. There was to be a duty on beet sugar production. It was fixed first of all at a very considerable figure, 48 cents per hundred. In the course of argument this figure was reduced and at the reduced figure, 24 cents per hundred, it went into effect. Did I say it went into effect? The Finance Minister tells us that they never collected anything under it. Do hon gentlemen know why they did not? For the simple reason that the government took it upon itself to postpone its application. They never let it go into effect, although it had been passed by this House; and now after a year goes by, during which the reduction was postponed by the government, they come to parliament and say "this was another blunder; the whole thing has to be repealed."

What is left, then, of the "reforms" of the 1922 budget? Do hon. gentlemen know? Economy is gone. The sugar duty reform is gone. The cigarette reform is gone. The depreciated currency reform is gone. The dumping reform is gone. The marking reform is gone, or almost gone; the old system re-appears to help along the lead pencils of North York. All these things have gone. What is left—let me repeat—of the budget "reforms" of 1922? I venture to suggest that by the time a year goes by, even by the time three weeks go by, there will be just as little left of the alterations the minister brings down in the budget of 1923.

I come to a discussion of the new proposals of this year. The minister announces a scaling of one tenth of the British preferential duties. I do not know upon what principle the minister does so. It is not in order to avoid protection; he tells us so himself. Perhaps it is in order to strike a blow at those horrid combines, monopolies and trusts which were the particular object of the diatribes of hon. gentlemen opposite two and three years ago. I wonder what are the "combines, monopolies and trusts," struck or staggered, by this peeling of the British preferential tariff to the extent on an average, of 1.9 per cent. What combine or monopoly is now the object of the vengeance of the government? Does anyone know? Hon. gentlemen who examine the industrial fabric of our country will find this out: that the one class of industry seriously affected is the woollen industry. The others upon whose goods the diminished duty operates are those whose main and determining competitors

4 p.m. are in the United States of America.

In the woollen industry our great competitor is Great Britain. Is the woollen industry a combine, monopoly or trust? Now. let me inquire. There may be such monsters in Canada, but if they deserve anything in the way of penalty at the hands of this government, they certainly do not get it in this budget. But the woollen industry in this country is not a combine. It is composed of small mills separately owned, scattered over the length and breadth of eastern Canada, mainly in eastern Ontario. Not one of them is a mill of great proportions; nothing in the nature of a combine was ever alleged against any of them; all of them are struggling to keep their heads above water, and have been so for years. Such is the industry against which this government has the courage to strike its blow. Tender and delicate the assault is, but they were just as careful in selecting the enemy as they were in tempering the force of the blow.

Then the budget goes on; the American tariff is to be left just where it is. Did I say, the American tariff? I should have said, the tariff against the world. Outside of this 1.9 per cent change in British preference there are more increases than decreases in the budget. There is a new duty on currants and raisins, four times beyond what it was before Why this increased duty upon currants and raisins? Here we have an echo of the French treaty debate. Do hon. gentlemen recall that we told the government in that debate that they had sacrificed this country, and had been utterly worsted in their negotiations with France; that they had put our own tariff out of line—put our luxuries away below our necessities, let off the rich and burdened the poor; that while they had reduced luxuries and thus made a big concession to France,

they had come back from France with a far higher French tariff against our actual exports than we had before? We told them as well the reason. The reason they did so was this: They had not armed themselves with any weapon before they started to negotiate with France; that they should have raised our duties on luxuries before they went over to that country, and thereby have been in a position to offer something to France in return for concessions by France to us; that instead they went over there bound hand and foot by the state of our own tariff and by their own commitments —the sincerity of which hon. gentlemen can now judge—by their own commitments uttered over and over again in this country. There was the reason why this Dominion was penalized and worsted in the French treaty negotiations. Our ministers took thought; they saw the force of our argument, though they were not frank enough to admit it; and now, having to negotiate with Australia they are advised by the Minister of Trade and Commerce—who has been over there—that unless they put our duties up on goods which Australia wants to sell to us they will have no chance in the negotiations at all. They come to parliament and they say: Australia wants to sell us raisins and currants. If we are to make a deal with Australia, and not capitulate the way we did with France, we will have to have a duty that is worth while on raisins and currants. So they lift the tax on these goods to three cents a pound in order that they may negotiate with Australia. Now, will anybody answer me this question: How is it this is a good plan to employ in the case of our sister dominion of Australia and a bad plan to employ in the case of France? I will be interested in the answer to that question. I hope the Prime Minister, if he speaks, will venture to essay the task.

There is also a new duty upon artificial silk. Artificial silk under this budget has a whole range of duties up to 37½ per cent. The minister did not dilate very long on the reasons for that move. I am not complaining of the duty. I do not know any way to get industries in this country, any way to keep our country strong and prosperous, a real country where people can get work, except by having duties on articles that we can make in this Dominion. But here is a government, which has been denouncing protection through all its opposition life, which has members supporting it, some of them even within the fold and rapture of office, who still tell us that protection is all wrong, a Government which to-day is trying to pretend to this country that the only reason it is maintaining a protective tariff is because it finds such tariff here and because it will disturb industries erected on that basis if it dares to shatter their foundation; here is a government, I say, giving such as the only reason for maintaining a protective tariff and then undertaking to establish a new industry on the same foundation. Thus they make it increasingly impossible for those who may ever wish to do so to get any relief from protection. Well, if inconsistency was a charge to level against this government no more concrete, glaring, brazen instance could be found. This government has been open to charges of inconsistency ever since it got into power. Why I almost smile at the resolution of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) in which he alleges inconsistency against the present Prime Minister of Canada. We take that indictment as proven in this Dominion now.

There are other increases but in the main the tariff is left practically where it was. The whole principle of a protective tariff is there intact. Indeed, it is reinforced by this very legislation, the new legislation, which is brought down in this budget. In respect of the shaving in the duties on woollens affecting a lot of small mills through this country I call attention to a further fact: that a similar shaving last year was followed by an increase of British importations of almost 50 per cent, by a contraction of Canadian production of 33 per cent and necessarily by a contraction of Canadian labour and Canadian prosperity. Was it followed however by any contraction of the price? Does anybody know of woollens being cheaper this year than last? Are you buying them cheaper in your stores? Not at all. The consumers got nothing, but our industries have been, in a measure, sacrificed to their larger competitors in the older land.

There was another effect of the tariff of last year. The government did venture then into the realm of reduction in the general tariff but only as to one class of goods—one that is worth mentioning. I refer to the reduction of the duty on farm implements. Here a 2½ per cent lowering in the general tariff took place on the part of a government which had solemnly promised to sweep those duties all away. Now, I want to put this question in the hearing of the House: What has been the effect of this reduction? Has there been any increase of labour employed in the farm implement industry of Canada? Has there been any increase in the consumption of Canadian goods? Has there been more work given to

one man in this Dominion? On the contrary, the reduction has operated exactly the other way. There has been less production, there has been a contraction of our towns, there has been an exodus of our mechanics, there has been a decline of our population, there has been a drying-up of sources of our revenue, there has been a lessening of our markets. Well, who has received the benefit? Are we told that the western Canadian farmer, or the farmer in any other part of Canada, has received the benefit? If so what has it been? Are farm implements cheaper to-day than they were a year ago? I have not heard of it. But I have read an advertisement which I think I brought with me, an advertisement published in a western paper which is interesting enough to give to the House. The advertisement in question is published in the Yorkton Enterprise and reads as follows:

> We are still in business carrying a full line of International Harvester Agricultural Implements, but regret at this time to have to inform the public that prices on agricultural implements have been slightly advanced since last season, for which we are not responsible.
>
> Advances on some of the more important lines are as follows:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Binders | $ 8 00 |
> | Seeders | 12 00 |
> | Mower and Rake | 3 50 |
> | Gang Plow | 6 00 |
> | Cultivator | 7 50 |
>
> and other smaller lines about the same proportion.

Then follows this interesting paragraph which I hope the Prime Minister will remember and ponder the rest of his life:

> This advance has been made notwithstanding the fact that we have a Liberal government at Ottawa, with sixty-five Progressives on the job and a Canadian Council of Agriculture in the background, all supposedly working overtime in the interests of agriculture.

I want to say a few words on the general question covered by this advertisement. I do not need to make any statement merely in order that members of the House may know where I stand. There has been misrepresentation of my attitude, there is contsant misrepresentation; it is all for a purpose. I have stood all my life for a policy of moderate protection for this country. Under the conditions of the last few years I have felt that the tariff in effect was on a general scale that could justly be described as moderate protection. In that stand I was attacked by hon. gentlemen across the way; attacked as following a false principle, as following a principle that bore down on producer and consumer and that favoured the monopoly and the trust; attacked as favouring a high protective tariff, by the very hon. gentlemen who come in this debate and declare that this same tariff—raised in some respects and slightly, almost microscopically diminished in others—is not now high protection but moderate protection and even a low tariff. I believe it is of no avail to argue the principle before many hon. members. But it is no longer a waste of time to argue it before hon. members opposite. It used to be. Those who fondly hoped in the years and the months that have gone by that the progress free trade principles were making was rapid, that the day of their triumph was dawning, have received a rude awakening since they have entered the parliament of Canada. Is it not plain, I ask of them, that your adherents in this House do not number more than half of what they did in the last parliament? Instead of getting converts you are only finding apostates. You cannot rally half the number to your flag that you could two years ago. Such "progress" is very slow. Why, the speeches hon. members made, particularly the speech of the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke), the speeches as well of other hon. members behind him—those speeches would have been received with pæans of joy and admiration by hon. members across the way if their authors had only made them two years ago. No, there does not seem to have been very rapid progress. And why? Do hon. members really think it is because the great part of the people of Canada elect representatives who are slaves to fetishes, who are instruments of great potentates or the victims of plutocratic corruption? I hope hon. members do not believe such things. The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) gave the lie to these assertions on behalf of the two older parties in very firm language Thursday night. I paid him the compliment of saying that I had never heard him hurl these aspersions upon others, but that I knew a party which had got into power by this very process. No; such absurd humbug is not the reason. The simple reason is that lying along side of a great republic, living in a world every country but one, yes every country of which to-day is protected, we, particularly, a young undeveloped Dominion, beside a tremendous nation the biggest industrially the world has ever known, cannot lay our markets open freely to them. We cannot lay our manufacturers and producers under competition at the hands of those who have their own market guarded for their advantage and an equal show with us in the outside world, while the producer in this Dominion has not access to their markets,

has no preference in other countries and has not even a priority in his own. These things were known to hon. members opposite two years ago just as well as they are known to them to-day. But they had a purpose to serve. The glory of office was in front of them, and they sought to delude a great population of this country into their support by professing principles and policies in which they had no belief at all. No. Protection will be the law of Canada for many years. There will be a different world before protection can be abandoned. We cannot get on under any principle other than that of protection. I remember it is only two years, indeed, since the then leader of the Progressive party, (Mr. Crerar) seconded in most eloquent and wonderfully emphatic language by the then hon. member for Red Deer, Mr. Michael Clark, declared that a change was coming over the commercial world, tariffs were coming down, the day of protection was nearly over, and they pointed in particular to the United States of America. In the words of the then member for Red Deer, the United States of America was "comparatively a free trade country," and in his opinion was soon to open its doors and the light of free trade was to shine. Well, what has taken place? There is not an hon. member to-day, even to my left, who so far deludes himself as even to profess that the world is moving to free trade. And this country of all countries, with its resources undeveloped, in whose neighbourhood we have the great developed, advanced, protected republic—this of all other countries would be playing the part of madness to march ahead of the others in the direction of free trade.

While on this point, I may deal with another phase of the budget presentation. I refer to a reciprocity offer to the United States. As respects the subject of reciprocity, do not let any hon. member think that there has been a change of opinion in this country. Oh, we have heard a lot about these changes of opinion. We heard about them away back in the eighties and in 1891; we heard about them in 1911. But always when the challenge came and the issue was disclosed there was found to be no change of opinion in Canada. Why is it I am asked that though we like to have treaties of reciprocity, favourable trade arrangements if we can get them with other countries in the world, and particularly with those of our own empire, we do not think it the part of wisdom to enter into an extensive reciprocity convention with the United States? Why is it? The United States I am told lies beside us, a tremendous population, and therefore a potential market, with less transport costs than to other lands; why not make, I am asked an extensive trade arrangement with them? Well, the reason lies in the very geography of this continent. The reason lies still more in the very fact of our separate nationhood. Let me explain. With any other country we are on terms of parity. Other countries are natural consumers of our goods, and we consumers of the goods of other countries. With different geographical conditions, different industrial occupations, other countries would have just as much to lose by cancellation of such an agreement as we would. With the United States the position is different. We are only 9,000,000 people and they are 112,000,000. They have a production twenty times our production. They have the biggest factories, the biggest industrial concerns and the biggest commercial organizations in the civilized world. They are as well our greatest competitors in all our lines of production. If we enter into a commercial arrangement with them there would be something at least, to say for it, if conditions were such that we knew there would be permanency to such arrangement. Now, mark you, I said there would be something to say for it. There would at the same time be much to say against it. In my judgment it would result in conditions in Canada very comparable with what to-day exist in the northeastern and the northwestern states. In these states their industries have been drawn by the magnetism of the great huge plants and populations of the central states, and the northwestern and northeastern districts are a little more than feeders for the great industrial centres of that nation. Tariffs the world over, though you can argue against them, have a tendency to distribute over the surface of the world varieties of occupations, instead of concentrating in particular localities all those engaged in single occupations. But I said before, there would be something to say for such a treaty if there was any guarantee or hope of permanency. In that case we would know what to do, investors would know what to do; agriculturists, would know what to do; ranchers, would know what to do; men thinking of going into any line of trade or production would know just what to expect. They would make their investments, and they would order their lives accordingly.

But is there any guarantee of permanency, or can there be any guarantee of permanency, under any conceivable circumstances in a reciprocity arrangement with the United States? I ask that question and I ask it seriously, because in my judgment it is at the root and

the heart of the whole problem. There was no permanency inherent in the 1911 treaty. Each country reserved the right to depart from it at its will. That the United States insisted on; that the United States will always insist on; and such insistence no government of the United States dare neglect at the price of its life as a government. No, the right to annul will always be theirs, and that right they have never failed, in the whole course of their existence, to exercise. They exercised it back in 1866, when our industries, having set themselves in those channels, our East trading with East, West with West, centre with centre, were rendered all but helpless by the annulment of the agreement and the consequent stoppage of trade. We do not need to go back to the 50's and the 60's; let us go back just two or three years. We entered into a reciprocity agreement, not an extensive one, a very simple one, a comparatively negligible one, as lately as four or five years ago. They proposed in their tariff that they would give this country free entry for our wheat, our flour and our other wheat products into the United States, conditional on our country doing the same for theirs—precisely the arrangement as respects wheat and wheat products that the reciprocity agreement of 1911 made as to a far wider range of articles. The government of the day accepted that proposal, and we placed wheat and wheat products on the free list. Their proposal extended to potatoes and we accepted that as well. For a few weeks this operated, and then came a period of suspension because of the two governments controlling their crops. The suspension ended, and within four months of the close of the suspension, the United States put a high duty on wheat and potatoes, and ended our reciprocity agreement. I urge this fact only to show that the possibility of any permanency to such an arrangement is nil. Not only is there no likelihood, there is utterly no possibility,—the exigencies of American politics demand that there be no possibility,—of permanence. This country is one country; the United States is another. We have our government; they have theirs. We are a British country; they are an American country. Their parliament, their legislatures, have the right to act. The longer an extensive reciprocity agreement operates with the United States, the more this country depends upon the continuance of that reciprocity agreement. Does anyone dispute my assertion? Did we not depend upon it more in 1866 than we did in 1854? Were we not injured more by its collapse in 1866 than we should have been had it collapsed in 1855? Did we ever get on in our lives as well as after we set our faces the other way, to develop east and west channels of trade which no other government could interfere with or destroy? The longer such a reciprocity arrangement operates, the more dependent we become. You say then that it must have proved to be good. For the sake of argument and only for the sake of argument, let me grant that. The fact is that the power to annul is a tremendous weapon in the hands of the United States. Annulment would mean very little to that country. Their trade, their production, is twenty times our own. Our trade with them is fractional as compared with their whole trade. Their trade with us would be tremendous compared with our whole trade. Our West would trade with their West, our East with their East, our centre with their centre. Those channels being established and other channels being to the same extent abandoned, the power to annul the treaty means a vital power over the legislature of this country. Hon gentlemen say: "They are a friendly people." Yes, but they are the American republic. We have things we have to take care of in competition with the United States. I could name them one by one. As matters stand now, when we are in no alliance, we are on a parity. They have no such extraordinary power, I am not afraid as matters stand to-day of any reprisal in the power of the United States, to wield. There is no reprisal they can exercise over us to-day that need put fear into the heart of any citizen of this Dominion. Whatever we may desire to do, in the interest of our country, let us do. There is no reprisal they can exercise that will not do them as much injury as it will do ourselves. But put us ten years under a reciprocity agreement; give those channels ten years to become established and then tell me what chance we would have in any negotiation with the United States. I ask hon. gentlemen in all seriousness to put themselves in that position. Where would we be then if we sought to make terms—say as to the draining of our lakes and our St. Lawrence through the Chicago canal? Where would we be then if we sought to make terms on half a dozen things of vital consequence to this country, which lie between us and them at this hour as matters of contention? No nation that respects itself will get into such a position. We are so geographically situated that there is a peril which, if we have not the manliness to guard against, we will afterwards be the victims of. Whether those words sink in or not, I ask at least that they be remembered, I ask that they be reflected upon, and, if the time ever comes, as it may, when by the

turn of the political wheel the United States government may look to us again for a reciprocal agreement, I ask hon. gentlemen before they commit themselves—when this is a real question, for now it is only a gesture—to think those thoughts over and to determine whether they are content lightheartedly to travel along that road.

I pass from reciprocity and I come to a discussion of other proposals of this budget. I purpose to discuss them in the light of their wisdom and in the light as well of the political honour of this Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not very fond of such discussion. Indeed, there is a tendency in more quarters than among the government members, but animated, I think, solely from there, to say: "Oh, we will let the past bury the past; political platforms anyway are not very serious matters; we cannot erect a future by decrying the past; the Liberal convention is four years old now or nearly so, and there is nothing to be gained by bringing its unwelcome ghost before this House." Such is the constant importuning of hon. gentlemen of the government side. I venture to say this—and I do so without any assumption of superior virtue at all—that if political platforms are to mean nothing, if they are only constructed to be discarded, if the carrying of them into effect, when power is gained, is not a matter of honour and of right, then responsible government is a mockery, public life is a sham and representative institutions are no better than a fiasco. Hon. gentlemen do not like to be reminded of their commitments of years ago. I have not seen one of them produce that brown-covered edition of the chronicles of the Liberal party at convention in 1919. I have not heard one of them read from it in this House or seen them show it to his fellows. The hon. member for North Waterloo, bolder than the rest, comes forward and says: "I do not think a government should be bound by the ill-digested conclusions of a convention." And the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), while affecting a certain academic loyalty to the resolutions of that convention says to hon. members to my left: "Oh, it is all right for you to talk; you are in opposition; but it is altogether different when you get into power." I have listened during the debate to this sort of contention from the hon. member for North Waterloo in the clear language that he uses so well; I have listened to dozens more of apologetic imprecations from the perspiring periods of the Minister of the Interior, all the way through to the massive and majestic eloquence of the Minister of Agriculture. But let hon. gentlemen reflect: What is to be the result on the young men, on all the people of our country, if honour and fidelity to political pledges are to be openly flouted in the parliament of Canada? Hon. gentlemen tried it in 1896. They made a show of allegiance then which at least had the merit of a certain plausibility. Now, not from one without authority, not through a mere backbencher, but through the mouth of the Minister of Finance, who is in charge of fiscal policy, they flout all allegiance to their commitments of only four years ago. The Minister of Finance openly tells this House that he is not bound by those covenants that his government is not bound by them, that his party is not bound by them. Why? Because at that convention he did not vote for them himself!

I said I would speak frankly in the presence of the Minister of Finance. He is not here, but I cannot be deterred on that account. The Minister of Finance has done no credit to the politics of Canada when he made that assertion; nor has he done any credit to his own record in our public life. The Minister of Finance was a party to, was present at, and took an active share in the framing of the very resolutions he now repudiates; and after they were adopted he contested on the basis of those pledges the leadership of the Liberal party which had adopted them and which had pledged itself to put them into effect. The hon. gentleman, for months after went through this country as a leading Liberal and as the prospective Minister of Finance and never for one moment gave in public a soul in Canada to believe that he himself differed in the least degree from the pledges and commitments of his party. Then he got into power and said, "I am bound no more." His Prime Minister, (Mr. Mackenzie King), too, stood up and declared last year that all he was bound by was a certain obligation to regard these specific, definite, concrete tariff covenants printed in his platform as a chart and compass to guide him in the sea of politics; and he the same Prime Minister listens now to his Minister of Finance declare openly to parliament that he has flung chart and compass away after the platform, and that all are gone and guide him and his party no more And this is called honourable politics! But more. The Prime Minister of this country declared in this House, only a little over a year before he came into power, that he intended to put into effect the very articles of the Liberal platform adopted at that convention. I read from Hansard of the year 1920, 1st June, at page 2993:

I would not be worthy of the trust reposed in me by members of the party with which it is my privilege to be associated in the position that at the moment I hold, were I to be one thing at one time and another thing at another time. Sir, I was chosen, for the responsible duties that I am seeking to discharge, at the Liberal Convention at which the platform of the Liberal party was laid down, and by that platform I intend to stand or fall. The resolution on the tariff was as follows:

Then he read the resolution verbatim—all about free farm implements, all about free cement, all about free foodstuffs, all about free fertilizers, all about free oils, and all these other long lists of classes of articles which his convention bound him to put on the free list "when returned to power." And he added.

Let me further point out that there is not a line in the resolution adopted by the Liberal convention which has not appeared in resolutions proposed in parliament from this side prior to the time that the convention was held.

The assertion he thus made was true; it was all true. The authority, the solemnity of the Liberal convention, all was added to by the resolutions of the whole Liberal party in this House time and again, year after year. Then the Prime Minister went on to attach another article of sanctity to the Liberal platform. He declared that "the last public address by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, only two or three weeks before his death, was, in the main, one approving of a resolution passed by the eastern Ontario Liberals, in words almost identical with the resolution which was adopted at the Liberal convention." Did he tell us then that this same resolution was not approved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) whom he intended to make Minister of Finance, and consequently that his party was not to be bound? Was there any language used in the whole speech of the Prime Minister which was not diametrically flagrantly, violently opposed to any suggestion of that sort? On the preceding page the Prime Minister made this statement, and I ask that it be brought to the ears of the Minister of Finance, for the Minister of Finance was present when the Prime Minister uttered these words, and he heard them without protest:

You had there exactly what you have here,—some taking extreme views in one direction, others taking extreme views in another direction. But, Sir, you had the splendid spectacle of that vast assemblage of men and women standing up as one and approving the platform of the Liberal party.

No absolution there, no exception of the Minister of Finance, no exception of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), no exception of anyone; everything the Prime Minister said on that occasion was said in the hearing of these two hon. gentlemen. The Prime Minister emphatically stated then that at the convention the whole "vast assemblage" stood up and voted for the Liberal platform as one.

Mr. EULER: I beg my right hon. friend's pardon; I was not present when the resolution was carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say so; I said that the declaration of the Prime Minister in parliament, that all who were present at the convention had voted for the Liberal platform, was made in the hearing of the hon. gentleman and of the present Minister of Finance.

Mr. EULER: I was wrong, evidently; I assumed that the hon. member was referring to the convention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; I take the hon. member's word for it that he was not present at the vote; he was evidently conveniently absent. But this is not all. The very same year the Liberal party of the province of Alberta, headed then by the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), met also in convention in the city of Calgary. This convention mark you was headed by the Minister who now tells us how different it is when you get into power. At this convention they adopted all the things adopted at the Liberal convention of 1919; but they did a lot more. Why, they said, there is no difference that anyone can see between the platform of the Liberal party, as professed and voted for in parliament, and the platform of the Farmers' party of Canada. And as it was necessary for them all to unite against the Tories, they voted for a resolution in which they quoted the whole Farmer platform and swallowed it line for line, declaring it to constitute the policy of the Liberal party of Alberta, headed by the present Minister of the Interior. But more. Their appetites were not satisfied even with the Farmers' platform. After quoting and adopting the whole Agrarian programme they added the following clause:

But this convention further asserts that free trade with Great Britain and the United States should be the ideal of the Liberal party, and that it is and shall continue to be the duty of Liberalism to earnestly strive to so regulate and direct the fiscal policy of Canada as to ultimately attain free trade with Great Britain and the United States.

Again I emphasize the observation of the Minister of the Interior—it is very different when you get into power.

Yes, these western ministers say they struggle, they still believe, they still hope. Evidently there is to be the very same plan of campaign in the country in respect of this tariff and the new policy of the government, the same double dealing, the same two-

edged sword as there was when they were in opposition. In opposition the plan was to fly to the four winds of heaven the Farmer platform—the convention platform—to proclaim it in all the issues of their party literature, but at the same time through the mouth of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler), through the mouth of the present Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) and through the mouth of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) to quietly assure all those interested the other way that they need not fear the Liberal party, that no matter what the platform said everything would be all right with them. Such was the method pursued, such seems to be the method still. The Minister of Finance stands up and says, "Here is the tariff of the Liberal party. Last year we shaved a little here and a little there, this year we shave a little here and we raise a little there, but now it is stable save only for exceptional cases." He told the whole business world of this Dominion that except in very exceptional cases, which he described, they could regard this as the permanent tariff of this country for some years to come. But the Minister of Agriculture says, "Oh, he did not mean that at all." He tells us that parliament can change the tariff next year. Well who does not know that? What we are discussing though, what the Finance Minister was pronouncing was the policy of this government. It has been proclaimed by the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Agriculture will be encouraged to carry on his pillow fight and to dangle hopes before the western farmer, but from our experience of the past I do not think we will put the influence of the Minister of Agriculture against the influence of the Minister of Finance. In the cabinet combats last year and this the Minister of Agriculture had all the cards, and all the records, he had everything on his side. He could have said to the Minister of Finance and to every other member of this government who was in the House of Commons in 1919, "Why, gentlemen, you voted for these very things I am arguing for, you voted in 1919 for the resolution of the hon. member for Brome which called upon the late government to free the food of the people and to free as well all the instruments of production and all the spare parts entering into the same. You voted for this motion of the hon. member for Brome, you voted for free food when there was not one man hungry in this Dominion for five that are hungry now." He could have said as well, "Why, the Prime Minister in 1920 quoted with approval and affirmed his fidelity to the statement of Sir Wilfrid Laurier at Hamilton in 1913 that the unalterable policy of the Liberal party was to have food free from customs duty for all the people." Yes, and he could have called forth the convention platform, that beautiful pamphlet, and said, "here is the book of the chronicles of the Liberal party, read it and behold our faith." All these arguments he had on his side. Then he could have come to the New Testament issued just before the election, with the photograph of the Prime Minister on the back and his signature inside, wherein it was declared that all those commitments of 1919 constituted the policy of the Liberal party still. All these weapons were in the grip of the Minister of Agriculture and in the grip of the Minister of the Interior. But how did they use them? What was the result of the contest? They lost all along the line. They did not win a single skirmish. So what is the hope for the future? Why, the Minister of Agriculture only makes a laughing stock of his friends. The Minister of Agriculture is an apostate to everything he has declared for in western Canada. The Minister of the Interior is the same.

Let me emphasize here that hon. members do not escape behind the "indigestibility," as described by the hon. member for Waterloo, of a convention platform. They voted for the same thing in this very parliament in 1919 —save the member for North Waterloo— he was honest enough to escape—and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea); they were the only two who had the courage of their convictions then; the rest, including the Minister of Finance including the Minister of Marine, including the Minister of Trade and Commerce, including the Secretary of State, including the Minister without portfolio (Mr. Sinclair) who sits in the seats of the mighty though I am afraid he does not exercise much of the power of the mighty—all these, indeed over half of the present government, voted in this House for the resolution in 1919 of the hon. member for Brome.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is wrong?

Mr. DUFF: That is not a fair reference to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Sinclair).

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would be willing to say the same of the hon. member for Lunenburg.

Mr. DUFF: You are fit to say anything, but the people do not listen to you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These hon. gentlemen voted for that resolution, declared it to mark their course, declared for free food—let me repeat, at a time when there was more prosperity in this Dominion, less men out of work—indeed, scarcely any out of work at all—less need of it than there is to-day many times over. They declared for free instruments of production at a time when there was a prosperity throughout the farming community of Canada, which we know nothing of to-day, at a time when wheat was over $2.00 a bushel and oats over $1.00 a bushel, whereas to-day wheat is half of its former price and oats you can hardly sell at all. But this was the policy of the Liberal party then. If there was an arguable case for it at that time, the conditions demand it ten times as strongly now. I stood against it then I stand against it to-day. I did not believe the policy they then advocated would result in the conditions they professed to desire; I do not believe so now.

But I want to come to some other features of this budget. Increases in taxation constitute an addition to the burdens of the people. New taxation is all right if accompanied by economy; unaccompanied by economy new taxation is all wrong. This government has added again to the sales tax. If there is one tax that comes upon the back of everyone almost equally, the poor and the rich alike, it is the sales tax of this Dominion. We imposed the sales tax first. I am aware of this fact, because I remember the reprimands and the castigations we endured at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite—and at the hands of none more determinedly than the Prime Minister of this country—when we put on 1½ and 2½ per cent as sales tax. He declared in the debate of 1921 that instead of getting more from income tax, instead of taxing luxuries, we were piling a "visible" tariff on top of the "invisible" tariff we had then by putting a sales tax on the backs of the common people. He denounced us for doing so, because he said, the reason we had not reduced the tariff and had not as he said taxed luxuries, the reason we had taxed the common people by a sales tax, was that we were the tools and minions of wealthy corporations; that we were the servants of organized interrelated business, or, as he was fond of describing it, of an industrial plutocracy. How would he like to hear with its application on himself that same argument to-day? To-day instead of taxing luxuries more he taxes them less; instead of taking the sales tax off he adds to it until it is twice the burden it was at that time. How would he like it if I urged against him now the allegation which filled almost every line of his speech in 1921? How would he feel if I told him that the reason he is doing what he is doing is because he is the meek and humble instrument of wealthy corporations, because he has not the courage to do right by the common people? How would he like that class of demagogism in parliament to-day?

Perhaps I should read a few words from what the Prime Minister said two years ago. He was first of all denouncing us for not revising the tariff. He said:

> To say that the changes being made in the American tariff are responsible for the abortive professions, the frustrated intention, of the government, is to assume an unlimited degree of gullibility on the part of the Canadian people.

The fact that an American tariff, temporary but about to be made permanent or probably to be made permanent, was in actual course of progress through the American congress—to urge that fact, he said, as a reason for referring revision was to assume gullibility on the part of the Canadian people. Here was what he declared to have been the real reason:

5 p.m.

> The failure of the government, at this time of high-living costs, and much needed increase of production, to give any relief from burdensome taxation to either consumers or producers, is not due to any circumstances so much a matter of chance as the present emergency legislation of the United States; it is due to a deliberate and determined effort to thwart trade and to restrict competition in every direction, with the Mother Country and our sister dominions even more than with the United States, in order that a few wealthy men and their immediate friends and associates may reap still larger fortunes through obtaining, not a much-needed home market, as they would have us believe, but a monopoly of the Canadian market.

And a few pages later he used this language:

> Do you see also, Mr. Speaker, why it is, in the budget which has just been presented by the Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton)—that this year, as in former years no account whatever has been taken of profiteering; why another year has been allowed to pass without any effort whatever having been made by the government to recover any of the war-time wealth; why, instead of the removal of any of the taxation that bears immediately upon the masses of the people, the duties upon the necessaries of life, it is the business profits taxes and the luxury taxes that have been abolished?

And he goes on to say:

> The protection for which we stand is the protection of the consumer against the exactions of combines, monopolies, and the super-organization of associated business.

Such was the whole tenor of his speech in 1921. Because we had abolished certain taxes

on expensive goods by which we had sought to get—with some success, though not with the success we expected—considerable addition to our revenue, and from which we did get quite a substantial sum; because we had abolished the business profits tax, these were the opprobrious epithets he applied to us; these he said were the motives which animated us. Is he restoring now the business profits tax? Is he restoring the luxury taxes? No, he is doing nothing of the kind. The business profits tax was abolished with the approval, expressed in this House, of the leader of the Progressive party; abolished, indeed, with the approval of many hon. gentlemen opposite, but abolished, the Prime Minister told us, because we were the tools and minions of the rich and powerful. The special luxury taxes were abolished, but hon. gentlemen know that they were abolished because of difficulty of operation. The only sales tax we put on was a small tax of 1½ and 2½ per cent, later increased by us to 3 and 4 per cent, applicable to home productions and to imports respectively. This was the sales tax that we imposed on the consumers of goods in this Dominion. At the same time we collected from our income tax some $93,000,000. We collected from our income and business profits taxes in our last year $101,000,000. This year the Minister of Finance is collecting through the same taxes just $72,000,000. But he put in 1922 an added tax on the whole people—a new sales tax—to make up the difference; a tax that has brought him last year an increased revenue of over $31,000,000. In a word, the tax that we collected from income, the tax that we collected from profits, even in our last year, after the business profits tax had been abolished and only arrears thereon were taken in, amounted in the aggregate to about $30,000,000 more than hon. gentlemen opposite are collecting by those means to-day. But to make up the deficiency the Minister of Finance swooped down on everybody—on the common people of this country, and took $31,000,000 more in an increased sales tax. He collected last year 4½ and 6 per cent and he is not satisfied with that; he comes along this year and lifts up the sales tax on Canadian goods, raising the rate upon them this time from 4½ to 6 per cent. This is an additional charge on all the goods covered by the sales tax, goods which comprise the clothing of the people, comprise what keeps the people warm—clothes, shelter, stoves and the like; which include hardware used by the people, and which include farm implements used on the land. All these things come under our sales tax, and the amount that has been added during these two years is more in every case than any customs levy the minister has taken off. To the sales tax as he proposes to collect it now a profit will be added by the manufacturer; to that another profit will be superadded by the wholesaler, and still another by the retailer. These profits taken together will make an addition to the cost of living in this country of not less than 10 per cent. Hon. gentlemen to my left frequently complain of the higher cost of living in Canada, the higher cost of articles which they have to purchase compared with prices across the line. But do you expect anything else when you have a 6 per cent sales tax at the source, on which two or three profits are bound to be levied? You have right there a 10 per cent addition to the cost of necessaries. In this fact we see the main reason why this government has brought about an enhancement of the cost of living during every month that it has been in effective power.

Mr. McMASTER: Will the right hon. gentleman permit a question? Does not the customs duty pyramid in precisely the same fashion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Custom duties on commodities when imported by manufacturers, undoubtedly have these profits added. But that is not a reason why we should change the method of collecting a sales tax when it is now being collected in a way which involves less burden upon the consumer. The fundamental reason why this change has been urged—and all hon. gentlemen have to do to see the truth of what I say is to read the literature of the organization which urged it—was to enable the manufacturer, the wholesaler, the jobber, the retailer, to pass on not part, but the whole of the tax to the consumer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my right hon. friend, just in order to be fair to the House, give a list of the commodities that are exempt from the sales tax?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have the list here. The right hon. gentleman will find it on page 10—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my right hon. friend read it? He has it there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a page and a half long.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And every detail is mentioned, even to the medals of soldiers.

Mr. GRAHAM: Even up to the medals of soldiers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not propose to make my speech as discussive and aimless as those of some hon. gentlemen opposite by answering the demands of the Prime Minister. But I will give the important items. They are the following: bread, flour, including self-raising flour, oatmeal, rolled oats, corn meal, rolled wheat, buckwheat, milk, condensed milk, buttermilk, cream, butter, cheese, and so on; oleomargarine, eggs, vegetable oils, bran, shorts, and the like. In the main these articles were all exempted before.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why the laughter from hon. gentlemen opposite? Many of those hon. gentlemen were not in the House at the time these things were done and therefore possibly they do not know the facts. Primary products were always free from the sales tax. If hon. gentlemen opposite get any delight in appropriating to themselves the credit of exemptions established by the preceding government we, in the generosity of our hearts, should not deny them because they have not much source left to get any delight from now. Primary products such as food products, primary forest products, logs and the like were always free from the sales tax. Ah! Let us come again to these exemptions. Hon. gentlemen opposite have added to them. Now, here is a chance to cheer. They come along this year and they put "newsprint" in the list.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And raw wool.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And raw wool, another primary product. Is that in a class to be compared with newsprint? I venture to say that this government in exempting newsprint has probably lost to the treasury of Canada one million dollars a year. Why is this done? Does any hon. gentleman know why we should go to the big newspapers of this country—many of which are very prosperous; the larger they are the more prosperous they are—and say to them "Oh we will take newsprint and we will relieve it of the sales tax" and then go to the farmers of this country and say "We have relieved the big newspapers of this tax but we will put a little more on your harrows, a little more on your lumber, a little more on your clothes, on everything you work with and wear." That is precisely the course hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. It may not be popular to say anything against the source of supply of a newspaper, but some things become a duty even though they are not popular; and I know of no reason on earth why newsprint should be put on the list of articles exempt from the sales tax and why working men should be told "We have to tax the clothing of your children, the smock that you wear, the pail that you carry. These we burden with our sales tax; we tax also what you put on your feet, the things as well that shelter you and keep you warm; but we have to relieve the big newspapers of this country of a million dollars on newsprint." Such is the way this government comes to the rescue of the common people, those common people for whom its heart bled when its ministers were in opposition. Such is the way they show to this country that these masses, these poor people who were ground down by the old autocratic government are now cared for and tenderly helped.

Let me review what the present administration has done. This government set out, or pledged itself to set out to reduce the necessities of life, to relieve food stuffs, to relieve the instruments of production of all duties and to put more taxes on luxuries and on the rich. Tell me of one dollar it has put upon the rich. Not one dollar, not one farthing. But it has relieved the rich of duties upon luxuries. The only things that are substantially reduced—that are reduced so that the reduction will reach the consumer—are luxuries imported into this country under the French treaty. This government has reduced the duties on luxuries purchased by the rich and has added to the taxes on necessities consumed by the poor. Our ministers can say: "We have brought the duty down on embroideries but we have pushed up the sales tax on boots and shoes." True the Finance Minister has made a slight reduction in the duty on boots and shoes from Great Britain knowing as he does that only a fraction, and that a fraction of superior and expensive quality worn by the well-to-do comes from Great Britain. In the case of boots and shoes from the United States it left the duty as it was but the sales tax has been increased to 6 per cent. This government relaxed the duty on brandy, it reduced the duty on champagne; and then it now has recourse to the sales tax and requires all the people of this country to make good reductions brought into effect under the French treaty. These things our ministers have done for the users of luxuries; but they have added to taxation on the necessities of life in direct and brazen violation of the pledge they made to the people of this country. "Oh," they cried in 1921—no one so often as the Prime Minister—"the main issue in this country is the cost of living. The cost of living must come down and it cannot come down under a combination of industrial plutocracy and political autocracy which is in power at Ottawa. So let me come

into office, he pleaded, and I will do this thing." The cost of living curve was descending at the very time he uttered those sentences; it went on descending almost perpendicularly until he and his ministers came into power. It kept on descending until their sales tax and their other new taxes came into effect—at which time the cost of living started to rise again and has been rising ever since. The cost of living is rising now and more rapidly than in other countries. The government of the day is responsible for the ascending curve of the cost of living at this hour. "Oh," they said "more retrenchment and economy must be the order of the day. You cannot get that from a government with a war mind. The Meighen government has had the war mind, and it cannot retrench." Well, this new government is now in power and beyond what it is saving by aiding the soldiers and by what it denies to the provincial treasuries and municipalities of the country what does its economy amount to? It amounts to less than nothing. Hon. gentlemen opposite also said: "Put us in power and we will get by direct taxation what the Meighen government gets by an invisible tariff." Who does not remember the speeches of 1921? I am sure the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) does not forget them. I am sure many other hon. gentlemen—some to my left—who were here then do not forget them: We were told that while Great Britain was collecting 80 per cent of her revenue by direct taxation and less than 20 per cent from customs, while the United States was doing the same thing, we were very far from such a millennium. Ah, yes, those words are in the Liberal platform, that whole recital is in the convention platform. It denounced the government of the day for collecting so little by direct taxation and so much by indirect taxation—what the Prime Minister called an invisible tariff. What is he doing now? The present government collected last year nearly fourteen millions more by the invisible tariff, by indirect taxation. They collected twenty-eight millions less by direct taxation than we did the year before. Whereas we collected according to the administration's own figures, up to the end of our last calendar year of government, for a period of eight months, 32 per cent by direct taxation his government collected in the corresponding eight months of 1922 just 24 per cent. What he fails to collect by direct taxation, what he fails to get by the increased revenue from customs, he piles on the back of the people of this country in the way of added sales tax.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Such is the record of this administration. I think the time is surely coming if it is not here when the people of Canada shall know very clearly just what political shilly-shally has been palmed off upon them during the last two years. I do not intend to indulge in prophecy—it is not one of my gifts, I never venture to indulge—but speaking of the present government I am safe in saying that no administration ever slipped back so far in seventeen months of power as this government has done since December, 1921. Indications are not a few that the time has come when something strong, something sound, possibly something heroic in the way of large policy has to be undertaken in this Dominion. The West is struggling against intolerable conditions. The Atlantic provinces are struggling against conditions just as full of despair—of these truths there is no doubt. Where is the government in the crisis? What is the government's proposal? Without a question there must be something done to bring the Maritime provinces of our country nearer to the centre of confederation and to the advantages they have a right to enjoy. Something must be done to give renewed courage and confidence over our western plains. If it is not done, where are we drifting? Has any one the smallest hope that within the spirit and the capacity of this government there resides the ambition, the will, or the strength to resolve the situation that is upon us? I do not think the people of this country have such hope. There must be strong, there must be sound, well-digested, plans evolved and there must be brave, true, and perhaps heroic, measures taken; and the people of Canada will increasingly long for men in office who can devise and execute those things which meet the exigencies of the hour. I think they will demand that the situation which confronts us to-day shall be met in something of the spirit and by something of the resource out of which the many crises of a great war through four years were surmounted, and by which the tremendous obstacles of the after war period were overcome.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): I unexpectedly intervened in the debate this afternoon, and I am not sure that I can contribute anything new or fresh to it, or that I can interest the members of this House in my remarks. If it is not too late, I should like to join with hon. members who have already extended their kind congratulations to the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) on

his very successful budget and also to join in their congratulations to him upon enjoying the distinction of having delivered in this country his seventeenth budget speech. Hon. members on this side of the House appreciate very much, indeed, I am sure, the kind remarks of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) and the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) in reference to the Minister of Finance. The hon. Minister of Finance has given forty-five years to the service of this country, and that alone is a matter of distinction. In that long period of service he has sincerely endeavoured to serve his country and has always been a true public servant. I believe to-day that in this country people regard him as the guardian of the treasury of Canada, and they have faith in his integrity and ability to render public service.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) started off this afternoon by saying he was very much disappointed in the budget. He said it was not a budget at all. Well, it took him a very long time to say what he required to say about it. I do not know what the hon. member requires or what he would suggest as being the proper form of budget. I remember in the early days of my parliamentary experience it was the practice for the Minister of Finance to deliver a three or four hour address, and at the end of it the minister looked like a contestant passing the winning post in a long distance race. Fortunately for Canada and the House, and in the interest of the discharge of public business, these long speeches usually delivered in the past by finance ministers have been abandoned, and very properly so. What should a budget contain? Very few matters after all interest the public or should interest the public in a budget. They require to know the financial position of the country at the end of the last fiscal year. They would like to know, and should know, what revenue the Minister of Finance proposes to collect for the next ensuing financial year, and how he proposes to spend it, and whether he anticipates a deficit or a surplus. These are important matters which should be contained in the budget. The leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that some Lords Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain had some time ago delivered very model addresses upon the financial affairs of the nation. I really do not know to what he refers, but I do know that in recent years, and upon many occasions the Chancellor of the Exchequer of England delivered his budget within half an hour. It may be that I misconstrued the purpose of the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. Perhaps I did, but if he seriously endeavoured to criticize the budget speech as to its form, I think he was wrong, because I do submit that it contained all the essential facts which a budget statement should contain. I think probably the leader of the Opposition felt that the budget of the Minister of Finance was not open to very serious criticism. I think that from his standpoint that was the weakness of the budget. Somebody said many years ago that it was the function of an opposition to oppose, and, of course, it is hard to discharge that duty if a budget is such that it cannot well be criticized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the budget speech was delivered by the minister some two weeks ago, and the country has had considerable opportunity of discussing it and expressing its views, and I do submit that it has been well received by the country and the Minister's political opponents outside of parliament. I think it is one that should receive the commendation of members of parlimaent, regardless of the side of the House on which they sit.

The budget statement disclosed facts which, of course, the country was very well acquainted with, namely: that our expenditures in this country are stupendous; that we must raise a very very substantial revenue by taxation and the re-statement of these facts in the budget only goes to show what a serious task confronts the government, parliament, and the people, of Canada. I do not think any Canadian could well be criticized for self-glorification of the manner in which this country, large in area but small in population, is able to carry the tremendous burden that rests upon it. I think it is a matter of which every Canadian might feel proud. We are carrying on a very expensive national establishment here, perhaps too expensive when we consider the extent of the country and the fact that the population numbers only eight or nine millions. It is a marvellous thing that so small a population is able to bear the burdens that rest upon them as taxpayers. We must, of course, in order to meet this gigantic burden, have faith in our country. Without that our task would be almost hopeless. We have however, to assist us in contemplating the future, the fact that we have the capacity to grow and expand.

If Canada were situated as Great Britain and some of the older European countries, where they find themselves fully developed and where it is impossible to increase in population, Canadians might well be discouraged. Our hearts must go out to the people of Great Britain and to the people of some con-

tinental European countries in their efforts to discharge the tremendous financial obligations to-day resting upon them by reason of the war. Our future in that respect is not at all dark. As I said before, this country is capable of expansion; it is capable of maintaining millions and millions of people who yet can be added to our population. The province of Alberta, concerning which we hear so much to-day, is alone capable of sustaining a population equal to that of the whole of Canada. The province of Ontario, again, is capable of sustaining a population double that which we find in Canada. So, when we have these possibilities in mind, the future should not seem so dark and hopeless as some Canadians would have us believe it to be to-day. Rather we should look to the future with courage, and with the abiding faith that in the early years yet to come, we shall have escaped from many of the oppressive burdens which we have to face to-day.

I should like to say a few words upon another subject which has been referred to time and time again during this session, so that I feel in doing so I should almost apologize to hon. gentlemen. We have heard a great deal concerning the fact—and it is a fact—that business conditions are depressed in this country. We have heard, time and time again, remarks regarding agriculture, particularly in the western provinces. Every Canadian who has come to years of understanding and who possesses powers of observation knows what are the agricultural conditions in the West just about as well as the man living in the West to-day. We have many ways by which we can acquire that knowledge. Those conditions have the sympathy of the people of the East; they would very much prefer that their fellow-countrymen in these new sections of the West were living under more favourable conditions and that trade was more favourable. Agricultural depression exists in the East just as much as it does in the West. Perhaps, in connection with agricultural pursuits in the East, this period of depression is not so effective by reason of the diversity of the farm productions of our eastern agriculturists. Those are regrettable conditions; but they are to be found in the East as well as in the West. We shall never solve this problem by accentuating conditions existing in the western section of the country without recognizing as well that they prevail in the extreme east, and without recognizing the fact, to which I shall refer later, that those conditions, after all, are world-wide conditions.

I might refer to the fact that in the great fishing industry of the Maritime provinces, they have suffered very much by reason of the fact that they have been unable to secure a market for their fish production. No tariff legislation, no efforts of governments or parliaments could have assisted them. They found that, through one condition or another, they were unable to sell their products in the markets in South America, in the West Indies, in the Mediterranean ports—places beyond the power of the arm of this parliament to reach. The same is true to some extent of the lumber industry, and of the fruit industry. It is true in Canada of the manufacturing industry as well. I know many industries in this country to-day which are being operated at a loss which loss the management deliberately assume; but they prefer to carry on at a loss, or at least, without a profit, in order to maintain their organization and in order that unemployment shall not be increased. There is not in this country to-day a human activity that is not in a depressed condition. Nobody glories in that fact; we all suffer from it. The same conditions prevail in almost every other country in the world, and my only purpose in referring to this is to impress upon hon. gentlemen this fact, that we live in troublous days; that we are suffering from the effects of the greatest war known to human history which disturbed the whole world; and that to attempt to solve our national, local and individual problems without fully recognizing these facts is altogether futile and almost a waste of time. After all, we who are here should be leaders in forming public opinion and in assisting our electorate to understand the causes of present-day conditions. At least we should deliberately avoid any misrepresentation or evasion in presenting the facts to the people lest we render ourselves unable to carry to them a sound understanding of the problem and render them unable to assist us, who represent them, in discharging our public duties.

We must face our problems in a national spirit and with courage, and we should avoid a discussion of these matters from a sectional or a provincial viewpoint. We should stress the national viewpoint. I know this is a difficult country to govern. The leader of the Opposition almost in his closing words, wanted to know what the government was going to do for the Maritime provinces, who feel themselves economically isolated from the rest of Canada. That is an economic fact, and I doubt if it ever can be changed. This, as I say, is a very difficult country to govern. But these

provinces were bound together deliberately for the purpose of building here a nation and welding the people who were here, and the people who were to come, into a prosperous and progressive nation. I do not know that any talk or suggestion about a violation of the confederation of the provinces, or any veiled intimation of a cessation from that political agreement, will help us to solve our problems. but this incessant accentuation of provincial and local problems, without due and proper recognition of the fact that they are also national, tends to the introduction of a restless political spirit which does not bode well for the future of this country. We have had in Canada in the last two or three years a new political doctrine which preaches the economic organization of groups.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not know what it is called, but I hear some voice of approval of that idea, and it sounds like a voice crying in the wilderness. I do not suppose it will have any effect on the movement, but I want to say that I disapprove of it, and so I hope, will everyone in Canada, It is economically nonsensical; it is absolutely devoid of any advantage to the country; and it can only prove to be mischievous. I believe that a great deal of the trouble in one of the provinces of Canada is due to the fact that there is an element always preaching this fallacy of economic group organization. No man who believes in the doctrine of free trade, or a moderate tariff, or who understands the fundamental principles of economics can believe in this new economic doctrine. Nevertheless I find that this doctrine of economic group organization is being promulgated in parts of western Canada. I have in my hand the Grain Growers' Guide, a publication known to hon. gentlemen, and in this particular issue there appears a resolution passed at the Alberta Farmers' parliament, I think in January last. This is the resolution:

> That we hereby reaffirm our adherence to the principle of economic group organisation and co-operation between economic groups and demand that our representatives stand firm in adherence to this principle, and that they oppose any steps looking to either amalgamation or affiliation with any political party, or to the forming of a new political party by any broadening out policy.

I do not deny the right of any aggregation of men to adopt that policy and promulgate it with all the energy they may see fit; but it is my right and the right of any other hon. gentleman if he desires, to express his disapproval of it. That is all I wish to say. I am not saying that all of the Progressive party sitting directly opposite me favour that; I do not think that very many of them do—at least, I should hope not. I might read a very effective statement, if I had time, made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) not very long ago in which he very strongly denounced the principle behind that movement, and I think that in doing so he rendered a great service to the country. I hope that his statement will be well considered by the people to whom he addressed his remarks. One effect of political doctrines of that kind, is the development of economic phantasies of such a character to-day as would, a few years ago pretty nearly send a man to some institution; and in the course of a few years, when matters have adjusted themselves, I am sure that those men who are promulgating these ideas at the present time will come to see the folly of it all.

I made a remark a moment ago to which I wish to return. I said that our conditions had not their origin in Canada, but in Europe, and I say that Europe must recover its economic processes before this country can do the same. If that fact were realized, many of the utterances which are made from time to time in this country would receive their proper weight. I am astounded at the many prominent Canadians who sometimes come out in the public press or in company meetings and speak in what they call the optimistic strain; they regard it as a bit of wisdom to be optimistic, as they say. Personally, I have no use for the words "optimism" and "pessimism;" I never use them if I can avoid them; I am not sure that they express anything worth expressing. I think it is better to try to recognize truth as being true and falsity as being false.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the hon. member referring to the Liberal platform of 1919?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not referring to that at all, and I should like to know what put that thought in the hon. gentleman's head. It would interest me to know that.

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member suggested it was well to know what was true and what was false. We have heard a great deal about the Liberal platform to-day and I thought he was referring to it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My hon. friend must have known that was not in my mind. I was trying to impress upon the House the fact that our commercial conditions in Canada had their origin in Europe.

Mr. IRVINE: And in Russia and Germany?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes; conditions in Russia have left a tremendous influence on all the countries of the world. Now, my hon. friends opposite are very much interested in wheat and the prices of wheat. That is the large and important production in the western provinces, and naturally they are interested in receiving a fair price that will afford them a substantial profit over cost of production. And we are all interested in that matter too. We are told that the production of wheat in the last year or two has not been profitable, and that fact we all regret. If there were any means by which we in parliament could correct that position and turn it into one that was favourable, we would do so. Under ordinary circumstances wheat ought to carry a very high price in the European markets to-day. Judged by the price of other commodities, it should be somewhere between $1 and $2 a bushel, perhaps more. But what produces the present condition? Europe desires wheat —Canadian wheat—but she is not in a position to pay for it. France and Italy are back to war-time milling regulations; in some countries the law requires that potato flour be mixed with grain flour; while in other countries the use of grain is prohibited for the making of beer. These facts are well-known to hon. gentlemen, and my only reason for referring to them is that Europe's economic condition is such that she cannot buy her normal requirements of grain, and this immediately reacts upon the wheat producer in Canada—he does not obtain the price which the world's market would fairly secure for him under ordinary conditions. Let me repeat, my only purpose in referring to this is to accentuate the fact, I have stated, and I think it is worthy of repetition, because men should not forget that our adverse economic condition is due to the economic condition of Europe to-day; and for that very reason we must be interested in international affairs.

Now, Mr Speaker, it is nearly six o'clock, and before I venture to approach another subject I wonder if it would be agreeable to hon. members to call it six o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, resuming my remarks of this afternoon I wish to allude very briefly to a matter which has been referred to frequently during this debate and, in fact, very frequently during the session. I have reference to the matter of the emigration from Canada to the United States, which has been going on in very substantial numbers during the past year or more. The fact itself is not in controversy, because it is well known that many Canadians, during the past year or year and a half, have gone to the United States. The statement, however, I thought frequently carried the implication of government responsibility, and that something should have been done, or might have been done, by this country which would have avoided that emigration. Now, Mr. Speaker, of course, the fact is very regrettable indeed, but I know of nothing which the government of the country at the moment can do to prevent it. The conditions of the United States are most peculiar, or have been during the past year or more, particularly if one has in mind the conditions prevailing in the other nations of the world. The United States has a very large population, large and well-established industries, and her natural growth is very considerable. The labour market was supplied very largely from year to year from European countries. That, however, has been prevented in recent years by their immigration laws. The result was that there was a shortage of labour, accompanied by an inflation in wages and an inflation in some lines of production and materials, particularly building materials. That brought about a condition of prosperity in the United States, and Canadians very naturally ask one another in these days how it is that in a country not very dissimilar to ours, lying side by side, we should find in the one an apparent prosperity, and in the other a depression in trade. While it is regrettable that so many Canadians are obliged to leave their country, I am not so sure but that the judgment of Canada in the course of a year or a little more will be that it was better that we should pass through the conditions we are now passing through than to have the inflation which the United States now has, and which in the course of a few months must collapse and be accompanied with the inevitable depression and dislocation of trade. Everybody who understands or cares to observe the conditions in the United States knows that that apparent prosperity is due to an increase in the building trade. It is also well known, and remarked by everybody in the United States who knows anything about the matter, that prices of building material and wages have recently reached such a stage that they can

proceed no further, and from day to day we notice in the press evidence of threatened strikes, and we may soon expect strikes in the building trade which will react upon this country and must end the inflation in the United States. It will not be an undesirable thing for the United States if that should happen. The reaction will affect us adversely, I admit, but looking to the future, taking a long view of things as we should in these days, it is perhaps better it should come, because the sooner will we and the United States and the other countries of the world reach something approaching normal conditions. Until that period arrives, whatever men may propose, deplorable conditions will prevail throughout the world. Therefore, I wish to say upon this point that I deny any government responsibility in this matter, and I doubt whether there is anything that we in this country could do to prevent that particular condition of affairs.

The leader of the Opposition referred this afternoon to the matter of expenditure and the balancing of our budget. I concede that this is, perhaps, the most important question in Canadian politics to-day, and of infinitely more importance perhaps than tariff or any other question which anybody might suggest. It is a question upon which we should not divide on party lines. It is a matter which affects every man in this country, the rich and the poor, the high and the humble, the weak and the strong. We, as representatives of the people, charged with certain responsibilities to whom the people of the country naturally look for some leadership, should give to the government of the day, whatever that government be, our best judgment in connection with the matter of public expenditure. I am not so apprehensive as to what should be the judgment of the government upon the question of expenditure. I am more concerned with the views of members of parliament and of the people we represent. If the government were led by the right hon. member who leads the Opposition, or if the Progressive party were on the ministerial benches, I would say of them, as I now say of the government, that I would have the greatest confidence in their desire to restrict unprofitable and unproductive public expenditure. I would also concede to them the sincere desire to balance our budget. But, as I said, I am not alarmed about the government not desiring to practise such a policy. I am more alarmed as to whether the public view is right and whether the view of members of parliament is quite proper in that respect. Some time ago we had a discussion in this House upon the question of the Hudson Bay railway. I had intended to take part in that, but for one reason and another I did not. The views expressed by the House, or by a great number of the members, left upon me the impression and conviction that we were not properly seized of the great importance of being right upon the matter of public expenditure. There is no political or party issue in this question. The Liberal party and the Conservative party were committed years ago to this expenditure. But it does not follow that either party is bound by this promise made in the past. It is true that gentlemen directly opposite me and their supporters in their respective sections of the country were always strongly in favour of this railway project, but it does not follow that to-day they should support it.

During the debate many speeches were made, some of them occupying fully an hour, trying to demonstrate that ships could navigate the Hudson bay and the Hudson strait, just as if it were a major factor in the case. In an argument, or discussion, or controversy of that kind, any person might well admit that a ship could navigate the Hudson bay and the Hudson strait. It has been done, but that, after all, is not important. The real question is, is the Hudson bay a commercial route? Can ships be put on that route and operate profitably? Can they carry grain through by that route at a price lower than the prices which are available to-day by the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence route, or by the rail and water routes? These are questions that should be settled before anybody in this country should commit himself to-day to any further expenditure in this connection other than outlined by the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) when the matter was up for discussion.

I wish to tender this bit of advice to the government, that before this country seriously entertains the idea of completing that project, a commission be appointed to inquire into what are really important and salient facts, but which have never yet, so far as I know, been inquired into at all. As I said before, the question of navigability of the Hudson bay is not a very important factor. Of course, there must be water there; conditions must be such as to permit of a ship leaving the Hudson bay port and proceeding thence to Europe. I will concede that now as being possible; but I would not concede it to be a commercially feasible route or one worth spending any more of the public money upon,

unless it is demonstrated in a more ample way than it has been up to the present moment that it is a sound, commercial, transportation route.

Mr. BIRD: Does the hon. member not think that, in the case of a port that is one thousand miles nearer to Liverpool than Montreal, the onus of proving the commercial feasibility lies upon himself?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I should not think so, to be fair to my hon. friend. I should say that, prima facie, every man who wishes to reflect upon the question at all, would conclude that the other route was the cheaper of the two, because there must be, in the first place, a large capital investment to provide shipping, and this must be done by the government because no private company will ever go into this enterprise. Everything indicates, on the surface at least, that you could not carry freight as cheaply by that route as by existing routes. I may be wrong; I merely say that it is sound to suggest that before the project is proceeded with further, there should be a closer examination of all the facts relative thereto.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the hon. member extend that suggestion to the Welland canal?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The Welland canal is in a somewhat different position, as I am sure my hon. friend will concede. I am not going to engage in an extended discussion with regard to that. There are in the western provinces instances where railway projects might very well be carried out, which would be in the interests of the country. I have heard the story of the need of railways in the Peace river country from some gentlemen who were in Ottawa recently, and I was very much impressed. When I heard the story, I could not but inquire of myself why it was that in this House amongst 235 members, there could be found men who could justify the expenditure of $25,000,000 on the Hudson Bay railway, and, perhaps, hesitate to urge an expenditure to construct in the western provinces some short pieces of railway which would do very much for those particular localities and for the interest of the country generally.

Talking about expenditure, I should like to make to the Minister of Finance a suggestion wherein he might save some money, and I am sure if he would carry out my suggestion, he will find that it is a sound one. According to the evidence before the House, it would appear that the operations of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine last year netted a deficit of six, seven or eight million dollars.

Mr. DUFF: Nine million dollars.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Nine million dollars. That is a very substantial sum of money. I am opposed to the continued operation of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. In the first place, it is costing us nine million dollars a year, and the people of this country have to be taxed that much to meet that deficit. It renders no service to Canada, for the reason that ships could be found elsewhere, owned by private persons and companies, which would perform the services just as well and as cheaply as the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is doing. I am not criticizing the policy of the government that inaugurated the programme of the construction of ships; in fact, I was a member of that government, and in that respect I am not in a different position from that of anybody who was in parliament at that time. Everyone who was in parliament at that time supported that policy.

An hon. MEMBER: At the beginning.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): At the beginning, it was deemed sound national policy. Almost every country in the world embarked upon a similar policy. I do not intend, however, to engage in any lengthy argument upon the merits or demerits of that scheme. I wish merely to point out to the Minister of Finance a method by which he may save eight or nine million dollars a year and do no injury to any public service or public interest.

The leader of the Opposition this afternoon criticized adversely the fact that the Minister of Finance predicted a deficit in the financial operations of the government for the present fiscal year. The Minister of Finance anticipates quite a substantial surplus of revenue over all ordinary, capital and special expenditures; but he anticipates again that the railway deficits will more than consume that surplus. The leader of the Opposition says that this country should be taxed to meet that deficit caused by the railway operations, so that the budget would balance. I admit there is something in that. The Minister of Finance was very frank about the matter when delivering his budget. All reflecting people will acknowledge the desirability of balancing budgets. That is one of the troubles of Europe to-day: Their expenditures are greater than their revenues, and they meet the situation by printing paper

money, ruining themselves, ruining other countries, impeding the restoration of trade processes as between countries and countries. I think our record in Canada up to date in this respect has been a very creditable one; in this respect, as in most other respects, Canadians have held their heads well during the trying period from the armistice down to the present day. We have done nothing in this country to impede the restoration of trade channels between this country and all other countries. In this respect we are quite unique; we are almost the only country in the world that has not enacted legislation specifically designed to impede trading between countries.

No other country is in quite the same position as we are in respect of our transportation system, and it is a serious matter to tax the people of Canada these days for railway deficits. This might be a good way of informing the Canadian people in a few, short years whether government ownership and operation is a good thing or not. It is, however, the judgment of the country that the government-owned system should be given a fair trial. I would look upon the advances made to the road as a loan, or advance, and not, strictly speaking, as a part of our budget ordinary. That view may be open to some criticism. I hope the day is not very far off when this country will commence to grow and its business expand, when our population will be such that our debt will be practically cut in two, while the railway business will have grown to such an extent as not only to pay its operating expenses but to repay to the government some of the advances that have been made to it, or it will be able to finance itself by the sale of bonds and through the proceeds of such bonds restore those advances to the government. Therefore, I am not inclined to agree with the criticism of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that the railway advances must necessarily, at the present time at least, be met by taxation. It is quite true that policy could not long be continued; neither can we long continue owning and operating a government system if it entails such a huge deficit as we have had during the past few years, because we should soon reach the limit of our capacity for taxation for that or any other purpose, and some other solution would then have to be discovered.

The leader of the Opposition this afternoon inveighed strongly against the government on its tariff policy and its failure to live up to the party platform drawn up in 1919. This matter was discussed very thoroughly at the last session and I do not know that I can add anything to what has already been said, either by myself or by any other hon. member. I think that altogether too much importance is attached to it. Many good and distinguished men in the past have reversed their positions in respect of public policy, and in that reversal have received the applause of the country which they were serving. Hon. gentlemen will remember that Sir Robert Peel, an eminent British statesman, at a certain period in British history was opposed to the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Mr. FORKE: Does the hon. member admit that the government has reversed its policy?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, I had not reached that point.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not see any necessity for this laughter and I hope there is more behind it than appears to me at the moment. No; I did not say that the government had reversed its policy, but I did observe that very frequently eminent gifted public men have reversed almost in a moment their position on certain public questions and have not been maligned for so doing. In their lifetime perhaps they were charged with inconsistency and with having abandoned their position for purely political gain, and it required the passage of days, perhaps years, to have justice accorded them. I mention this merely to suggest in very general terms that the public should not require an inflexible stand by public men on any question. Surely there should be some room for variation in their opinions on such questions if the changes, the conditions and the circumstances of the times justify or warrant it. That was the point I wished to make, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite, who were laughing a few moments ago, will not disagree with it.

Now, Sir, I was not at the Liberal Convention of 1919.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You were in different company then.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I was in England at the time and if I had been in Canada I should hardly have been a welcome guest at that convention.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, you would.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Therefore perhaps I can speak with a little more freedom in this regard than can some of the hon members who were present at the convention.

The tariff policy enunciated at that convention is not before me at the moment, but in general terms it declared in favour of an increase in the British preference and for substantial reductions on specified articles. I do not hesitate to say that it is unwise for any party convention to write a tariff schedule. It is not their business and they cannot do it; and I should say very frankly and emphatically of the Liberals who were gathered together at that time—I know them, and I do not want to say anything that is not inspired by kindness so far as they are concerned—that they could not possibly have been in a position to write a tariff schedule then. It was their duty to declare themselves upon matters of policy and nothing else. I say the same thing, too, about the policy, the platform, of hon. gentlemen opposite; they were equally foolish. If those hon. gentlemen came into office to-morrow they could not carry out their programme; and if I were to lead them through that door yonder, one by one, I am sure they would agree with me in that statement. I should hardly expect them to do so collectively before the public, however. I have not the slightest doubt that in regard to their policy pretty nearly every hon. gentleman opposite me disagrees emphatically with one or more of the planks of their platform; I have too high an opinion of them individually and collectively to believe otherwise. At the same time I am not criticizing the main principle running through their platform, and I repeat that political parties are perfectly within their rights and are only performing their duty by the public in a proper manner when they declare themselves on certain principles in relation to public policy. But they have no right to deal with details, and if they do so they are bound to find themselves in serious trouble later on.

I might say more about hon. gentlemen of the opposition. There is not much use in their declaring before the public that they have been always consistent either as regards their general programme or in respect of its details. Take the tariff declarations of the Liberal-Conservative party, called the National Liberal and Conservative party; you could put anything into it or take anything out of it, and probably it was designed to facilitate operations of that kind. At the same time, however, it is only fair to say that the Conservative party have been consistently strong protectionists. Now, is it not easy to discern a distinction between the tariff policy of the Liberal party, say, and that of the Conservative party in Canada?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I know that my hon. friends who say, "no", do not mean it, but they cannot provoke me away from my argument by such an interruption. The Conservative party have been consistently protectionists, except for slight variations and departures at certain times when it appeared politically advantageous to them to make a detour. They use very old-fashioned arguments in support of protection and if I were supporting a tariff policy I would find a better ground on which to advocate it. Last evening an hon. gentleman in the Conservative ranks spoke somewhat in this way: "If we buy goods in a foreign country we send our money away to help build up that country." Well, that is the idea of an antediluvian; I could make a better protectionist speech myself, or at least I could give more convincing arguments in favour of protection. That is absurd, because we do not send money away. If we send goods away we have to get goods back; the imports and exports must in the main balance. We must have trade; and a lot of this loose thinking is perhaps due to the fact that it is not countries who buy and sell; it is only people who do so. Why, the leader of the Opposition during the general election in 1921 had prominently exposed upon his political literature a statement attributed to Abraham Lincoln, that if you buy from abroad you have the goods, but you have lost your money; but if you buy at home you have your goods and you have your money too. As a matter of fact, Lincoln never said so, because he was always too wise and too well informed upon economics. I only refer to this to show that the Conservative party are— I was going to say poor thinkers. But they are pronounced protectionists now, and if their statements are to be believed they expect to remain so, because they do not think it is wise for us to trade with the people of other countries, or perhaps, speaking more accurately, they do not believe in the people of Canada doing business with anybody else; for that is what it gets down to.

What is the position of the Liberal party? It may be quite true to say that while Liberal ministries have been in power we have had an element of protection in our tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite say if they came into office there would still be an element of protection in the tariff. They have said that time and again. It is in their platform. Even in their amendment to the budget they recognize the probability of that element being continued; but they say protection

should not be granted unless the applicant comes before a parliamentary committee and makes good his request for protection. That is simply the tariff board idea. They have it in the United States, and it is, I think, a pretty good way of perpetuating protection. I would hardly agree to it myself. At the same time, I think I am well within the mark when I say that Liberal governments have from time to time reduced the tariff, that they have always expressed the view that the principle of protection is wrong and that it should be the aim and purpose of the people of every country to some day reach a free trade basis. It is a mental outlook if it is nothing else.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr MACLEAN (Halifax): A man may believe in the efficacy and soundness of free trade or low tariffs and yet find it impossible of accomplishment by reason of the past economic policy of his country, or by reason of conditions of one kind and another which are beyond his control. There is no occasion for my hon. friend opposite to laugh. I am not propounding any new philosophy; they themselves believe in it. For instance, during the past few weeks I was surprised to find so many hon. gentlemen among the Progressive group urging that we should carry coal from Alberta to Ontario. I have not much faith in the proposal myself, although I think it is well that it should be studied so that in the event of a recurrence of conditions such as prevailed last year in relation to our coal supply the government would be ready to meet the situation. The average member from Alberta to-day, I suppose, would support the policy of taking coal from Alberta to Ontario, but at the same time he and his colleagues know it can only be done by adding to the railway deficit and taxing the people.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. gentleman makes the statement that members from Alberta know coal could not be transported to Ontario without adding to the railway deficit. How do they know? The question is open for discussion. The hon. gentleman is assuming that members in this quarter of the House are willing to grant a bonus to the railways for the carriage of such coal; but he has no information to that effect.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would think that pretty nearly every hon. gentleman opposite knows—

Mr. FORKE: You do not know what they know.

Mr MACLEAN (Halifax): I hope my hon. friend will not take offence at my remarks, they are not intended to offend him. I am ascribing to him a measure of intelligence which I hope he will not refuse to acknowledge. I want to say it must be common knowledge that it is not possible to carry coal from Alberta to Ontario except at a rate which would be unprofitable to the railways, and that this loss would have to be made up in some way or another by the people of Canada generally. I regret that such is the fact. I am not criticizing my hon. friends opposite I am only attempting to show that they are only human and think much like the rest of us do.

Mr. WARNER: Have you read diligently the evidence given before the coal committee?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I have not read it diligently, I have not read it at all, and I do not expect ever to do so; but I have read some of it and have discussed the matter with men who hold very practical views in regard to it, and their views were of much greater assistance to me than would be a perusal of all the evidence.

Mr. WARNER: Do you think it would be a good idea to withhold criticism until after the conference at Winnipeg and until the committee have made a report?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think after that conference and everything else is closed my hon. friend will agree with me that I am a pretty accurate prophet in respect to this particular matter.

Now, taking the record of the Liberal party and going back to the year 1896, I submit to this House and particularly to hon. gentlemen opposite me, that it supports the view I was expressing a few moments ago, namely, that very important reductions of the tariff generally have been made while the Liberal party were in office. In 1897 the preferential tariff was brought into effect. That
9 p.m. was a tremendous change in the tariff policy of the country. The opponents of the Liberal party of that day said this preferential tariff would have a disastrous effect upon our industries. This important and substantial reduction would never have originated from the Conservative party. It still continues, and I think it should be regarded as evidence of the desire of those who believe in the greatest possible freedom of trade to bring it about as time, conditions and circumstances permit. Then came 1911 when the Liberal party of that day committed themselves to a policy of a

trade treaty with the United States. Surely that was evidence of a desire on the part of the leaders and parliamentary supporters of the Liberal party to encourage the greatest freedom of trade possible between Canada and the United States. Some hon. gentlemen sitting directly opposite me opposed that move on the part of the Liberal party. I understand that the new member who came to us recently from Moose Jaw (Mr. Hopkins) —who spoke last night and whom we were all glad to hear—was one of those who in 1911 opposed the trade agreement with the United States.

Mr. HOEY: That is one of the inaccurate statements that were widely spread over the constituency during the recent campaign. I want to say, on the personal authority of the hon. member, that he did not vote against reciprocity.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am bound to accept the word of the hon. gentleman. Of course, if the hon. member in question says he did not support the Conservative party of that day that ends the incident. I have no desire to misrepresent his position. Then since 1911 there have been reductions of the tariff, made by Liberal ministries. Reductions were made last year. True, they were not very heavy reductions, but it indicates the tendency on the part of the Liberal party to reduce the tariff, at least, in some degree, and at certain times, according as circumstances may in their judgment justify such a course. The tariff announcements made by the Minister of Finance a few days ago contain, I think, quite substantial reductions, when we consider the effect of the 10 per cent reduction in the duties under the British preferential tariff. With that record, known to the public and particularly known to hon. gentlemen opposite—known, in fact, to the world—I fail to see the justification for their open and declared opposition to it. They themselves admit that if they were given the confidence of the electorate and were sitting on the ministerial benches, they could not at once introduce free trade.

There are one or two reasons why it is difficult to put into effect at this time, or will be in the early years to come, a tariff on a free trade basis. In the first place, we must have revenue, and how are we going to get it unless, in part, by the imposition of tariff taxes upon imports? Where is it to come from? In his amendment the leader of the Progressive party states that further revenue might be obtained by an increase of the excise tax. I think the Minister of Finance has explored every avenue that he could think of to augment his revenue by excise, and he has failed. Having found that some of the excise taxes imposed last year were too high and did not accomplish the object he had in view, he was obliged to come before this House a few days ago and frankly concede that his judgment was wrong in that respect, and he seeks a reduction of these particular taxes.

Then the suggestion is commonly made, "If you lose some revenue by dropping tariff taxation, why, you can increase the income tax." Well, it is very easy to say that, but it is very much more difficult to get revenue in that way. I fancy that income taxation in this country is just as high as it should be; I am not so sure that its reduction at a very early day would not be better from the point of view of revenue, better for the national interest as well as for the individual good. We cannot long proceed to take all the difference between the costs involved in production and the price paid by the consumer, and put it in the treasury in the form of taxation. We must have some capital with which to develop the country, with which to expand our present businesses and establish new ones, and those funds will not be available if we take too much taxation from the people. Therefore I say that we must derive a very considerable portion of our necessary revenue from customs taxation; it is impossible for us to get away from it. For that reason I suggest that it is not fair to charge the Liberal party with a deliberate and malicious abandonment of its traditional policy in respect to tariff and trade matters, because the necessities of the hour demand that we obtain some revenue in this way.

Last year, speaking on the budget, I very frankly said—and I have always held the idea; I wish to be candid in the matter—that in view of our proximity to the United States, a highly protected country, a country which is increasing its tariff against us, frequently doing so deliberately—in view of these circumstances we cannot entirely abandon our tariff. I do not think it bad business to have some instrument in your hands with which to bargain with your neighbours. I was very glad to hear during this session the suggestion from two or three hon. members of the Progressive group that it would be unwise to abandon our tariff altogether, in view of the attitude of the United States toward Canada on this question. I cannot recall who the hon. gentlemen were, but I remember distinctly that three of them made remarks of this import. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sure, were not pleased with the

attitude of the American people in respect of the Fordney tariff. I cannot see how our friends of the western provinces could support a policy which involved our giving the United States, while they were taking this attitude, free entry into our markets. That to my mind, is unthinkable; it would not be sound national policy, no matter whether a particular view on the question of tariff is, in principle, sound or unsound.

One of the things in connection with this budget upon which I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance is the offer it contains for reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States. I believe that will have a good effect. I believe in the freest trade relations possible with the country to the south of us. We sell to them probably the same amount that we sell to Great Britain; we buy from them, however, about five times as much as we buy from Great Britain. That disparity is natural and inevitable, in some degree at least. But when the Liberal party declares itself in favour of the establishment of closer trade relations with the United States, it should not be condemned by our friends opposite or by anyone else. Such a declaration is evidence of a desire to bring about the end which our friends of the Progressive party seem to be more anxious to attain than do the people of any other part of Canada—and I can quite understand their position in that respect. The United States only recently, under what is termed the flexible powers given to the President, increased the duties on some seven or eight articles being exported from Canada which happened to be either on the free list or subject to a very low tariff rate. Now, the people of this country cannot very well submit to that, and it is only natural that Canadians should like to keep themselves in the position of having an instrument to bargain with the country to the south of us. I fail to understand how hon. gentlemen representing western districts could entertain any other view; indeed, I do not believe they do.

The fact that the Minister of Finance referred to the desirability of stability in tariff matters has been considerably criticized. I think the statement has been much exaggerated. It seems to me, however, that if that fact was not made the subject of criticism it would be something else; I am not sure but that the criticism has that colour. Suppose we read again the remarks of the minister so that we shall be sure what he did say and give to it a proper interpretation. The Minister of Finance said:

> Business men do not like to be always threatened with changes in the tariff.

I do not know that there is any objection to that. Whatever a man's views on economics, or trade matters, or tariff matters may be, I do not see that he can object to the principle involved in that statement. In our municipal or provincial affairs, we like to have some finality to our taxation schemes. However that statement is qualified. Let me read further:

> There is no finality in legislation either as respects that tariff or as respects anything else. That which parliament can do to-day it can undo to-morrow. Everybody knows that. Everybody must conduct his business in the light of that fact. Nevertheless it is desirable that something like an assurance of tariff stability should be given to business men. Exceptions will occur. There will be cases where, in the interest of the consumer, reductions in the tariff ought to be made.

The Progressive platform contains a suggestion pretty well along these lines. The Progressives did suggest that the duties on British imports be cut down immediately 50 per cent and that in the course of five years they be abandoned. I do not think they imagine that that is a practical suggestion, or that they could put it into effect even if they were on the treasury benches. In the amendment there is the declaration that violent changes cannot be made in the tariff, and that business must be given an opportunity to adjust itself to new tariff conditions. Well, one system is perhaps a little more extreme than the other, but each is an acknowledgement of what is a practical fact, known to everybody of mature years and who has any experience in business affairs at all. I think the minister's statement is a fair one. It would be unjust to the country to be making tariff changes every year. Furthermore, I doubt if there is any Minister of Finance who, speaking from a physical point of view, could go through one parliament of four years and undertake to give a tariff revision each year to the degree made in this budget we are discussing. I appeal to hon. gentlemen in this House, and to hon. gentlemen opposite, upon this criticism which is made of the tariff, and I ask if there is anything really and substantially objectionable in the position taken by the Minister of Finance. Would they themselves not do the same, or say the same, if they were charged with the responsibility of the administration of the public affairs or of the financial affairs of this country?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken much longer than I intended when I first rose this afternoon, and as I stated at the beginning of my remarks I hardly hoped to enlighten the House upon the matters before us, or to contribute anything to the discussion that was new or fresh. The problems before us

to-day in this country are great, they are almost oppressive, and to face them and deal with them in the proper fashion we must have stout hearts and exhibit a great deal of courage. We must deal with them in a broad, national way, although I do not ask any members from the different sections of Canada to be unmindful of their own sectional interest. We cannot avoid that, and unfortunately there is such a lack of community of interest in the three great sections of this country that sectional views and interests must frequently project themselves into our political issues. We must also exercise patience in the restoration of a condition of normal trade and business in this country as in the case of the peoples of most other countries of the world. As I said this afternoon the restoration of Canadian trade, the reconstruction of the world, cannot be accomplished by the efforts of any one country or of any two countries. Trade to-day is a matter which concerns the whole world. Finance, taxation, expenditures, trade, tariffs, affect every country of the world, and as they affect one they react immediately upon the other. We must exercise or display wisdom and economy in our public expenditures. We should support the government in their efforts to control expenditure and make only wise, profitable and productive outlays. The budget delivered by the Minister of Finance, I submit, in view of the conditions prevailing in this country and throughout the world generally, is a fair one and is worthy of the support of the public, and I think will meet with favourable consideration from the hon. members of this House.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, before I enter upon the remarks which I have prepared to address to this House this evening there are some matters which have cropped up during the debate to which I would like to devote a very short period of time.

I am sorry the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is not in his place, because I propose to direct a few observations in his direction. He has always treated me, since I have been a member of this House, with distinguished courtesy, and I would desire to return courtesy with courtesy; and the criticism I offer to a few of the remarks he made this afternoon is criticism directed in that temper. But I was sorry for something the right hon. gentleman dropped this afternoon. It was his remark concerning the highly esteemed and regarded member for Queen's (Mr. Sinclair), the minister without portfolio. It is true that that hon. gentleman's voice is not often heard in the debates in this chamber, but those who have sat by him day after day in the no less exacting and, perhaps, important work of committees know how sound is his intelligence, how wise his discretion, how limitless his industry.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In the absence of the leader of the Opposition I think I should say that my hon. friend is entirely mistaken.

Mr. DUFF: Oh no, he is not. We all heard him this afternoon.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) will reserve his comment until I have concluded my explanation. He is entirely mistaken. What the leader of the Opposition was referring to was the imputed position in which the free trade members of the government, those gentlemen that believe in a low tariff, found themselves—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —and he said he was even content to include the member for Lunenburg in that description.

Mr. McMASTER: I am not unaware of the tone in which the remark was proffered. I am ready to believe, however, it slipped unwittingly from the lips of the leader of the Opposition, and I would merely say to him that it is good to have the strength of the giant, but tyrannous to use it as such.

I would like to make a few other remarks concerning his address. When the right hon. member spoke with considerable enthusiasm of Great Britain having reduced her debt by £100,000,000, I could not help remembering that a few short months ago, when sitting on this side of the House, he told us how Great Britain had been ruined by free trade. Apparently the country that has been able to reduce its debt and to balance its budget, is that country which the right hon. leader of the Opposition characterized as having been ruined by adopting and continuing a policy of free trade. Not only has it followed for many years the policy of free trade, but it has repented of any changes from that policy, and I would like to read to the House what Mr. Lloyd George said at a meeting held the other night in Manchester, England. He said:

There are three dangers to liberty. The first is protection. I will tell you what I will do. If there is going to be a fight about Free Trade,—and I believe it,—let us get rid of all three, the McKenna tariff, the Paris Resolutions, and the safeguarding of In-

dustries Act. Let us clear the decks, and if there is a fight for free trade let us go forward as a united party.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to a remark made by the right hon. member concerning the United States. He pointed out what was quite true, that the Americans had raised their duties quite recently, but he did not tell us that since the Americans raised their duties they have had a congressional election in that country, and that the Republican party lost very heavily in the contest. He forgot to tell us—after all it was hardly his business as a protectionist statesman to inform us on this point—that the organization in the United States corresponding to our Council of Agriculture in this country has had its eyes opened, and has placed itself on record as favouring the reduction of the present tariff in the United States and the admission of some of our cattle free into that country. Then the right hon. and learned gentleman talked to us about reciprocity. He said that reciprocity was undesirable from two points of view; first from an economic point of view, and secondly from a national point of view. As I understood his argument it was this: Grant for the sake of argument that it is going to help the country, and that it is going to increase your trade with the United States, you have no assurance that that market will always be yours. You may organize your trade in order to take advantage of that market, and then, perhaps in ten years, the doors will be closed and your trade will be disorganized to your great loss. I think the natural producers of Canada are prepared to take that risk. If the doors be opened in a reciprocal trade relation with the United States, there will not be one dollar's worth of goods go from Canada to the United States unless there is a better price to be realized for those goods. There will not be one dollar's worh of goods come from the United States unless you get a better value for the money. Reciprocity gives a better opportunity for advantageous exchange. That is all it does. Suppose the doors were opened, and also suppose that they were closed in ten years, would Canada not be just so much better for that ten years of increased prosperity?

What gave the agriculturist in eastern Canada a great help between 1854 and 1866? It was the reciprocity arrangements that were made with the United States. It is too bad they were lost, but let me remind hon. members that the United States of to-day is a very different place from the United States of 1866. They have become a very highly industrialized nation during the years that have elapsed since then, and I cherish the notion that if the doors were open and reciprocal trade allowed to flow in natural channels north and south, it would be found so much to the advantage of both parties that the doors would never be closed. It is well worth taking the risk. Of course, there are those who wish to think that in some way or other free trade relations would hurt our national spirit, and that we would be less loyal to throne and flag if such a thing were adopted. Just think of the United States itself. New York has been trading freely with Vermont for hundreds of years. Are Vermonters any the less Vermonters? Or are New Yorkers any the less New Yorkers to-day than they were in former times? Of course not. The proposition is ridiculous. It was a herring drawn across the trail on the last election on this question in 1911, and it is to be hoped, for the good name of Canada, that childish arguments of that sort will not be used again.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition says that conditions are bad in Canada among the farmers, not only in the West but in the Maritime provinces. Unfortunately, I believe that what he says is true, but what is his remedy? He tongued-lashed the government for two hours this afternoon, but when he is called upon for a remedy, what is the remedy that he proposes? A continuation of the principle of protection, which is in other words a continuation of high taxes. The friends who sit behind him, small in number, though loyal in disposition, enthusiastically applaud this remark. Let me say that the country requires something more than a reiterated demand for the maintenance of taxation to get itself out of its present economic difficulties.

I have little to say in connection with the observations made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). He said this country was a difficult one to govern. I think that is true. He said we needed courage. I think that is true. He said we needed patience. I believe that is true. I will not call him an apostle of the obvious, but I will say that he is a St. Paul of the obvious—the greatest among the apostles. He dwells upon the Liberal mentality towards reduction of duties. He said the Liberals have a mind working towards lower duties and freer trade. I agree with him. I have that mind myself, but I wish to see that mind control matter, and to see a movement made in the right direction I was glancing at the life of John Bright the other night, and I found that he entered parliament in 1841, and by 1846 the Corn Laws had ben repealed. I do not know whe-

ther I expect quite such prompt action on the part of the people of this country. I do not know whether the need for freedom is quite as great as it was in the Great Britain of that time when people, through protection, were reduced to starvation. But I do say that I believe the people of this country are not going to be satisfied with a mere attitude of mind concerning the trade question, but that action and reasonably prompt action will be required. That leads me to what I have to say in this matter.

I purpose, Mr. Speaker, to vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke), and I purpose to vote against the budget. When I next resume a seat in this House I purpose to sit where is the nearest approach that we have to the cross benches. My observations to-night will be directed not to an apology for, but in justification of, the action which I purpose to follow. I crave your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, in advance for the use which I shall be obliged to make of the first personal pronoun. Perhaps as I am dealing with my own conduct, that may be an excuse.

First of all, I wish to say that I am a Liberal and was never more a Liberal than I am to-night. I believe in the necessity of Liberalism. I believe the ills of this world can be healed, and healed only by the application of Liberal principles, but I want to see those Liberal principles applied with courage and with promptness. Just as we may find religion summed up in a few words, so we shall find the essence of Liberalism in those watchwords of the past, the watchwords of the Whigs of days gone by, the watchwords of the Liberals of days gone by—"Peace, Retrenchment and Reform," "Free Trade, Peace, Goodwill amongst the Nations," "Trust in the people, qualified by prudence; in opposition to distrust of the people, mingled with fear." We find the necessity for the application of what Mr. Lloyd George has recently characterized as a good definition of Liberalism: "Fair play for the under dog." That is what we need in this country. I have no apologies to make in this House or elsewhere for my conduct as a Liberal and a Liberal party man.

As a schoolboy, I became possessed of the illogical absurdities of the protectionist principle and protectionist practice, and I joined myself to the party which at that time stood for lower tariffs, which had denounced in eloquent terms the very principle of protection and which had said that protection was legalized robbery. I do not use the language of extremeness at this time, but that was the language used at that time by Liberal statesmen. As a college youth, I took an active part in the election of 1896 in the county which I now have the honour to represent in this House. As a result of the efforts of the Liberals in that county, there was returned to this House, after an absence of some five years, that good, sound public servant, the late Hon. Sydney Fisher. I rejoiced when the Minister of Finance made the cuts that he did in his Tariff Act of 1897. I supported his British preference and his various extensions thereof. I hoped, as all other Liberals in the country hoped, for the success of the reciprocity negotiations that went on in 1897, and I was sorry and disappointed when they failed.

Mr. DUFF: In 1911.

Mr. McMASTER: No, in 1897 there was a commission which sat at Washington with Lord Herschell as its chairman, which endeavoured to get reciprocal relations with the United States. That failed at that time through no fault of the Liberal government. I frankly admit that I was never perfectly satisfied with the advances which were made after about 1900, when the British preference came into its full effect. After that we made little, if any, advance in the low tariff direction. I admit frankly that the government was always face to face with the pressure from the vested interests of this country who, in the elections of 1900, 1904, 1908, were clamouring for what they were pleased to call adequate protection. The party, I suppose, is entitled to some credit for not having given way to that, though some way was given, and the schedule on some textiles was raised in 1904 or 1907, I forget just which.

When the reciprocity campaign of 1911 took place, I practically closed my law office in Montreal and threw myself into the fight with every atom of enthusiasm and power which I possessed. I believed that we were making a great forward step for Canada in that reciprocity election. I do not know just how much credit must be given to those who beat us in that election by their opposition to reciprocity. Other matters came in; sectarian cries were raised; racial cries were raised, and in the province of Quebec anti-Imperial cries were raised. As a result, we lost the election. But in my humble opinion, one of the reasons why we lost that election was because, from about 1900 to 1911, we failed to preach our Liberal doctrine on trade matters. Prior to 1896, every election in Canada was a course in political economy conducted by such men as Cartwright, Mulock, Fisher, and Liberals of the old school. When we got

into power, the government was busy with other matters; the country was developing at a great rate; railway questions employed the energy and the mind of the government to a large extent; but we failed to preach our gospel, and the Nemesis which overtakes any church, or any body of men, or any political party that fails to preach its gospel, overtook us. There had come to the polls, there had reached maturity, thousands, if not tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of young men who, when 1911 came, had never heard the trade question discussed, who did not know the difference between the principle of protection and the principle of free trade, who never understood that trade in itself was a good thing, and who, therefore, were ready victims to the flag-flapping campaign that went on and the appeal to anti-American sentiment which, unfortunately, was raised by many Conservatives of that day with the slogan of "No truck or trade with the Yankees."

After that happened, I came into close personal touch with the leaders of the Liberal party of that day, especially with the Hon. Sydney Fisher and with that great Liberal statesman, the revered and deeply beloved chief of the Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I remember in May, 1912, he came to Montreal to a great meeting. We had been beaten a few months previously, in September 1911. On that occasion there were not found wanting protectionist Liberals of Montreal who begged the old chieftain to forget all about reciprocity and to put it among the disused things back upon the shelf and say nothing about it. And what was his reply to their entreaty? I remember, as if it were yesternight, there stood the white plumed knight who said that reciprocity was a good thing, that the people of Canada had made a grave mistake in rejecting it and that they would some time wake up to the conclusion that they had erred; and then with a gesture he said: "My orders not to win or lose; my orders are to fight." It was imbued with that spirit that I went on doing all that I could for Liberal principles and the Liberal party, believing that the Liberal party was an instrument for the putting into action of those principles; and it was not very long until my principles, and my adhesion to my chief and to the Liberal party, were put to a very severe test in the election of 1917. Now, I have no criticism to offer of those men whose mind and conscience led them to leave Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the conscription issue. My mind and conscience led me to a different conclusion, and while some left him, I was among those who stood fast by the old chieftain; and when the storms, nay, the tornadoes of sectarian hatred and racial antagonism descended upon the head of him who had always stood for broad toleration and a deep and pure Canadianism,—descended upon him because he was French-speaking and a Roman Catholic,—I considered that only an additional reason why I, an English-speaking man and a Protestant, should stand firm by his side.

Why do I vote against this budget? I vote against it because I believe after a careful consideration that it is not a Liberal budget. It is a protectionist budget with a strong Maritime province flavour.

Mr. DUFF: Not strong enough for me.

Mr. McMASTER: When I say "Maritime flavour" I mean that it proposes the unwise provision that goods which in the natural course of events would come by sea-carriage, which is much cheaper than land-carriage, to Portland, Maine, and thence over our own railway to Montreal, a distance of less than 300 miles, shall be discharged at Halifax and come by land carriage, a much more expensive way of transportation, over 841 miles. That is what I refer to. If it were the mentality of the Nova Scotians that I was thinking of, then gladly would I say that it was not only tinctured but saturated with a Maritime flavour. I am just wondering whether this is a party budget at all; I am wondering whether it is a budget brought forward by a party. What is a party? A party is a group of men who have decided to advance the public interest along certain lines which they hold in common. I have studied the budget carefully but for the life of me I cannot see the common principle that animates it. I never was a good man at physics, but if I remember one principle of physics it is that any body of matter, operated on by equal powers of attraction in diametrically opposite directions, just about stays where it is. And that is true of this budget. Let us examine it. Before I deal with the budget, however, permit me to speak for a moment concerning the resolution, which I am going to vote for, and in respect of which I shall make some remarks of a somewhat critical nature. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), with the legal acumen which is the distinguishing characteristic of the profession he adorns, has already pointed out a clause which I had noticed as one liable to give considerable embarrassment in the future. After saying that while recognizing that changes in fiscal policy should be made in such a way as

to give industries affected a reasonable opportunity for readjustment, it goes on to say:

> This House is of the opinion that the principle of protection as a basis for fiscal policy in Canada is unsound, and that every claim for protection should be heard publicly before a special committee of parliament.

I do not like that. There is an undesirable inference to be drawn from it which I do not think was in the minds of those who drafted the resolution; I am sure it was not. If a protectionist manufacturer were represented by a lawyer as able as the senior member for Halifax, then that inference is undoubtedly the one that he would draw from that clause of the resolution. I wish it to be distinctly understood that when voting for the resolution I do not bind myself to give any consideration to claims for protection. I think we have got far too much protection, and I want to get rid of protection, not add to it, no matter how many public inquiries are held.

I am not at all sure that it was wise to have drafted the clause in the way in which it is drafted in which reference is made to reciprocity in trade with the United States as outlined in the proposed Reciprocity agreement of 1911. I am quite in favour of reciprocity, and I would have the Reciprocity agreement of 1911 if we could not get a better one. But that clause of the resolution looks as though it merely depended upon us whether reciprocity would go into effect or not. I think it would have been better to say that every effort should be made to obta'n such a reciprocity agreement.

I do not know that all the methods for raising the revenue, if such a resolution as this were adopted, have been explored. I think we should carefully consider the possibilities of a tax on unearned increment of land. We should carefully consider whether there should not be a federal succession duty tax on very large estates. These however are questions of detail, and the principle of the resolution is one which I can enthusiastically approve. It denounces protection and gives a reasonable opportunity for readjustment; it looks to what I believe is the only way in this country in which we can get out of our political and economic difficulties. We have been trying for fifty years to make ourselves wealthy by restriction; it is about time that we changed the plan and freed the energies of the people in order that they might be enabled to secure that wealth which the natural resources of the country, and their own enterprise and intelligence, should place within their grasp. As regards the proposals for reciprocity, I approve of them, but I do not know that they are necessary. Section 8B of the minister's resolutions provides:

> The Governor in Council may authorize any minister of the Crown to enter into negotiations with any authorized representative of the government of the United States with a view to the making of a commercial agreement between the two countries on terms that may be deemed mutually beneficial. Any agreement so made shall be subject to the approval of the parliament of Canada.

I have just one or two observations to make upon this resolution. I am in hearty sympathy with the idea, but I wonder whether it is necessary to have it declared that it is within the power of the Governor in Council to authorize any minister to negotiate a reciprocity arrangement or treaty. Surely it is always within the powers of the government to delegate one of its members for such a purpose. I note that this arrangement would be subject to the approval of the parliament of Canada. I would like to say this: If the protectionist mind continues to be developed as is likely by the present budget, what is there to prevent a repetition of what happened in 1911, when we got the Reciprocity agreement from the United States and found that the Canadian people had forgotten what was good for them and voted it down?

It is quite true that we have had offers of this sort before. If I mistake not, Macdonald put an offer of this sort upon the statute books of Canada, and it remained there until it was withdrawn in about 1898. Then, strange to say, the Americans in 1911 passed legisiation, which remained in force for about ten years, in fact until a few months ago, in which they made an offer to us. Unfortunately the wills of the parties never met, as we lawyers say. What was required was a national broker to bring the parties together. And what we require in Washington to-day is an ambassador to represent Canadian interests there all the time, to drop the word in due season as to the advisability of close commercial relationship between the two great nations which occupy such a large part of the North American continent.

Now, we have had some sort of reciprocity with the United States, as the right hon. leader of the Opposition said in his remarks this afternoon. But while we are offering reciprocity, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is reciprocity in certain lines now within our grasp. Boots and shoes and leather go free into the United States. Why therefore should they not come free into Canada? In connection with this matter the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), whose remarks I always listen to with the greatest of pleasure and attention, said there were manu-

facturers in his riding who were prepared to have reciprocal trade relations with the United States if we could guarantee them permanence. I may say parenthetically that I visited his home town some months ago and I never was in a more beautiful town of its size, surrounded by fields so well cultivated that they gladdened the heart, and with every indication of hard work, thrift and brains among its people. Well, if it was possible for those manufacturers to open up lines of business with a few customers who might drop off in three or four years I wonder whether they would say, "We do not think we will bother going after their business; it lacks permanence." Would they say that? I do not think they would. And let me contrast their attitude—which I have no doubt is correctly described by their distinguished representative—with the attitude of the stock-raisers of the West who had a cargo of stockers landed on the dock at Bristol, I think it was, almost as soon as the British cattle embargo was lifted. Why was it, Mr. Speaker, that this provision of the American tariff allowing boots and shoes and leather to enter the United States free has been on their statute books since the 3rd October, 1913, if I mistake not, without its being availed of to any great extent by our manufacturers, while the cattle embargo was not off a day before a cargo of stockers was landed at Bristol? What is the difference? Were these stockraisers better business men than the manufacturers of North Waterloo? No, I do not believe so. But they were driven on by the urge of economic necessity to avail themselves of the very first chance to get into another market. They had no home market which would under ordinary circumstances absorb their product, and therefore as gallant adventurers and capable business men they had to look abroad in order to find customers.

The same thing affects agricultural implements; these can go free into the United States. Then there is in the American tariff provision whereby certain materials, for which at the present time there is a tremendous demand in the United States, may enter the American market free or at such rates of duty as will be imposed on similar goods coming into Canada from the United States. I refer to building brick, calcium carbide and its by-products, and cement. Now, there is no question about the building boom in the United States. I notice in the papers that bricklayers in that country are not satisfied with twelve dollars a day; they have struck for more. Why should not our brick and cement manufacturers who are situated in positions where they can readily ship their products into the United States market take advantage of their opportunities? The movement of brick and cement is largely controlled by the freight rate, and where the Canadian manufacturers of these commodities can have them carried by water, or where they can have the advantage of a cheap freight rate, surely it should be the business of government to let them get the advantage of trading across the line.

Now, let me deal for a short time with the budget itself. I would hate to be unfair. The government deserves great credit for reducing the duty on both raw and refined sugar. That reduction should be of some advantage to the Canadian consumers of sugar. But the budget reminds me of the vicissitudes of human life—there are so many ups and downs in it. Hemp for agricultural purposes goes on the free list; licorice paste not sweetened goes down to 10 per cent, 15 per cent and 17½ per cent, as against 15 per cent, 20 per cent and 20 per cent under the old tariff. Raisins and dried currants go up in the scale, and so do potatoes.

Now, although I live in Montreal I represent an Eastern Townships riding. There one of the national dishes is raisin pie, and why the wives of the farmers whom I represent should be obliged to pay more for the raisins that go into their pies in order that Australian raisins may come from—I do not know how many thousand miles, but I suppose at least six thousand; it took the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) a considerable time to go there and come back—why raisins that come from California should be excluded by a tariff which has been increased by about 300 per cent in order that raisins from the other side of the world may be brought in is, I suppose, part of that mania for interfering with the free play of commerce, which I expect will be sweetened and blessed by the slogan of "Imperial Solidarity" or something of that sort.

I do not need to talk about the duties on artificial silk. Artificial silk has become a protected article, on the old protectionist theory that every process through which material goes should add something to the duties. I am not going to read all the different processes and all the different rates of duty; the duty starts at one end at 10 per cent and ends at the other at 37½ per cent. I will not delay the House long with any remarks on the bounty on hemp or remarks on the bounty on copper: I am of the opinion that every rope should hang by its own

strength and that every copper tub, as well as every other tub, should stand on its own bottom.

Why am I opposed to this budget? Because as far as I can see any governing principle in it, it is the principle of protection. I could not quite see the force of all the bitterness in the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) this afternoon. He should be rather pleased; this administration has come to agree to his fiscal views—there does not seem to be much difference between them on this budget. That is a matter, I should think, for congratulation, if the right hon. gentleman is really sincere in his protectionist views. But I sometimes wonder when I listen to his splendid eloquence and observe the operation of his analytic mind, whether he really is protectionist; it would seem strange if he were.

What is the problem that faces the Canadian people to-day? Half our people live on the land; a great deal more than half the people, probably three-quarters of them, either live on the land or directly depend upon those who do. And what is the situation in regard to our farmers? Of course, they can improve their methods. I understand the view of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is that if only we could all go in for mixed farming, all would be well. I am quite willing to admit that farmers could improve their methods, that they may be able to get better prices for their products without getting more from the consumer, by following out proper methods of co-operative selling. And perhaps if the rings and combines will allow them—and there are such, although the right hon. leader of the Opposition scoffs at the idea—they may get some things cheaper through co-operative buying. But that will not affect to any very great extent this great difficulty: that the farmer sells his products at prices which are somewhat under wholesale prices, and has to buy the commodities which he needs in retail quantities at prices enhanced by a protective tariff in many cases and by the rings and the selling agreements which exist, to a greater extent than they otherwise would, under the tariff. That is the great problem of the farmer. I do not propose to enter into any long disquisition about the theory of free trade and protection, for I would weary you; you have listened to long speeches and interesting speeches to-day. I am opposed to the principle of protection. I do not propose to wipe it all out over night; I do not propose to do anything extreme, but I propose, if I possibly can through my feeble efforts, to get action. I am opposed to the principle of protection because it has proved itself in this country a most dismal failure. I do not think anybody will deny that we have an honest, a thrifty, a hard-working people. We have good men and good women in Canada. We have good soil, second to none for certain purposes. We have certain disadvantages: we are spread too sparsely over the country. We have a hard winter, but not an unhealthy one. But we have not kept our natural increase, and we have not kept the immigration which we have brought in at great expense during the last thirty years. That is the situation; that is the proof of the failure of this policy.

Then, the policy is anti-national. It was called the National Policy; it is not a national policy; it is a policy which makes the trade question and the taxation question of this country nothing more than a local issue. The eloquent member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) last year stated with interesting frankness that if he lived on the prairies he would no doubt be a free trader, but as he lived in British Columbia he was a protectionist. It is not only anti-national, but it is anti-social, it gives certain people a direct interest in the incidence of taxation and makes it profitable for some people that a high debt should be maintained in this country in order that there may be a high rate of taxation. It is anti-national in that sense. The consequence is that whenever a trade question is under discussion in this House we have hon. members presenting, not a national view, but a sectional view; it is hardly possible for them to do otherwise. It makes of this House directly an antithesis of what Edmund Burke said parliament should be. May I, Mr. Speaker, quote his words:

> Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation with one interest, that of the whole, where, not local purposes—

It will be recalled that an hon. member of this House, speaking the other night on the copper bounty, did not attempt to express what he thought was the national interest; he expressed rather the view of his constituents. Let him as well as others listen to these words:

> —where not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member, indeed, but when you have chosen him, he is not member of Bristol but he is a member of parliament. If the local constituent should have an interest, or should form a hasty opinion, evidently opposed to

the real good of the rest of the community, the member for that place ought to be as far, as any other, from any endeavour to give it effect.

But there is a deeper reason, Mr. Speaker, why I should oppose this budget, a reason deeper than any economic reason. I cannot regard this budget as anything else but a distinct repudiation of the representations made by the Liberal party at and since the convention of 1919, and, indeed, a falling away from the true historic principles of the Liberal party. I do not pretend that our practice has always been consistent with our profession, but I do say that as between the two great political parties of this country, the Conservative party stood for the principle of protection and the Liberal party stood for the principle of free trade, or, if not free trade, low tariff. If any one tries to represent the Liberal party as a protectionist party he is endeavouring, I think, not to justly interpret the history of this country.

Now, what was the Liberal party platform? The distinguished member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) says that those who gathered at the Liberal convention were very foolish because we laid down this platform. The member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) says that he does not think that the Liberal party should be shackled or fettered by any pronouncement on the trade question made at that convention. The member for Halifax was not at the convention, but I believe the member for North Waterloo was, and if he disagreed with the idea of laying down a platform which was one of the avowed objects of the convention, I ask him, in all sincerity and with all courtesy as one old friend to another, why he came? The Liberal platform was laid down at the Liberal convention which met in the early days of August, 1919. One reason why the Liberals called a convention in 1919 was this—and here I beg to remark that they are the only one of the two great parties which so far have held national conventions. Others have held provincial conventions, but of the great parties in the country the Liberals only have held a national convention. We held a national convention because the Liberal party had been rent in twain by the conscription issue. We wanted to all get together to draw up a policy we could all subscribe to. In general terms—I am no doctrinaire who believes in being shackled to the crossing of every T and the dotting of every I in a pronouncement of this sort—that it should be a chart and a compass, and that chart and compass should be kept in use. That is the claim I make. We gathered together from all over Canada to name our leader and to lay down our platform. I do not think it was a foolish proceeding. May I note this: That in 1893 we did the same thing. We had a convention and laid down a platform, and we won the election of 1896 and went back into power after being out of office for eighteen years. In 1919 we laid down our platform, elected our leader and went back into power in 1921. The Liberal platform read as follows:—and I am not ashamed of this platform.

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

Mr. McMASTER: It was not drawn up by myself alone; it was decided upon by others as well as myself. As it was drawn first of all in a private meeting I have no right and I will not attempt to say whose hand wrote it. I was called from the General Resolutions Committee, of which I was chairman at the convention, to defend this platform from the stand on which the speakers stood. I spoke on that occasion against the Premier of British Columbia who, for some reason or another, was against, not the spirit of the platform, but certain provisions therein. A distinguished lady from Hamilton spoke against it, and a very dear friend of mine from Montreal did the same thing. Well, I spoke, it was put to a vote, and was carried by about nine votes to one as far as I could see. There was no question as to the unanimity, the substantial unanimity, of the delegates gathered there, that it was the proper platform for us to lay down. How does it read? I am sorry the right hon. leader of the Opposition is not in his seat to-night. This has not got a brown cover but it is the same platform and he would have the pleasure of hearing it read in a certainly distinct and audible voice. It reads as follows:

That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplshing of two purposes of the highest importance; First, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat the principal articles of food, farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof, rough and partly dressed lumber, gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments, cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.

And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provisions of this resolution when returned to power.

I am reminded that when free trade was placed upon the statute books of the Old Country in 1846 there had been for years before deficits in the budget, and widespread unemployment and distress among the people. We are told that we cannot have reductions of tariff because times are not good. That is one reason that is given to us why we cannot have relief. No doubt that same argument was used against the efforts of Cobden and Bright, but what happened in Great Britain was this: They took their courage in their two hands for they wiped off the duties on food stuffs —they had in the earlier years removed most of the duties on manufactured articles—and prosperity returned. And I say that in Canada prosperity will return with liberty given to people to carry on their business in the way they think best and given the right to interchange what they produce more freely for what they need.

Now, the Finance Minister has suggested that he does not regard himself as bound by this programme. I do not pretend that a responsible minister is bound to take a programme of this sort and to implement it into legislation in identically the manner in which the programme sets matters forth. I hope I am no mere doctrinaire, but what I do say is, that it is the bounden duty of public men who would consider themselves bound by such a programme to put its main features substantially into effect. The Finance Minister says he is not bound by this programme. Well, I will not permit myself the freedom of language which the hon. leader of the Opposition permitted himself this afternoon. I am a very much younger man than the Finance Minister. I have been associated with him for a great many years, he as a leader of a party with myself as a humble follower, but I say this: That he attended the convention, that he was appointed to—although I do not remember whether he attended or not—the General Resolutions Committee of the convention, and—what is perhaps the most important of all—that after we had passed this resolution by an overwhelming majority he accepted nomination as the leader of the Liberal party the day after. I do not suggest for one instant that he, by that act, undertook to carry out to the letter this programme; but I say that his acceptance of nomination as a possible leader of the party could be reasonably interpreted as an acceptance in its general outline and general principle of the resolution which had been passed. But I think I can convince this House by further evidence that the Finance Minister is bound substantially to carry out the programme laid down by the convention. Speaking in the House of Commons on the 18th May, 1920, page 2510 of third volume of Hansard, the present Minister of Finance concluded his remarks with these words:

I therefore conclude my remarks by moving, seconded by Mr. King:

That all the words after "that" to the end of the question be omitted, and the following inserted therefor:

"The Minister of Finance in the budget speech, in the session of 1919, gave assurance to the House that during the ensuing parliamentary recess there would be a public inquiry by the minister and one or more of his colleagues into the operation of the customs tariff, with a view to a general revision of the tariff at the following session."

I have by the courtesy of the Finance Minister copies of the evidence that was taken by that commission in my office at the present moment. If the typewritten pages were placed one on top of another they would reach to about my chest. But apparently nothing further was done in that connection. The quotation continues:

That the promised public inquiry has not taken place, and the expected proposals for tariff revision at this session have not been submitted to the House.

That in view of the continued increase in the high cost of living, of the greatly increased burden of taxation, of the hardship which many of the people suffer from these causes, and the unrest naturally arising therefrom; and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to increase production and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of parliament, the House is of opinion that, pending a wider revision of the tariff, substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance; first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country."

That was followed the next year, on the 10th May, 1921, by another statement. The same hon. gentleman, as reported in Hansard in the session of 1921, concluded his remarks to be found in Volume IV, page 3155, of Hansard, as follows:

"That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question, be omitted, and the following inserted instead thereof:

The House regrets that, after repeated assurances by the government of an intention to have a revision of the Customs tariff, and after a protracted inquiry extending from ocean to ocean by a committee of cabinet ministers, the government have made no proposals for any reduction of the tariff;

That, while recognizing that existing financial requirements of the Dominion demand the maintenance of a customs tariff, the House is unable to concur in the declarations by the government that the tariff should be based on the principle of protection; the tariff is a tax, and the aim of legislation should be to make taxation as light as circumstances will permit;

That the aim of the fiscal policy of Canada should be the encouragement of industries based on the natural resources of the country, the development of which may reasonably be expected to create healthy enterprises, giving promise of enduring success;

That such changes should be made in the Customs duties as may be expected to reduce the cost of living, and to reduce also the cost of implements of production required for the efficient development of the natural resources of the Dominion;

That, while keeping this aim clearly in mind, the House recognizes that in any readjustment of the tariff that may take place, regard must be had to existing conditions of trade, and changes made in such a manner as will cause the least possible disturbance of business."

Without anger or discourtesy, but in all seriousness, I state that the present budget proposals, based in many instances on the principle of protection, are a repudiation of the words of the Finance Minister in 1920 and 1921. I say that it may be possible for public men to obtain office by laying certain programmes before the people, and it may be possible after they get into office to depart from those programmes and still remain in office, but I say that it is wrong. I submit the harm done to the country is not merely the economic harm that flows from the adoption of a false economic theory, but the harm that results to the public life of the country. The world is in an unsettled state to-day. Men are questioning the value of institutions which have come down to them from the past. I am a Liberal, but, like Gladstone in the days gone by, I am anxious to preserve what is of value in our present social structure, and parliamentary institutions are one of the most precious institutions we have. But we can only have parliamentary institutions if we have representation, and representation becomes a farce if men do not advocate and endeavour to bring into force in power what they advocated while they were in opposition. It may be asked why I take upon myself the unpleasant task of dealing with this situation as I am dealing with it to-night. Well, one reason is that there does not seem to be anybody on this side of the House at least anxious to assume the job, and, therefore, it falls to my lot to do it. But, perhaps, I have a certain right, perhaps a greater right, and therefor a greater obligation, than many of my fellow members. When I came into the House in 1918, we met in March of that year, shortly after the House convened I had the great honour—an honour that I will cherish all the days of my life—of being chosen by my leader, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as financial critic of the opposition. I considered it a high honour. I was a new member of the House. I had never belonged to a local legislature. I had not even belonged to a town or municipal council. I did what I could to criticize. The first budget I had to criticize was one presented by the senior member for Halifax and the next was one presented by Sir Thomas White, then Minister of Finance. I frankly admit that the low tariff view was not under-emphasized in any remarks which the member for Brome addressed to the House and to the country. But I say that the resolutions which I moved—and I moved two resolutions one going into supply, asking for reductions in the tariff, and one on the budget in 1919, in the same strain—were supported, not by all the members of the party, but by practically the whole of the Liberal deputation at the time, and, therefore, it seems to me that I have a certain right to protest against what I believe is a repudiation and a reversal of the Liberal policy upon the trade question. Then, when the country was being prepared for the great victory of 1921, I played a very modest part in that preparation. I had the honour to accompany the Prime Minister into western Ontario in 1920 and to the "Garden of the Gulf in 1921," and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, in the "Garden of the Gulf," in that beautiful Prince Edward Island, I gave them the pure milk of the Cobdenite word. The people of that province, few in number, but I think, inferior to none in intelligence and patriotism, heard that gospel very gladly, and we found that at the next election there were elected from that province four members as Liberals to support a Liberal government. I believe they thought that the Liberal government, when returned to power, intended to make substantial reductions in the tariff. I am far from considering myself a Samson; but I do not propose to grind corn in the mills of the Philistines, nor do I propose to be dragged at the chariot wheels of the triumphant protectionists.

Just another word, and I have done. There are those in this House who may say: "You were elected as a Liberal to support a Liberal administration; you have no right to act against them; you have no right to vote against them; you have no right to speak against them; you have no right to take another seat in the chamber without consulting your electors."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: I hear some people saying, "hear, hear" to that statement. Let me read to those who say "hear, hear" the words of that great English Whig statesman, Edmund Burke, who possibly laid down as correctly as was ever laid down, the relationship which should exist between member and constituents. Edmund Burke said, in addressing his electors at Bristol:

> Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents.

I break off my quotation to state to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my fellow members, that I have followed that plan. Since I have been a member of this House, every session I have gone back to my people and held meetings with them. After one session I had one meeting when I had the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) with me, and we had such a large meeting on that occasion that I did not think it necessary to hold another during that recess. But after each session I have held meetings, from that one meeting to other times when I have held as many as thirteen in a small riding, the smallest riding in Quebec. I maintained a close co-operation and correspondence with my electorate, and anything I did in this House I reported to them. I think, on the whole, I generally obtained, without any formal resolution or anything of that sort, their approval of what I had done. I may say that in this case I had no time to go and consult my electorate to any extent, even though the obligation had been upon me. I saw the chairman of the organization in my riding; and while I had not time to talk to a number of my electorate, I talked with a few of them. Though they may regret that I find it incumbent upon me to take a seat which will be an outward and visible sign that I am not in sympathy with the administration on their budget, on the whole I believe they are willing that I should do as my mind and my conscience dictate I should do. Edmund Burke continued:

> Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own. But, his unbiassed opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you; to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representive owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion...

[Mr. McMaster.]

> To deliver an opinion is the right of all men; that of constituents is a weighty and respectable opinion, which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear; and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But authoritative instructions; mandates issued, which the member is bound blindly and implicity to obey, to vote, and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience,—these are things utterly unknown to the laws of this land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution.

It is on that ground that I take my stand. I do not propose to push a doctrine, no matter how sound, to extremes. An occasion will present itself very shortly in my riding, where I can place my whole case before my electors. If they approve what I have done, then will I gladly continue to serve them. But if they do not approve what I have done, if they wish to have in this House a Liberal who thinks more of the label on the bottle than what is in it, who will sacrifice his opinion arrived at after careful consideration and in the light of his conscience, to the desire of the whips, then I will resign my seat and allow them to elect such a one if they so desire. Then, somewhat disappointed, but neither downhearted nor disconsolate, I can go back and devote to my clients, my office and my law books some part of the energy which I have, as far as in me has lain, devoted to what I considered to be the interests of my country. I have enjoyed public service in this House and out of it; but I enjoy public service only on terms which, I believe, are consonant with the dignity of a public man, and I do not believe a public man helps himself, or his party, or his country by voting in a manner in which he does not believe. I repeat, I am not leaving the Liberal party; but I am refusing to support the present administration in a budget which I do not believe to be a Liberal budget. I take my seat in the corner of the chamber. I join no other party. There, when liberal legislation is brought before this House, I will support it by my vote and, if necessary, by my voice; but I shall be in a position, if legislation which I do not think is liberal, is brought before the House, to criticize it with a greater freedom, though I trust with no lack of courtesy, than I possess when I sit amongst those who are responsible more or less for the legislation.

In closing, let me quote again that great English statesman Edmund Burke. I say it in all humility, but I believe it to be true:

> My principles enable me to form my judgment upon men and actions. . . . . The principles of true politics are those of morality enlarged; and I neither now do, nor ever will admit of any other.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, before I begin to

discuss the budget I desire to join with those hon. members who have preceded me in congratulating the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon having completed his seventeenth financial statement. I will go even further and say that the minister deserves to be described as a faithful public servant. It is quite true that in his budget speech he did not perhaps include certain matters which some of his supporters would like to see taken into consideration, but it is possible that the minister may consider them when his proposals are being discussed in detail. I had not the pleasure this afternoon of listening to the whole of the speech of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), but that part of it which I did hear impressed me as being full of ability, although I fear it lacked any generosity whatever towards the government of the day. Possibly that is not the part of the leader of the Opposition, nor indeed of the party which he leads; I do not suppose it is to be expected that they should show any generosity of feeling towards this government. I was therefore in a measure surprised when my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) in the course of his remarks, exhibited the great magnanimity which he did on that occasion. He said in discussing the budget that he had no amendment to offer but would leave the Progressives to put forward one on this occasion. Why did he make that observation? I wondered whether a ray of light had come into the old Tory party, or whether this was a piece of generous behaviour. I do not think it was generosity, in the least degree. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for West York seemed to me to feel great regret that he could not criticize the budget more severely than he did, so that his not moving any amendment was due to no generous impulse on his part. Our friends the Progressive party have taken a very decided view of the budget; they are very firm in their attitude towards it. They say that the policy of the present administration is in no regard distinguishable from that of its predecessors, and by way of rider to this, they say that the system of protection is wrong in theory and in fact. They go on to say that the tariff should be lowered, tending, of course, towards free trade, or failing that, a tariff as near free trade as it can be, until free trade can be secured in this country.

I think that anyone would admit that this is about the most difficult country in the world to govern. We have a very small population sparsely spread over a tremendous area, a ribbon of land stretching from ocean to ocean. There are certain ideas in the Maritime provinces, other ideas in Ontario and Quebec, then going over that great bridge of stone into the prairies we find entirely new ideas, and so on over the mountains to British Columbia. I do not wonder that my Progressive friends opposite should have certain views of their own in regard to questions of the tariff. I do not blame them in the least. But my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke) in his speech, which I thought was a very able one and which was full of sincerity, as the hon. member's speeches always are, made a remark which appealed to me very much; he said that the West, the manufacturers in the East, should try to get together. Well, that is precisely the policy which I think we should endeavour to bring about in Canada. It is absolutely impossible in a country of this character for the people to live apart; it is impossible to have one principle in the West and another in the East. After all, why should it be impossible to strike some common ground? What reason is there why the farmers of the prairies should not trust the East as the East trusts them? They say, "We cannot agree to that because the men of the East are manufacturers and they therefore want a tariff." They do want a tariff, it is quite true. But, on the other hand, do not the people of the West want certain policies as well? Surely it would be possible in due course of time for the parties to get together and arrive at one common policy which would be good for the whole of Canada. Why should one policy be advocated for one part of the country and another for some other part? How is it going to be possible for Canada to proceed under such circumstances? How would it be possible for any business in this country, whether farming or manufacturing, to prosper if we are divided as regards the desires of the country as a whole? Obviously it is quite impossible.

My friends of the Progressive party tell us that times are very hard in the West and that they are finding it very difficult to get along. That is quite true. But in reply to that it can be very truthfully said that not every business in the East is prosperous; the business men of the East are experiencing their own difficulties also. An hon. member stated in his speech that the farms are not paying, but he admitted, I believe, that certain returns showed that in the case of each of 240 farmers there was a surplus of some $600. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there are many inhabitants of the province of Quebec from which I come who can barely make a living, to say nothing at all of $600 to boot

The difficulties are not alone on the prairies; they are not alone in the West. Difficulties are common throughout Canada to-day; but my good friends the Progressives will not consider this fact at all. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to consider the great fundamental difficulties that exist throughout the country at this time. They say they want certain policies put into effect; they want certain economic facts realized. Well, I know, and we all know very well that they do. What are those facts to which I refer? They say that one thing they want is lower freight rates. Of course the West needs lower freight rates; but the East needs lower freight rates too. But how can we have lower freight rates at this time, if at the same time we are to pay any operating charges at all on the railways? If we increase the deficits of the National Railways it simply means that they must be made up in taxation in some other form. The next thing, they say, which bears heavily upon them is the loss of the purchasing power of the dollar. That also is perfectly true; I know full well that the prices of farm products have been deflated while a great many other commodities have been inflated. But is that the fault of the government? Can this government remedy the condition quickly? They certainly cannot.

They also ask for rural credits. Well, I am certainly very much disposed to give the West rural credits if this is feasible. But, after all, is not this a subject for provincial action? Unfortunately our western friends do not take these factors into consideration. We in the East would like to see the economic evils under which the people of the West are suffering remedied where possible, but they cannot be remedied in a day—in fact some of them are beyond the power of governments to remedy. That being the case, what do my hon. friends, the Progressives, do? They bring in an amendment to the budget condemning the government because it does not introduce lower tariffs.

Now, I should like to address myself particularly to my hon. friends of the Progressive party. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) gave us in great detail his ideas of free trade. He said it is a splendid theory. I agree with him, but so far as I can see it is a theory and nothing more. He did not for a moment suggest, neither did a single speaker among my friends opposite suggest, how the revenue loss from reduced tariff duties can be made up. Our tariff to-day is not a high tariff; it is on an average 17½ per cent collected on imported goods. I do not call it a protectionist tariff; on the contrary, I have always termed it a development tariff. I believe that we need such a tariff to encourage our industries and permit of their fullest development. What would happen if we had not a tariff of that description? Our industries in the East could not survive, they would go out of existence. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke) says, "All right, if they cannot survive let them go out of existence." Well, that is what is staring us in the face in the East. There is not the slightest question of a doubt that if the tariff is lowered at once, or if it is to be lowered from time to time to any appreciable extent, our industries will simply have to cease.

But supposing these industries do close up, what will happen to the people employed in them? Will they not have to leave Canada to gain a livelihood elsewhere? Will there not be unprecedented unemployment and tremendous loss? And will not the number of people as a consequence who can be taxed be gradually diminished, and the burden of taxation become all the heavier for the rest of us to bear? These results are bound to happen.

But supposing, for example we did do away with our comparatively moderate tariff, how are we going to obtain our revenue? I have no doubt that the gentleman who drew this resolution sat down with pencil and paper and figured out very carefully how he was going to obtain his revenue, because I assume that if my hon. friends of the Progressive party succeed to office they will put this resolution into effect. I am positive that my hon. friend from Brandon will never go back on anything he says, and it follows that he and his party will implement their resolution whenever the opportunity presents itself. Well, have the hon. member and his friends sitting around him studied how they will get their revenue if their resolution is put into effect? I doubt if they have. I doubt very much if they have considered how the revenue of the country is to be maintained. What was secured from the tariff last year? I am speaking now of the tariff purely from the view of revenue. I am assuming that we have closed up our factories and created unemployment.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. gentleman has got past it, but it is only an assumption on his part that all the factories will be closed; he does not know for certain.

Mr. MARLER: I was waiting for an interruption from the hon. member because I want to ask him a question in reply. Does he or does he not admit that this country can stand free trade?

Mr. FORKE: While we stand for free trade in principle, I do not think the hon.

gentleman has heard any member of the Progressive party state that we are going to put free trade into effect immediately. Hon. gentlemen supporting the tariff always ask the question: How would you get your revenue without the tariff? Well, you could have a very much lower tariff to begin with and yet have a very much higher revenue. A protective tariff is not a revenue tariff. Twenty-two and a half per cent or twenty-five per cent straight protection does not produce very much revenue as a rule; consequently you may have a very much larger revenue with a very much lower tariff.

Mr. MARLER: I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for his reply. It is precisely what I wanted to get. My hon. friends the Progressives, then, do not believe in free trade.

Mr. FORKE: No, I did not say that.

Mr. MARLER: So far so good.

Mr. FORKE: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not say so. I believe free trade is the proper principle to be put into practice; but we are sensible people and realize existing conditions, and therefore we simply say: It is for the manufacturers to get prepared for free trade, and they should be given time to adjust their business accordingly. I have more faith in the Canadian people than the protectionists have. I believe our people have sufficient energy and ability to make their business successful without any protection whatever.

Mr. MARLER: Very well. Then when my hon. friend's party come into power they would serve notice on the manufacturers of Quebec and Ontario and the rest of the Dominion: We are going to lower the tariff year by year, and you must arrange your business accordingly. Am I correct in taking that to be the policy of the Progressive party?

Mr. FORKE: Broadly speaking.

Mr. MARLER: I am sorry to put these questions to my hon. friend, but I would not have him misunderstand me and I should not like to misunderstand him. I can assure my hon. friends opposite that I have the fullest sympathy and the very greatest admiration for the West. I say that with perfect sincerity. All I ask in so far as the East is concerned—and although I am not speaking to a very full House to-night I know full well that my words will be heard outside—is some reasonable tariff which will permit our industries to develop, and until our population is very much increased we cannot do with any lower tariff than we have now. Let me add that the East has every sympathy with the West and wishes it the fullest prosperity, and would welcome any reasonable policy on which both East and West can stand together. Later on, I shall speak—possibly with the approval of my hon. friend from Brandon—on a suggestion which I have to make to the government. But I can say in all sincerity that the present tariff, in so far as can be ascertained without investigation, is needed in order that we may retain our industries and ensure their development in harmony with the growth of the country. We cannot compare the industries in our little country of less than nine million people with the industries in the States which my hon. friends of the Progressive party are so fond of referring to for comparison. Do my hon. friends know that the mills in the province of Quebec have to run on very many lines of goods so that each product consequently costs much more to manufacture, whereas in the United States a single mill is run year and year out on one line of goods alone?

One hon. gentleman opposite some days ago compared the prices in the United States with the prices here. I know that the prices in the United States are lower than they are in Canada; they are bound to be. We cannot manufacture things at the prices at which they are manufactured in that country. Take down your tariff and you will close up your factories, drive all capital out of Canada, keep people away—that is what you are facing if you cut your tariff down too low. The hon. member for Brandon will say, "Oh, we are not going to do it all at once." Perhaps not; I would not accuse hon. gentlemen opposite of doing any rash thing; they are not that type of men. I believe they are all sincere and honest men, but they would serve notice on businesses that the tariff was coming down, and that would create an unsettled state of mind among those carrying on business in the province of Quebec, in the East generally with the result that those businesses could not progress.

Let me come back to the question of how we are to obtain the revenue. There was collected last year in tariff duties $133,000,000. I was going on to say when I digressed a few moments ago that I assumed whoever drafted this resolution, whoever is to be minister of finance when the Progressive party gets into power, carefully studied out how that $133,000,000 should be made up. It is suggested in this resolution that in order to provide for

revenue to take the place of the tariff, there should be an extension of the income tax which would bear more heavily on unearned incomes. Now I am quite positive—and I trust I do not overstate the case—when I say it is utterly and absolutely impossible to make up $133,000,000 in income tax at all. It is next to impossible to make up half that amount from income tax. I will tell you why, because I figured it out myself with the very greatest of care in order to see if I could read into this resolution any possibility of taxing what are commonly called unearned incomes. The term "unearned income" is used very loosely—sometimes to designate the accumulations which a man has gathered together after years of labour. I do not call that unearned income. I look upon unearned income as income derived from inheritance, and receipts of that description. I do not see any serious objection, as I stated in the House a few nights ago, to slightly increasing the tax on income which is accumulated but which is not being actively earned. I see no particular objection to a slight additional tax there, and I see no objection to a considerably heavier tax on inherited income, because that is not being earned as class A income is. The total income tax collected in 1922 was $40,000,000. The amount collected on incomes up to $20,000 was roughly, $20,000,000. Now, I know that whoever drew this resolution was not trying to get after the little fellows; he was trying to get after the big fellows, the men who had large incomes; he wanted to tax them more heavily in order to replace the loss occasioned by the change in respect to the tariff. Well, I have said that in respect of incomes of over $20,000 the amount paid by way of income tax was $20,000,000. If you wish to make up only half the $133,000,000, or $70,000,000, out of these larger incomes, you have to impose a tax three times as heavy as the present tax. Now, I have made a calculation in order to show hon. gentlemen opposite the fallacy of this resolution. So far as getting your revenue is concerned it is absolutely fallacious; you would go broke in one year if its suggestions were carried out. What would happen? Let us tax these larger incomes, starting with an income of $30,000. You would have to continue the present tax of 14 per cent and have in addition another tax of 42 per cent; in other words, you would tax that income 64 per cent in order to gain one-half the amount collected last year in customs duties. On an income of $50,000 you would have to place a tax of 80 per cent; on an income of $60,000, 82 per cent, and in the case of an income of $70,000, in order to get your revenue you would have to take it all—every cent the man had by way of income. That is how increasing the income tax would work out according to the most careful calculations that I have been able to make—and I may say that I am not unused to figuring out income taxes in many ways. I suggest to hon. members that that is a matter worthy of consideration.

The resolution goes on to suggest also an increase in excise duties. Well, the amount of excise duties collected in 1923 was $35,000,000. You have to make up your $133,000,000; in other words, you are going to reduce your tariff gradually until it gets to the vanishing point and you put into practice the free trade theories that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) propounded so ably to-night. I say that he pronounced the theories very well indeed, but he did not give you one single practical idea as to how free trade as applied to Canada would affect the people of this country or affect anybody else. In this resolution you pick on the poor old tariff, which has been made the football of politics from time immemorial. You say, "If the tariff is lowered, if the tariff is taken off, notwithstanding the fact that industries will be ruined, our lives will be saved." But what did one of your own members say the other night? He made a statement which to me was exceedingly significant. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Pritchard) said that the amount of taxes paid by every person in Canada owing to the tariff was $14.68, or, for a family of five, $73.40. Now, Mr. Speaker, is the West as badly off as all that? Are your difficulties worth only $73.40 to each family? There is the statement of your own member—are you going to ruin the businesses in Quebec and Ontario for this amount? That is what you will do by this resolution if it is carried, as the hon. member for Brandon assures me in due course of time it will be. That is what is going to happen.

However, let me leave the acrimonious part of this resolution. I do not think members of the Progressive party have seriously studied the effect of the proposed amendment. They did not sit down and study and figure out as to how that resolution could be given effect to, and they run the danger by leaving it on the pages of Hansard of having it quoted against them some time in the future just as the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) to-night—somewhat unkindly I thought—flung into the face of the government the resolutions which had been placed on Hansard by the Liberal party. My recommenda-

tion to hon gentlemen opposite is to withdraw that resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Do not flatter yourself.

Mr. MARLER: I am not flattering myself; I am trying to do you a distinct service.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): We will look after ourselves.

Mr. MARLER: Look after yourselves? I absolutely challenge my hon friend from Last Mountain to make up any budget on that resolution. I challenge him to do so. I would like to see him come before the House, and with pencil and paper figure out any budget that will make up for the custom revenue that will be lost under that resolution. The resolution as drawn is directly opposite to the interests of the Progressive party. They talk about the primary industries of the country. Here it is in black and white—the primary industries of the country. And they talk about the natural resources, those great natural resources we have all heard so much about. Why every man who has spoken in this House from time immemorial has informed us that we have the greatest natural resources of any country in the world, which I believe is true. But those natural resources, Mr. Speaker, are worthless until they are taken from the ground. The only way that can be done is by the employment of capital. Capital and people are the two essential things to this country. I think even the hon. member for Last Mountain will agree to that.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): You mentioned capital twice. I wonder if you are forgetting labour?

Mr. MARLER: I spoke of capital and people. Perhaps my hon. friend does not think that people will labour; I know many of them will not at the present time. But capital and people are what we want in this country now. Very well, you destroy the industries in the province of Quebec by lowering the tariff gradually, by not keeping those industries stable, by letting them gradually go down. If you do that how much capital do you think would come into Canada? You will not get a single dollar of the capital which is coming into this country at the present time. Place your income tax as proposed under this amendment and see how much it will help you in the way of securing capital. Why, Mr. Speaker, the income tax in this country should be reduced—there is no question about that at all. It is far too heavy a tax to put on the shoulders of the people. If it was reduced I venture to say you would find a far greater amount of capital flowing into Canada.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Where would you get your revenue?

Mr. MARLER: I would get the revenue from the development tariff of which I spoke. The system of indirect taxation which is in force at the present time is the fairest way of getting a revenue. It bears equally on most people, but the direct taxation which this amendment suggests be carried out involves too heavy a load.

Mr. SPENCER: Do you not agree that indirect taxation involves a heavy load?

Mr. MARLER: Taxation of all kinds is a heavy load. Let my hon. friends opposite understand it quite clearly I am in favour of lightening taxation of every possible form, but how can taxation be lightened at the present time with deficit after deficit in our annual budget? Indirect taxation is not pleasant, there is no question about that at all, but nevertheless there has to be taxation in order to obtain the money for running the country.

Now, I am going to depart from my Progressive friends and direct my remarks to the government itself. With a great many things my hon. friend for Brandon (Mr. Forke) has said in his speech I am in accord. I think he sized up many a situation which is well worth the most serious consideration of the government at the present time. He spoke, for example, about the question of economy. Mr. Speaker, I might be quite wrong but I think we are spending far too much money in this country. That, I think, is an undoubted fact. The hon. member also spoke about the cost of civil government. In my opinion he was absolutely right in his remarks in that respect. Civil government in this country is costing an outstanding, a ridiculous amount, a sum that it never should cost a little nation like ourselves. Civil government never should cost us what it costs us in Canada. Some of the figures I am about to read were taken from the speech of the hon. member for Brandon but they have been supplemented by figures of my own. In 1912 we had a population of 7,300,000, we had 8,371 employees, and the Civil Service cost $7,805,373. In 1922, ten years later, we had a population of 8,788,000, we had 11,878 employees, and the Civil Service cost $19,271,985. So that in these ten years, although our population only increased 1,488,000, the number of employees increased 3,507 and the cost increased $12,466,612. I say

that expenditure for civil government in a little country like this is next to absurd, and there should be a thorough inquiry as to whether or not civil government in Canada cannot be carried on at a very much less figure. Any business would go out of existence with a lack of economy of that description.

There is another matter I intend to speak about and I apologize for keeping hon. members at this late hour. It is that we should only spend in this country what we have to spend, and cease piling up deficits year after year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARLER: Of late years we have had a deficit each year. In 1921, $92,000,000; in 1922, $81,000,000; in 1923, $50,000,000, and possibly next year we will witness another deficit. I am not criticizing the Minister of Finance; I am not even criticizing my genial friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) as regards his administration; I am criticizing every member of the House of Commons.

An hon. MEMBER: You are wrong.

Mr. MARLER: I do not think the people of the country will say I am wrong. They will say that this government, and any government is wrong unless we have greater economy and make our budget meet. We have got to do that. We have got to cease spending money, and the only way we shall ever be able to lighten taxation, lighten the load which is at present on the backs of the Canadian people, is to cut down our expenditure and only spend what we have got to spend.

In addition to that I have this to say: We have two classes of taxes in this country at the present time. We have our war taxes and our ordinary taxes. Our war taxes should be devoted to meeting war expenditure entirely. We have got to pay for the war and the people will cheerfully pay the taxes that are needed for that purpose. But the ordinary taxes that are levied should meet the ordinary expenditure, and the country should be run within the limits of that taxation.

Now, Sir, I pass on to another subject and I shall not detain the House very much longer. In the budget speech there was a declaration by the Minister of Finance of tariff stability. That declaration has been read in a variety of ways. I, myself, thought well of that declaration. I thought well of the intent of the minister in telling that to the manufacturers and the various other interests in the country in order that business might be stable. I thought well of that declaration at the time, and I think well of it yet, because it means stability, and we do need stability without a question of doubt. But the question of tariff stability does not mean that there shall never be tariff revision in this country. We must have tariff revision in Canada. The country does not stand still. It is in the interests of the consumer and in the interests of the producer that the tariff shall be revised from time to time. Now I am going to deal once more with the word "protection" which is in this resolution which is before us. It says:

> That any claim for protection should be heard publicly before a special committee of parliament.

I do not want to cast any suspicion on the committees. I do not want to deprive the members of any committee of this House of any knowledge or intelligence they should have, but I say a committee of parliament would be just about as well equipped to pass on the question of making up the tariff as it would be on the question of making up railway rates. The question of making up the tariff is one of the most complicated matters which is ever brought before parliament, and has to be dealt with by the Finance Minister. How has the tariff been made up in the past? It has been made up by a committee of ministers from the cabinet going all over the country and getting information on various questions. They no doubt did their work well. I think my hon. friend from West York headed the last commission. He no doubt did his work well. He always does his work well, the only work he does not do well is criticizing this budget, and the reason he could not criticize the budget was because he agreed almost entirely with it, and it nearly broke his heart to have to criticize it at all. That is the reason he did not do it well. I am quite certain that in the revision of the tariff he did his work very well indeed. How can even a committee of the cabinet make up a tariff?

What we need is an advisory tariff commission, which will be a permanent body, which will look into the question of the tariff, collate the necessary information and bring it forward to the Minister of Finance. I do not say that the tariff can be taken out of politics entirely. I know that it cannot be taken out of politics altogether. I am fully aware of that fact. I know that when the tariff is made up by the advisory commission of which I speak the government of the day must have the last say as to whether or not a certain tariff shall be raised or a certain tariff shall be lowered, but I do say a body of experts can bring before the government the information which is necessary for them to make a

fair and equitable tariff and although hon. members opposite may not agree with me on the question of whether we should have what I call a development tariff or not, although they are unalterably opposed to the principle of protection, they at least would know whether the manufacturer who came forward was not getting an unreasonable protection, but that he was getting a fair protection, consistent with other interests.

Why? What has to be considered in the tariff? There is not only the question of the original cost of goods and the question of transportation, but the great question of distribution. The expense of distribution, I believe, from the manufacturer to the producer is far too much at the present time. There is a tremendous spread between what the manufacturer gets for his products and what you hon. members from the West have to pay for yours. There is no question about that. I have gone into that point time and time again with the manufacturers of Montreal. In 1912 the question of an advisory tariff commission was brought before the House of Commons; it went through the House but was defeated in the Senate. I do not think I am sufficiently narrow-minded not to accept from the Conservative party, or from the Progressive party, whatever policy is for the good of the country, because that is what we are all working for and the country is in too serious a position to put party before country. I will say on the floor of the House now that I will take advice from any party which will bring forward what is a fair and proper proposal. Therefore, recognizing the necessity of tariff revision, and speaking on the necessity of a tariff advisory commission to-night, I am glad to have the benefit of the advice which was brought before the House at the time to which I refer. The Conservatives brought this matter up in 1912, but if some hon. members on this side of the House have any objection to take advice from the Conservative party, let me say that the tariff has changed very much since 1912. In those days there was $73,000,000 collected from the tariff and now $133,000,000 is collected. Since 1912 we have had a great war and tremendous taxes have been put on our shoulders. Since 1912 we have had the pleasure of seeing that dilapidated annex of the Liberal party, namely the Progressive party, expand to the number of sixty-five. Well, sir, all these facts are true. I say the tariff should be framed with the assistance of an advisory board for the purpose of advising the Finance Minister on matters of that description, so that a fair and reasonable tariff for the development of our industries and the protection of the consumer will be prepared. I regret that my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke) and the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) will not withdraw the resolution. I think they will be sorry when they get into power, which we hope will not be for a long time. When they get into power and read this resolution in Hansard I think they will have great difficulty in reconciling themselves with their action on this matter.

Let me turn to the hon. member for Brome who made a speech this evening, and stated he was absolutely against the principle and practice of protection. No doubt hon. members opposite agree with all he said. They have heard his remarks with reference to his defection. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to say very much about the defection of the hon. member for Brome beyond stating it was very regrettable to me that he should have adopted such an attitude towards the party he has followed for so many years. What did the hon. member say? He said he was a Liberal and he was the only man who understood the Liberal doctrine. Well, why does the hon. member for Brome pose as the arbiter of the Liberal party? Can no other hon. members in this House understand what the Liberal doctrine or the Liberal policy is? Why did he say that he, and he alone, is the only man in the House that understands the Liberal doctrine?

The hon. member for Brome is advancing his own personal ideas and views instead of sinking those personal views as many of us have to do for the general good of the country. He will not merge those views with the views of others, but he stands out for a fad and fancy and he is chasing a rainbow. That is all he is chasing when he talks about free trade. It is nothing else. It is a regrettable incident that he should take the attitude he has taken to-night. It is an impossibility to have free trade and have the country prosperous. Let me ask the hon. members opposite who applauded him so vigorously to-night, did he give you any solution of the problem as to how you were going to meet the financial obligations of the country? Did he explain to you how he was going to assist you in your policies? He did nothing at all. He did nothing at all except propound the idea that free trade was the best policy for the country, and that under the system of protection we had not been successful. I do not agree with his statement. I think we have been remarkably successful. I think our trade is certainly something to be exceedingly proud of in a country of this

description. I think we have a splendid set of people in this country to be proud of. The effort of the West has been one of the most magnificent efforts that have ever been put forth in history. Those are all matters that we may be proud of, and they have all taken place under the system which has been in vogue for a number of years.

The hon. member for Brome went on again to speak of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He said that he knew him; that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had made him financial critic; yet he absolutely turns around on the tariff policy which Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself put into force with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), when he came into power in 1896. As a matter of fact, the Laurier-Fielding tariff is less than it was in 1896, and the hon. member for Brome says, "I revered Sir Wilfrid Laurier," yet he turns around on his follower who made the self-same tariff at that time. That is the attitude which the hon. member for Brome has taken towards the Liberal party to-night. There is no consistency in his attitude. I see the hon. member for Last Mountain shaking his head. Why does he shake his head? Will he tell me?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Yes I will—because the hon. member who has the floor has been misstating the position of the hon. member for Brome. That is why I am shaking my head.

Mr. MARLER: I can assure my hon. friend that the last person I would like to make a misstatement about is the hon. member for Brome.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The hon. member has been doing so.

Mr. MARLER: In what way? I have not been making any misstatement to my knowledge. I am stating simply what he himself has stated. His one ambition and object, his whole speech, centered around the word "protection;" that we had to get rid of protection; that we had to get on to free trade.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARLER: Some hon. gentlemen say, "hear,hear." I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to make up any budget on the basis of free trade. I will challenge any hon. gentleman opposite, if free trade ever does come in —and it never will—to be any better off under it than under the present tariff. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), I suppose, after voting to-morrow night, he will be sitting beside the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark). Perhaps they will come to an agreement to-morrow and do their best to defeat the government. I warn them that supposing they do defeat the government, they will not go back to their constituents with any feathers in their caps. Their constituents will not thank them for defeating the Liberal government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: Forget it.

Mr. MARLER: Hon. members laugh. I take it that they mean their constituents will thank them for defeating the Liberal government. Is that what they mean?

Mr. GOULD: I think so.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I think the trouble is that the hon. member does not understand the Progressives at all.

Mr. MARLER: I think I understand the Progressives very well. I have said nothing about the Progressive party to-night except words of encouragement. I can say much more than words of encouragement; I can say much more about the Progressive party if I wanted to say anything about them; but I will say that they are the greatest protectionists we have in Canada to-day.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Of our country.

Mr. MARLER: Of themselves. They do not think of their country; they think of themselves.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Not at all. Shame.

Mr. MARLER: What about the wheat board? Is that not a protective measure?

An hon. MEMBER: Not at all.

Mr. MARLER: I suppose the Hudson Bay Railway is an investment?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Where does the hon. member get protection?

Mr. MARLER: That is purely a Progressive attitude.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Where is the protection in the Hudson Bay Railway?

Mr. MARLER: It is not protection; it is selfishness. I have spoken about protection. The Progressive party come out now about free trade. We understand that party.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The Progressive party have not done that.

Mr. MARLER: What have they come out for? For this resolution?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Not for free trade.

Mr. MARLER: We will accept the resolution on its face as being the policy of the

Progressive party. We in the East know precisely what the Progressive party in the West means, on the basis of that resolution, and that being the case, we can act accordingly.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, after what has been said in this House, I do not think there is very much left at the present time for any member to say. I do not think I will take up the time of the House in complimenting the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on his budget, and then start to tear it to pieces and wind up by saying that, if it carries, it will ruin this country. I cannot understand how any one living in Canada and knowing Canada as every member of parliament should know it, can be such a pessimist. It seems to me that if the members of this House would quit playing so much politics and would get down to business and work in the interests of the people, as that is what they are sent here for, it would be better for everyone concerned. What the members of this House ought to have is courage and confidence in their country, and then work in the interests of the people who have sent them here.

A good deal has been said about this budget, but from this side of the House, at least, very little has been said in its favour. There are one or two items to which I should like to draw the attention of the House, and the first is in connection with the sales tax. It has been stated a great number of times that that tax is going to work a hardship on the people, and that it is not fair that the sales tax should be increased. In my opinion, the sales tax as it was before, worked a very great hardship on the people; but taking into consideration the number of items that are left out and free from the sales tax under the amendment proposed in this budget, I do not see how any hardship will be caused. I would like to cite one instance of the way in which the sales tax, as it was before, worked. In Victoria, if a person bought a thousand bricks at $20 the sales tax was 2¼ per cent which came to 45 cents. Those bricks would be brought up to Vancouver and it would cost $2.50 to bring them up. Handling and other items would bring the cost up to $24 a thousand. Two and a quarter per cent on $24 would amount to 55 cents. Then those same thousand bricks would be sold again and possibly hauled out to South Vancouver. This hauling out would cost $5 more, which would bring the cost up to $29. Two and a quarter per cent is charged again on that amount, and this would add another 65¼ cents. And the result was that the people who used those bricks in South Vancouver would finally have to pay the bill, and the sales tax on those thousand bricks would be $1.65¼. In this way the man who sold the thousand bricks in the first place in Victoria would have to pay only 45 cents, while the man who used them in South Vancouver would pay $1.65¼. Why should the labouring man in South Vancouver who is building a home for himself pay $1.65¼ sales tax, when the man in Victoria has to pay only 45 cents? The amendment makes this sales tax so that any person who uses one thousand bricks, if we take them at the prices at which they have been, will pay $1.20 at Victoria, $1.20 at Vancouver or $1.20 in South Vancouver. This will equalize the matter all around. It is a fair proposition, and many people out West will appreciate it very much. I for one compliment the Minister of Finance on bringing in this amendment.

A good deal has been said about the bounty on copper. I think the Minister of Finance used good judgment in giving a little bonus in connection with copper. This will put the smelters of British Columbia, at least, on such a footing that in a few years they will be able to compete in the markets of the world. Not only that; but it will give employment within a few months to from 500 to 1,000 people. That means a great deal to us out West as a floating surplus of labour is always drifting towards the Pacific, more particularly in the fall of the year when the climate counts so much with them.

As regards hemp, I am more than pleased that the Minister of Finance has seen his way to offer a small bonus to this industry, but I hardly think he has gone far enough. I think that the time limit of the bonus should have been extended to at least ten years. I may say at this point that the firm which is at the back of this prospectus in Belfast is one that I knew for a number of years before coming to Canada. It is second to none there, and when I recalled the days when I saw hundreds, indeed, thousands of people, in that factory earning a good living, and when I heard of the proposal to start a factory in Canada I certainly was more than pleased to learn that the government was likely to give some encouragement in the way of bonus. It will take nearly three years to get the factory started in Canada. In the first place, they will have to select the hemp seed for the farmers. Then they will have to educate the farmers in the methods of raising that hemp. Not only that; they will be obliged to put up buildings and obtain the necessary machinery that is used in the manufacture of the hemp. They will have to make that machinery particularly for this purpose,

because it is not like ordinary machinery that is kept in stock; it will have to be especially made. After that it will be necessary to instruct those who are going to use the machinery. So that I cannot see how this firm will be able to get down to business inside of three years. This is quite a large proposition, it would mean a great deal to the people of the prairies and I certainly think that the government would be fully justified in extending the period to ten years. It would mean retaining millions of dollars of Canadian money in Canada and would give work to thousands of our young people; and what Canada wants as much as anything else is industries that will absorb our young population and give them employment. No country can long remain in the forefront of nations whose people are not workers. I think one great necessity in Canada to-day is to provide work for the young people. Surely with a country such as we have in Canada, covering an area of 111,000 square miles, greater than the United States and Alaska combined, we should be able to find employment for Canadians. I cannot help thinking—and I am speaking in this regard from years of experience in this country—that one good Canadian born man or woman brought up in Canada is worth two who have been brought into the country. The Canadian-born man is accustomed to Canadian ways and can help develop the country; he falls into line naturally and does his work much better than people brought from the Old Country.

There is one thing I should have liked to see in the budget and that is a little more British preference, not on goods as a whole but on clothing. When we take into consideration the amount of wheat, and cattle and other products that we sell to the Mother Country, I do think that we should give a little more preference to British-made clothing. Canada is a cold country in the winter time, and it is very necessary to the health of the people that they should have warm clothing; and the working people as a general rule can ill afford to pay the prices that are demanded nowadays for articles of apparel. I should have liked to see a greater reduction in that respect than there is.

There was one question which I intended to bring up in connection with the budget, and that is the question of old age pensions. But I have been engaged to such a great extent on committees that I really have had no time to give the matter any consideration, and therefore I think I had better refrain from saying anything in reference to it. Some time ago the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) made the statement, that he did not see that this government was under any obligation to consider any further help for the unemployed. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be well for the hon. minister to re-consider that assertion. We in the West are in a rather peculiar position. There is generally a large floating population on the prairies that come out West in the fall of the year, and to me it hardly seems right that Vancouver—because that is the place that is most affected—should have to provide for these people in the winter time. I do not think that city should have to provide either work or food for them. Indeed, I have been always of the opinion that the Dominion government should give to the province of British Columbia special consideration in this respect. The floating population comes out West in the fall and, as I have said, as soon as the spring opens up, they drift back to the prairies and other places. We often ask ourselves this question out there, why should we provide for these people in the winter season? Yet we have got to do it. Now, I think that if the Dominion government would go ahead and construct a highway or a portion of a highway, and continue this work for a few years, as I think they would be justified in doing, it would go a long way towards relieving the situation. When British Columbia entered confederation it was agreed that the province should get a railway. Before that railway was built we had a highway as far east as Hope; it was known as the old Cariboo road. When the railway was built it practically did away with that highway, and then the Canadian Northern was constructed and it put out of use the remainder of the highway. Generally it has been the custom when a railway is built that the railway company replaces any highways it put out of commission in the section of the country through which it passes, and I think that this government would be fully justified in replacing that portion of the highway which they were the means of destroying when these railways were built. If the government did this it would, as I have said, go a long way in the direction of relieving unemployment for a number of years.

Another question which I wish to touch upon briefly has reference to a statement made by Sir James Lougheed and Senator Fowler. Sir James Lougheed is reported as having said:

> A change is now made, at the instance of a very small and irresponsible group in the House of Commons.

I may say that he was speaking in connection with the Immigration bill.

> I am satisfied that this bill does not represent the sentiments of the House, and it certainly does not represent the parliament of Canada. The small and irresponsible group in the Commons would engraft upon the statutes. . . .

He then goes on to say:

> Yes, there is in the House of Commons a Labour party of one or two, I think it numbers two.

Mr. Fowler then stated:

> The government showed that it had some sense in the beginning, but then they gave way to the improper gang. We get out the worst and most dangerous agitators from the British Isles.

Sir James Lougheed interjected:

> No doubt about that.

Mr. Fowler continued:

> The English are a peculiar people, and if a man is attacked by the public he will be protected by the police. Then they say, "Oh, he is an Englishman," and that makes him all the more dangerous.

Now, I would like to know what right has Sir James Lougheed to make such statements about members of this House? I come from the British Isles and I have no doubt that I am one of the people referred to. If I had not at least as good a record as Sir James Lougheed or Mr. Fowler I do not think I would want to sit in the House of Commons. It seems to me that no man is a true Canadian who does not want to build up in Canada a great white civilization with brotherly friendship as its guiding star. I go further and say that I think such statements as those which I have quoted show a lack of principle that one might not expect to find in a gentleman; nor do I think a gentleman would make such statements about any member of this House, and I for one resent it.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): Before discussing the budget, Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my congratulations to those already tendered the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon the introduction of his eighteenth budget. I think other members have referred to it as the seventeenth, but if my memory serves me last session the hon. gentleman introduced practically two budgets, so one may say that this is his eighteenth.

An hon. MEMBER: The seventeenth.

Mr. ARTHURS: The eighteenth I think. I have listened with a great deal of interest to five or six, as the case may be, of those budgets. I have also listened to the hon. gentleman in opposition when he was the chief financial critic for his party, and I can assure him that he makes a better critic than he does a minister of finance so far as his budgets are concerned. I only hope he may long continue to be active in one of those two capacities,—preferably as financial critic of the opposition.

When the budget of 1922 was brought down the country awaited it with great interest. Almost everybody in Canada was anxious to hear the budget debate of that year, for they were eager to know whether the government would fulfil the promises contained in their 1919 platform and supplemented by various speeches from members of the government. But the friends of the government were disappointed. They found that this "immediate and general reduction of duties" as promised in the platform of 1919 did not materialize. They found that farm implements were not placed upon the free list, and that mill machinery and other implements of production were still on the old tariff basis. In a word, they found that none of the articles specifically mentioned in the platform of 1919 were put on the free list—not even cement. My right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, did me the honour to invade my constituency, and while the Minister of Finance says he did not subscribe to the platform of 1919, I can assure him quite confidently that his leader while in my county did subscribe to every plank of that platform in so many words.

It is quite true that in order to please our friends from the West there was a reduction made of 2½ per cent in the duty on certain farm implements, but every cent of this was accounted for by an increase in the sales tax, so that to-day the farmer of the West has not benefited one cent by the reduction in duty. During the election of 1921 in my county, and I think in every other county in Ontario, our friends opposite held up the duty on boots and shoes as a horrible example of what a tariff might amount to. They took the duty of 30 per cent and pyramided it in various ways until they had it over 100 per cent; but we do not find that since our friends succeeded to office they have made any attempt to reduce this duty.

They also took various other ways of implementing their promises. For instance, they made a reduction of 5 per cent on milk bottles and also upon their paper covers, and they made porcelains for pumps absolutely free. That was the total extent of tariff reductions during 1922. But to offset this they increased our taxation in various ways. As I have already intimated they increased the sales tax of 50 per cent and allowed it to pyramid in exactly the same way as before, with the result that for the last fiscal year they have collected approximately

$31,000,000 more than they would have under the old rate. They also placed an additional tax upon cheques and upon receipts. The latter, Mr Speaker, is a very grievous and annoying burden upon the people of this country. If a drover comes along to a farmer and makes him a payment of $10 or $15 upon a purchase of cattle, the farmer is supposed to be able to immediately produce a two-cent stamp and place it upon his receipt.

I notice that the minister has seen fit to reduce the tax upon cheques. Last session after considerable discussion he agreed that the tax should not be greater than two dollars; in other words, that cheques for $5,000 should go through for two dollars apiece. This year he has reduced that to $1 maximum. But the poor man who issues small cheques is still taxed in exactly the same way.

Mr. PUTNAM: I suppose the rich man gives many a small cheque?

Mr. ARTHURS: And he pays the tax; but if he gives a big cheque he gets off at half price.

Mr. PUTNAM: If he gives a small cheque he helps the poor man to pay the tax.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why not let him pay the whole tax? It is just as reasonable that he should pay the same proportion of tax on cheques that he does on his income.

Mr. PUTNAM: That is quite another matter. My hon. friend wanted to make the poor man out as being the only issuer of small cheques, which is absurd.

Mr. ARTHURS: What I say is that the tax is infinitely more on the poor man who issues small cheques than on the rich man who issues big cheques. The net result of the tariff of 1922 was to increase duties by three-quarters of one per cent on dutiable goods in another way, the net result was to increase the duty on all goods entering Canada, whether free or dutiable, by one-third of one per cent. But the friends of our friends opposite said, "This government has only been in power a few months. They cannot do everything in a day; the best solution is to leave them alone for a year and wait until they bring down the budget of 1923." Well, we are here to-day to discuss the tariff of 1923. I am quite satisfied that our free trade friends, if we have any, outside of one hon. member who spoke this evening—I am quite satisfied that our Progressive friends, too, are disappointed, and that they find very little comfort in this budget of 1923. It is quite true there are certain small reductions. The minister has reduced the duty upon goods entering Canada from Great Britain by an average of 1½ to 2½ per cent, and outside of certain specific articles, I do not know that I quarrel with him in that respect; I think his intention was a good one. His idea seems to be to promote trade through Canadian ports, and so far as that is concerned I hold up both hands in favour of the minister's position. However, there are certain articles—the woollen trade has already been brought to the attention of the minister—in connection with which the proposed change will entail great hardship. I am not going to take up the time of the House on that point; the minister knows the situation just as well as I do; he knows the difficulty that may ensue in that connection.

The minister has also reduced the duty on sugar by 50 cents a hundred. The average householder purchases in a year less than 200 pounds of sugar. The minister stated that the reduction in duty would amount to $1,250,000. I think I am correct in that figure.

Mr. FIELDING: Two and a half millions.

Mr. ARTHURS: Well, any figure you like. This reduction is principally to manufacturers of candies and various lines of that kind. I have said that the average householder consumes less than 200 pounds of sugar annually; that would mean a reduction to him of one dollar per year. The minister in the next line of his tariff is adding to the duty on currants and raisins—multiplying it, in fact, by 4½. He has increased it by 450 per cent—from two-thirds of a cent to 3 cents a pound. The housewife, therefore, will pay in the increased duty on currants and raisins every cent of the reduction on sugar.

The minister has also made a small reduction on scrap iron. I do not know whether or not that affects our friends from the West, but these are the only reductions of any moment in the tariff proposals of the minister. He is very careful to see that nothing but what is really scrap comes into the country. under the conditions of the amended tariff.

But the minister has also increased the duty in many ways, particularly on the ingredients that go into the manufacture of paint. In spite of the hon. minister's declaration of some years ago that he was not in favour of establishing any new industries in Canada at the expense of the taxpayer; that if a man undertook to establish a new industry and expected to have protection for it, his advice to him was, "Don't,"—I am not

quoting his exact words, but I am giving the tenor of his remarks—in spite of that he has introduced duties which have been so far unheard of in Canada, though I am not saying that they are wrong. The first on the list is a duty of 35 cents per hundred pounds on potatoes. I think the hon. minister is right in doing that; he would be right if he followed the whole line of the Fordney tariff and gave our American friends some of the medicine they are trying to give us. But the minister did not enunciate that principle in years gone by; this procedure is contrary to his former declarations in this House.

Mr. MARTELL: He has enunciated it now.

Mr. ARTHURS: He has had a change of heart. If he really feels that change of heart he should be on the other side of the House.

Mr. FINN: How would you like him over there?

Mr. ARTHURS: We should be glad to have him—better than we would some hon. members who sit around him.

The minister has also placed a duty on crude petroleum of .3, .4 and .6 cents per gallon. This duty has never been heard of in Canada before. He has also placed a duty on fire brick. I may say just here in passing that the platform of 1919 purported to allow free entry into Canada of machinery necessary for the manufacture of necessities. There is no mill in Canada using steam that does not use fire brick in the construction of its plant. The minister has taken the other plan in this instance and has placed a duty of 5 per cent British preferential, 7½ per cent intermediate and 10 per cent general tariff on fire brick. He has also placed a duty on artificial silk and silk yarns running from 10 per cent up to 30 per cent.

The minister has been in times past an opponent of bounties. In fact, he said on different occasions that a duty was bad but a bounty was worse. He has repeated that expression in my hearing many times in this House. But we find to-day that his tariff is largely made up of bounties. The member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) has commended him in that respect so far as the copper bounty is concerned. I have no fault to find with the building up of industries in Canada; I am only pointing out to this House and to the country the minister is swallowing everything he has said in past years in regard to this bounty question.

Since this government has been in power it has repudiated through its finance minister and otherwise every pledge that it gave to the country.

Mr. MARTELL: What pledges?

Mr. ARTHURS: Tariff pledges. Perhaps there was an exception in the case of the province of Quebec, but hon. gentlemen went all over the country from the boundaries of the province of Quebec to Vancouver preaching lower duties, proclaiming that their tariff was exactly the same as that of our Progressive friends, and they were elected on that stand. They have repudiated that; to-day, as I have said, they have a tariff which is higher than the tariff they found in effect when they came into power.

Mr. PUTNAM: Can the hon. gentleman name one authoritative Liberal who preached that during the campaign?

Mr. ARTHURS: The Prime Minister preached it in my riding.

Mr. PUTNAM: As I heard it from all the leaders—

Mr. ARTHURS: I am making this speech. The hon. gentleman has got my answer. There is one thing I overlooked to mention. The government did make an attempt to lower the cost of living, and they did it in this way: They arranged and presented to this House a treaty with France, whereby they give important concessions to that country—especially low duties on wines, silks, laces, handkerchiefs, ribbons, millinery, etc. The farmer and the workingman will be pleased to know that the duty on silk has been reduced to 20 per cent, while the duty on printed and dyed cotton fabrics remains at 25, 30 and 32½ per cent in respect to all other countries. They have reduced the duty on velvets from 32½ to 20 per cent; on French laces from 27½ per cent to 15 per cent; on perfumery from 32 per cent to 25 per cent; on feathers and ornaments for hats, from 27½ to 22½ per cent. And in respect to all these items the reductions apply not only to France but to Switzerland, Japan and various other countries under the favoured nation clause. I may point out that it is a good way to lose revenue but a very poor way to reduce the cost of living. Every dollar of revenue that is lost owing to the negotiation of this treaty —and it will amount to upwards of a million dollars—must be paid in some way, and it will be made up by the man who is subject to direct taxation; there is no question about that. I am sure that our prohibition friends —they have not any in Quebec, I presume,

but elsewhere there are some—will be pleased to know that the minister has reduced the excise duty on native wines from 30 cents to 7½ cents per gallon, or from 5 cents to 1½ cents a bottle. I am quite sure that Mr. Raney will agree with the minister in that particular.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Raney approves of it.

Mr. ARTHURS: Are you sure of that?

Mr. GRAHAM: Native wine is provided for in his act.

Mr. ARTHURS: I want to say a word in regard to the 6 per cent sales tax. The minister has claimed that the new tax will not be pyramided. Well, as a matter of straight business, the tax of 6 per cent upon the manufacturer will, before it reaches the retailer, be upwards of 10 per cent. We will take it that the average rate of profit from the manufacturer to the jobber or wholesaler is 20 per cent upon the original cost of the goods. That will increase this sales tax from $6 to $7.20. The usual profit to the retailer is 33 1/3 per cent or upwards. If we take it at an average of 33 1/3 per cent we find that the tax when it reaches the consumer amounts to $9.60 instead of $6. Or in other words for every $6 of money that the government receives the consumer pays $9.60.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words upon an entirely different matter. The government have not stated to parliament what their attitude will be regarding the Crowsnest pass agreement in the future. We have a provisional arrangement putting the Crowsnest pass agreement into operation. It has been in effect for one year during which time the railway companies claim they have suffered a loss in receipts of $20,000,000. Now I contend that every dollar of that is at the expense of the eastern shipper. Before the Crowsnest pass agreement was put into force last year the railway companies approached parliament, and the country, and offered a reduction of approximately 7½ per cent on all basic articles. This would give a fairer rate upon lumber, brick, cement, and all kinds of farm products both in the East and in the West. Northern Ontario, from which I come depends largely upon the production of lumber, pulpwood, ties, etc., the production of which furnishes employment for thousands of men. The hon. member who spoke immediately before me commended the minister for placing a bounty upon copper, on the ground that it would employ from 500 to 1,000 men. I can safely say that the tie and pulp industries in northern Ontario employ ten times that number of men every year, and in many years twice that number. During the war, and since, the rates upon these various articles have been increased by 100 per cent. To-day we find in northern Ontario that where the men previously received $80 to $90 a month with board—and I am speaking of northern Quebec just as much as northern Ontario—they now receive from $26 to $35 per month and board. We find that the farmer up there, who is the principal producer of pulpwood, is faced with a condition that leaves him in very poor shape financially. We all know that the price of lumber, ties, pulpwood, and other materials of this nature is fixed at the point of delivery. Well, the farmer receives that price but it is a fact that in many cases in northern Ontario he pays more for freight rates upon this lumber than he receives for the timber, for his work upon that timber upon his piling, loading and everything else included. These are absolute facts, and I believe that in the interest of this country, something should be done to relieve these men from the present condition which is almost intolerable.

Now I want to say a few words upon the immigration question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARTHURS: I am away from the tariff question now. I want to point out that in 1914, before the war, our immigration amounted to 403,000. In 1920, soon after the war finished, it amounted to 117,000, in 1921 it was 148,000, and last year, 89,000, steadily dropping as hon. members will notice.

The Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Stewart), when he explained his policy the other day, brought forward no solution of the immigration question. His main effort, apparently, was to hand over—I was going to say to some private individuals but it is not necessarily so—to some company $100,000 provided they induced 200 families to settle upon land in western Canada; or in other words to give them a bonus of $500 per family. I can assure him that if he hands that money over to even the Drury government we will get better results than that in Ontario alone. I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on immigration. I did not speak, but I found there were as many opinions expressed as there were members speaking, and they were not all confined to one side of the House. On the government side there were—I will not say renegades—but some men who at least were not in favour of the policy as announced by the government.

Mr. CANNON: Who were they?

Mr. ARTHURS: The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler), the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). These were the notable and upstanding figures on the government side.

Mr. CANNON: Who said that?

Mr. ARTHURS: The hon. members referred to said it themselves. They said they were opposed to the policy of the government. The difference of opinion among the members of the Progressive party was even worse than among the members on the government side. We found the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) saying that we should have all the immigrants we could and he would not confine them to agriculturists, he wanted mechanics and artisans. The hon. members behind him entered into what I might almost call a Marathon to see who could make the darkest and worst picture of the conditions in their own particular county. I am quite certain that I never heard before in this House—even in the old days when the Liberals were in opposition and used to use some strong expressions about the conditions of the country—I never heard a more depressing speech, or one of such a blue ruin character, than that made by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) wherein he said that there were already in his province 20,000 bankrupt and the rest were going through as fast as they could. The only hon. member, in my opinion, who beat him as a blue ruin artist was the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good). He said that if we wanted men to go on the farm we ought to import Asiatics, that they were the only men who would stay there at the present time, and he commended that policy to the government apparently in all earnestness. Our friends in Toronto have a different policy. They are going through the country to-day claiming that they have a policy which will put men on the farm only. As a matter of fact I read in a newspaper, either to-day or yesterday, that some men imported from Stornoway under this policy had gone into some other employment—I will not say what it was—and the provincial government were going to deport them because they did not stay on the farm. It was a brewery.

I was glad to hear the statement of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) that he was at the present time paying attention to the northern parts of Ontario and Quebec. I come from northern Ontario, and I may tell hon. members of this House that there are millions of acres of land there available at the present time, which will make the finest homesteads in Canada. Some of this land is timbered and some is burnt over. Preferably the best land is the timbered land. That will probably seem strange to our western friends, but the timber on the land provides work for the men during the winter and gives them an income, so they can go ahead and clean up the soil. The best residents of Canada are the men in these northern districts. While the agricultural population of Ontario has been decreasing in most parts, the agricultural population of northern Ontario has been increasing each and every census, and will continue to increase, and I think it would be wise if the minister would make an effort to populate that part of the country. I commend the minister for his consideration in the matter. We do not grow wheat up there, but the man who grows the most wheat is the poorest man, according to the theories of my hon. friends to the left of me. No part of Ontario is better adapted for cattle raising or ordinary mixed farming than this district. It is quite true that some of these men have suffered misfortunes on account of fires, but we find them going ahead and rebuilding their homes, and a year from now they will be in better position than before the fire, because the land will have been burnt over and cleaned.

I remember thirty years ago we had a slump in the lumber market in northern Ontario, and many of the men from my county left their farms in the Parry Sound district and went west, most of them going to Alberta. To-day there is not one of those farms that is not in better condition than when these men left it. Our farmers are succeeding. Many men have come in, have occupied the farms for a while, have turned the farms over to their sons and have retired to small villages having made enough to keep them according to their ideas. I think this matter should be brought more prominently to the attention of those incoming settlers whom we hope to receive in Canada. The hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) said that he quite agreed with the minister in certain particulars, but he thought they required a different class of settlers. He said if we had to populate northern Ontario or northern Quebec we should have the men who would lead the simple life. I do not know whether in the West they lead a double life or not; if they do, perhaps that will account for some of their troubles. But I can assure him that conditions in northern Ontario are just as good in every way as in other parts of the

country. We have roads, schools and everything that the West can offer the settler—even Ford cars.

As I said before, I am in favour of an immigration policy of this kind.

Mr. ARTHUR DENIS (Saint Denis) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, since this debate has begun, many speeches have been made, many views have been expressed, but I think this discussion, which is not lacking in importance, would have been better appreciated by the country, if the speakers had restricted themselves to the subject matter of the budget. Unfortunately, such was not the case. The interests at large were sacrificed, or rather relegated to the back ground, for the benefit of a certain group, a certain class, or a portion of the country to the detriment of the public's interests. Are these, Sir, the duties incumbent on a loyal representative of the people? I do not think so, and if a number of members are guided by such ideas they have a wrong conception of their responsibilities. I was much impressed by the eloquent speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance. His excellent work calls for my most sincere congratulations. He is truly the man of the hour—the best man in the right place. If the country enjoyed an era of prosperity under the regime of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, between 1896 and 1911, it is due to the hon. Minister of Finance, the same person who, at present, is in our midst. From 1911 to 1921, the Conservative party was at the helm of the affairs of the country, with the result you all know. The country was beset by many evils. Not satisfied with having increased our national debt by hundreds of millions or having burdened the people with heavy taxes, they forced, through an infamous and anti-Canadian Act, our sons to cross the seas to shed their blood on the plains of Europe. While this was going on our Ministers—a few of their silhouettes I notice on the cold benches of the opposition—were scattering the public moneys in the name of freedom and civilization under the double cloak of war and the British flag.

On December 6, 1921, the day of relief came, forever honoured in the history of our beautiful country. The people, aroused and disgusted, drove from power these ravenous wolves so as to bring back to power the country's former benefactors.

Barely a few months have elapsed since the Liberal party, under the wise and progressive—not progressist—direction of its leader, the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, took hold of the administration of the country, that the clouds which darkened the horizon are scattering, unveiling a ray of hope,

to the great satisfaction of the people of this country. There is considerable improvement in the financial situation, thanks to the wisdom, experience and ability of the hon. Minister of Finance. The period of deficits is coming to an end and would already be a thing of the past had we not inherited from the late regime the National Railways and Merchant Marine which alone absorb $100,000,000 of our revenues per year.

Thanks to the economy being now practised, before long the budget will balance itself and the taxes imposed through the necessity of the moment will, to the satisfaction of all, disappear. I deem it my duty to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance for having made progress in that direction, in relieving us of certain taxes on the necessities of life, thus lightening the burden of the consumer, and allowing industries which employ a great number of hands, to better remunerate them. I wish further to extend to him our thanks for having suppressed the retail sales tax so as to collect it at the source of production and on imports.

Before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, there is one subject to which I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance: it is the income tax.

To be brief and so as not to take up the time of the House with useless repetitions, I shall simply state that I entirely approve the few suggestions which were put forth by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault). I favour giving an exemption of $500 instead of $300 for each child. I am in favour of exempting the head of a family of all taxes on a revenue of less than $5,000. I support the suggestion of allowing an exemption for all children who are going through a course of study. I would also like to see a tax on dividends drawn from all investments in companies, wholly apart from the tax already imposed on the general business of these companies. The husband and wife having property in common should each benefit of an exemption of $2,000; in a word, they should be looked upon as if they were separated as to property, according to the spirit of the Income Tax Act.

I feel confident that the hon. minister will give to these few suggestions his serious consideration and that a bill purporting to such an arrangement will meet with the general assent of this House.

One last word, Mr. Speaker, I have full confidence that the present government will know how to carry on efficiently the country's affairs. I confide in their sense of justice and patriotism and for those reasons, I shall vote

against the amendment and in favour of the main motion.

In giving such a vote, I am absolutely satisfied that I will have done my duty towards my country and the electors that I have the honour of representing.

Mr. HARRY LEADER (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not desirous of rising to make a speech at this late hour, but I have a duty to perform. I have the advantage of hon. members who have been in constant attendance in this House, in the fact that I have been able to go home and have a week's vacation on the farm. While that is an advantage, in that I feel fresh in comparison with some hon. members present, it is a disadvantage as well because what I have to say may be a repetition, as I was not in this House to listen to the speeches and I have not had time to read them. If, however, I wander far afield, I know Mr. Speaker will call me to order.

While I was in the West, news of the budget that had been delivered here had travelled that far, and the man or the woman is a rare bird, indeed, who is in favour of the budget as it was brought down this year. The western people are almost a unit, so far as I can see or hear, in condemning this budget that was delivered in 1923. This morning I received a resolution passed by the District Board of the constituency of Portage la Prairie, and I should like to read it to the House, if hon. members will bear with me. It reads:

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE, May 19, 1923.

Mr. H. LEADER, M.P.,
Parliament Bldgs.,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir:

I am instructed by the district Board of the Constituency of Portage la Prairie to forward to you the following.

Whereas the national prosperity is mainly dependent on the development of those interests native to the country, and whereas a tariff based on the principles of protection bears unduly on those natural industries thus retarding production and the development of our natural resources, to the point that agriculture can scarcely maintain itself and is becoming completely demoralized, and whereas the present government gave definite promise in its platform of 1919 to remove the duty on at least the necessities of life and the implements of production. Therefore be it resolved that we recognize the tariff proposals of the Hon. Mr. Fielding as breaking faith with the people of Canada, and further we stand unalterably opposed to the principle of protection being recognized in formulating tariff proposals. And we further express our wholehearted approval of the amendment proposed by Mr. Forke, leader of the Progressives.

JAMES MCKENZIE.

Mr. James McKenzie is one of the old-time Liberals of Portage plains. I think I am safe in saying that on this committee of seventeen or twenty-one, I do not know which, not more than two members are not former Liberals; they all condemn the budget that has been brought down, and they are firmly of opinion that the Liberal party has betrayed the people of this country.

There are in the budget things that we could, perhaps, say a good word for. I should like to say—and when I say this, I know it will not meet with the approval of many of my Progressive colleagues—that as a good Canadian I approve the preference for British goods entering Canada via Canadian ports. The government might have carried out that part of their platform very easily at this time. I think they should increase the British preference to at least 50 per cent. They have a great opportunity in view of the fact that Britain has come to our aid and lifted the embargo in order to allow our cattle to enter the Old Country. The government might have reciprocated and increased the British preference to 50 per cent in accordance with their platform. My idea would be to work the duty off altogether and to admit British goods into Canada via Canadian ports duty free.

There is one phase in connection with this budget that I should like to see rectified, and that is as regards the stamp tax. Last year when the grain dealers were buying wheat from the Canadian farmers, in the settlement for grain they issued their cheques; they put stamps on them, and they charged the stamps back to the farmers. This was the cause of considerable annoyance and there was a great deal of opposition to it. In my own case I did not like it. It was not universal; they could not say that it was a rule of the Grain Exchange, because they violated that rule many times. The first car I sold to Smith-Murphy, they either forgot to charge the stamp tax back, or they did not think it worth while to do so. As regards the second car, in sending me back settlement, they charged me up with the stamps. I wrote them saying that I felt inclined to contest this right, and they wrote back claiming that they had every right in the world to do so. I went to a lawyer thinking that we would make a test case, and I was advised by the lawyer that unless I had plenty of money to spend, it would, perhaps, be better to drop the matter. That is rather unusual advice from a lawyer. I was advised to write to the law officers of the Crown in Ottawa. I did so, and after consideration on their part, I received a letter in reply stating that there was no doubt that the law called for stamps to be placed on every cheque, but that the question

as to who should pay for the stamps was a matter of settlement between the parties interested. This simply meant that I had no redress in that direction unless I went into a lawsuit. I then took the matter up with the Board of Grain Commissioners at Fort William, and while I will not read all of the letter I received in reply, it says in part:

In reply to your inquiry of November 1st, I have to advise that the matter referred to therein does not come within the jurisdiction of this board.

What I should like to know is who has jurisdiction over this matter. If any organization or body in this country can issue a cheque, put stamps on it and compel the other fellow to pay for the stamps, that looks to me like special privilege. I should like to know if the Grain Exchange has this special privilege. If it has, we want to know that fact, and I do not think it should enjoy that privilege.

I should like for a few moments to speak about the cattle trade. I might say that I am a practical cattle raiser; I have put a good deal of money into the business, and I am desirous of raising for export the very best class of steers that I possibly can. We have hopes of increasing the revenues from our farm by going into the live stock business. It, however, rather takes the heart out of a man when he has reached that stage of investing his hard-earned capital in an industry and when he is producing what the market demands, to find some big interest step in and take the cream off. That has happened as regards our freight rates. The lifting of the embargo should mean a great stimulus to stock breeding but ocean rates are too high, and they are robbing the farmers of their legitimate profits. A lower tariff should be established and maintained by the action of the government. I see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is in his seat. I notice on reading Hansard that he says:

The reason I take this matter up now is because on several occasions there have been intimations of a more or less insinuating character made with respect to this matter. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) came out frankly and intimated gross negligence on the part of the Department of Agriculture with respect to this matter.

I did say that, and I think I could prove the charge. The Minister of Agriculture made the statement that he had inquired of Sir Henry Thornton and had been told that it would take at least $32,000 to fit up each ship to take our cattle overseas. Let me quote from the Winnipeg Free Press of May 17:

But if Mr. Motherwell had this information, why did his deputy as late as December 13, 1922, make this statement to the members of the Western Canada Live-Stock Union—

Who met in Brandon last winter.

—"Canada owns a number of vessels and I have been trying to influence the department to put some of these vessels at the disposal of the cattle interests. I hope the government will make a move in the matter. These vessels are not very large, nor are they as seaworthy as they might be, but they could be utilized in the spring and fall trade."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Dr. Grisdale, my deputy, made the statement, which he is reported to have made, in December, before Sir Henry Thornton was in charge, while Sir Henry Thornton's statement was made in March. That is the difference.

Mr. LEADER: Evidently the department had under consideration the question of fixing up the vessels to take care of the trade. As I said before, I think I could substantiate the charge I made in this matter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think the hon. member meant it very seriously. It was just a little play in the game.

Mr. LEADER: I might point out that in a newspaper report it was stated that even the dumb beasts themselves objected to the attitude of the government, for the very first steer that landed on the other side upset the representative of the government.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Perhaps they had been celebrating.

Mr. LEADER: I happened to see a letter written by the president of the Scottish Farmers' Union—Mr. Elliott, I believe the gentleman's name is—in which he stated that $160,000,000 was paid for Irish cattle last year. I think that Canada might very well get a share of this trade.

Mr. PUTNAM: I do not think that there is necessarily a difference between the statement of Dr. Grisdale and that of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. LEADER: If there is a difference, it is this, that the deputy did try to persuade the government as late as last December, and the government had cognizance of the fact, that we needed vessels. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture was trying to induce them to get those vessels ready to take care of the trade that would open up this spring.

Mr. PUTNAM: The minister said that they could be utilized. The Minister of Agriculture found out that they could be utilized but at great cost.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Will my hon. friend (Mr. Leader) be good enough to tell us

wherein I was remiss in my duty in this matter? I know he does not want to be unfair.

Mr. LEADER: I have no desire whatever to be disrespectful, for I have every admiration for the Minister of Agriculture; but I rather think that he himself has been playing politics so far as this question is concerned. I see by Hansard that he made the statement that it was owing to the advertising of the number of cattle that we were going to ship overseas that the shipowners put up their rates. Well, if anyone did any boosting it was Mr. Duncan Marshall, the representative of the government, who went over to England and made the statement that at least 200,000 head of cattle would be shipped over this year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Where is your authority for that statement?

Mr. LEADER: It was in the Free Press.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: A bad authority.

Mr. LEADER: I think the Minister of Agriculture should quit playing politics in this matter, should put away all camouflage, and make an honest-to-goodness attempt to foster this great branch of the live stock industry.

I would bring to the attention of the House the question of the recent floods in Manitoba. This is almost an annual occurrence in my constituency, where the Assiniboine river overflows its banks. There have been some delegations here to interview the government and I have been in touch with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King, Kootenay) myself. A telegram was sent to me the other day concerning this matter, which I shall read to the House. It is from the secretary of the Elie branch of the United Farmers:

> A meeting was held to discuss flood conditions on May 12th 1923 at Dacotah Man. of farmers and even in spite of conditions of roads caused by flood the farmers of the district were well represented. After a general discussion of seriousness of flood conditions caused by over-flow of Assiniboine river the following resolution was passed:
>
> "Be it resolved that in view of the immense damage caused on the south side of the Assiniboine river, and this being the second flood in two weeks flooding thousand of acres each time the area covered being at least fifteen miles long and several miles wide, and this being a repetition of last year when land was covered with water after crop was in causing suffering and ruin to farmers, most farmers having to move out for first flood, having feed and seed ruined, then moving back and seeding, and then having the second flood, thousand of acres will not be reseeded this year, and in this instance the flooded condition being over seven miles from the river and this being only fractional part of damages, this meeting urges that the government do something to remedy the situation."

In regard to the condition of affairs out there, I am of the opinion, as I stated last year to the Minister of Public Works of the province of Manitoba as well as to the federal minister, that concerted action should be taken to meet the situation. This is a matter that calls for the consideration of the municipalities, which I think should work in conjunction with the provincial and the federal governments. I believe that they could arrive at some plan of concerted action that would provide adequate measures to cope with this annual difficulty.

I want to say a word in regard to the National Railways, which constitute one of the biggest items of our expenditure. The only solution for our railway problem is more traffic and efficient management. The people are realizing this and are giving the National Railways more and more patronage, while the employees are anxious to give good service so that the railways may pay. Going home a short time ago I fell in with a gentleman who was just coming back from England. I might observe, by the way, that I never miss an opportunity of seeking information in regard to our National Railways, and I got into conversation with this gentleman. He had been in this country for thirteen years and he told me that he was a booster for the Canadian National Railway system. He said that in Great Britain this government, as previous governments had done, was maintaining an immigration office to secure immigrants to Canada. When any immigrant went to the office he inquired how he would travel if he wanted to get to Battleford, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton or any other centre in Canada. The immigration agent would inform him that there were two railway systems in this country, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railway, both first-class. The emigrant goes home and the next day gets a stack of circulars from the Canadian Pacific Railway glorifying that system. Of course, we admire them for this, because they are after the business; but the fact is that the emigrant gets not one word with regard to the Canadian National Railways. I am not criticizing our railways, but I hope that whatever I say in this respect, which is intended for the benefit of the system, will be taken into consideration and be accepted in the proper spirit, and that if there are any irregularities they will be rectified at once. Owing to a slight accident on the road we were three hours late getting into Winnipeg. This man had his wife and two daughters and an aged mother, eighty years old, whom he went to England to bring out to this coun-

try. We had to be transferred from the train we were on to another train over about a quarter of a mile of rocky country, and it will be readily understood what a trial this was for the aged lady. We were three hours late arriving at Winnipeg. The conductor of the train told these good people that as they were billed right through to Vancouver they would not have to be transferred to another car in Winnipeg and could go to bed. Arriving in Winnipeg orders were given to transfer them to another car, and this old lady, who had been in bed about two and a half hours, had again to be disturbed. There was another woman with three small children of four years, two years and three months respectively, and these, too, had to be transferred to another car. The confusion may be imagined.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will my hon. friend give me the date?

Mr. LEADER: It would be a week ago Sunday night. What I am trying to get at is that people will patronize the road that gives them service. When this man arrived in Winnipeg, he said, "I have been a booster for the Canadian National System, but I have been sold." He did not go so far as to say he was through with the system, but he was evidently very much disgusted. The conductors were not to blame, it was some one higher up. I do not want to get anyone into trouble, but I am anxious to see our railways given a fair chance. Some of the passengers on that train inquired if they had time to go down to a restaurant to get something to eat, and they were advised by some of the officials that the train would be despatched as soon as possible. They waited for a time, and then they were informed that it would not go out until twelve o'clock. When they got down to the restaurant they found it closed.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Montreal restaurant of the Grand Trunk closes at midnight.

Mr. LEADER: Perhaps that is customary; anyway it was not conducive to a good frame of mind among these people. I find the equipment of the Canadian National Railway is just as good as that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the employees are just as anxious as their rivals to make everyone comfortable. In a word they are trying to get business for the people's system. And I believe that the people in general are beginning to realize that they must patronize their own road if they ever expect to have it on a paying basis. We admire the Canadian Pacific Railway, but we have got to give the public just as good service on our national system if we are going to get their patronage. I went to the trouble of finding out how many cattle have been shipped from Winnipeg since the British embargo was lifted, and how they were routed. I found that over twelve hundred were transported by the Canadian Pacific Railway and around nine hundred by the Canadian National. The Canadian Pacific are getting the business. I was told by a man who claimed he knew the facts that twenty-five carloads of Canadian cattle that should have been shipped over the Canadian National Railway were switched at the last moment to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Winnipeg. I am offering these criticisms not to knock our national railway, but to build up the system and see if we cannot convert these deficits into surpluses.

What I have now to say will interest the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). Does he remember Riley's army? This has a vital connection with the revenue of our railways. Some members of the government have stated they are not in favour of public ownership, while other ministers have said, "We are willing to give public ownership of our railways a trial. It is a legacy bequeathed to us by the previous government, and we will do our best with it." Well, last year Riley's army marched down to Ottawa. They were transported back to Toronto not over the Canadian National Railway but over the Canadian Pacific. The Minister of Labour will correct me if I am wrong, but I understand a special train from Ottawa to Toronto costs $800.

Mr. MURDOCK: The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. LEADER: Can you tell me how much a special train costs?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think 150 minimum fares; but every passenger would have to pay the minimum fare, which, as I recall, was $7.85. That is what was paid by the government for transporting Riley's army back to Toronto.

Mr. LEADER: Am I right in saying that the amount paid the Canadian Pacific Railway was $1,428?

Mr. MURDOCK: I forget the exact figure. The question was answered in the House and the information appears in Hansard. There was a very substantial reason for sending Riley's army back to Toronto by the Canadian Pacific Railway—a reason which I am sure the hon. member would admit to be ample if he knew the facts.

Mr. LEADER: The point I want to make is that this money was paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway when it might have gone into the revenues of the people's railway. This system should pay very shortly if we all

do our duty by it. We hear quite a lot about government interference with the management of the Canadian National Railways, but I do not see how we can give Sir Henry Thornton a free hand so long as we are footing the bill. That is why I am addressing these remarks to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), who I hope will take them into consideration and see if he cannot prevent the repetition of such mistakes. Other matters have come under my personal observation, but I do not deem it wise to make them public here to-night. However, I shall be very pleased to have an interview with the minister and convey this further information to him with a view to getting things fixed up.

What I am about to say now will not be very popular. In view of the fact that our public debt was increased nearly fifty million dollars this year, and is very likely to be increased to about the same extent next year, I want to declare that the government plea for economy is not sincere. I will tell you why. I introduced a resolution some time ago, and hon. members know with what favour it was met. I do not say that opposition came all from the other side of the House. But I do know that the government are creating new offices and paying out high salaries, and if they were honestly anxious to economize they would not do this. I need mention only two specific cases—Mr. Duncan Marshall's appointment at a salary of $6,000 a year and expenses of $15 a day; and Dr. Pugsley's at a salary of $9,000 a year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I correct the hon. gentleman? I think he will find that the Hon. Dr. Pugsley's salary is not paid by the people of Canada.

Mr. LEADER: Then I do not know from what other source it can come.

Mr. GRAHAM: Alien enemies' property.

Mr. LEADER: I had quite an experience when I introduced my resolution for the reduction of indemnities and I am convinced that it is no use for a private member to introduce such a resolution. Economies along these lines must come from the government; they must have the endorsation of the government. Yesterday a Conservative member—I forget his name—and to-night the hon. member for St. Lawrence division (Mr. Marler), suggested that there was too much extravagance in the administration of the affairs of the country. The hon. member to my right declared that there were three or four cabinet ministers absent during the session at the very time their presence was needed in Ottawa, if it was ever needed here. But you are getting along quite well, and I think you can do it always. The United States only has ten cabinet ministers, and I do not believe they are a bit better than you people are. I think we could get along here with ten, too.

Mr. MURDOCK: My understanding is that the United States cabinet ministers do not have to attend sessions of congress until one o'clock in the morning.

Mr. LEADER: I am going to draw my remarks to a close—and perhaps that is the most popular thing I have said to-night. I want to say frankly that I met most of the ministers for the first time since coming here; I have had personal dealings with them, and they have always treated me with courtesy and have been willing to do anything they could for me. But I think we have too many of them; that is the only fault I have to find with them.

Mr. MURDOCK: Where would you start trimming?

Mr. LEADER: It might not be nice to say—you heard what the hon. member to my right said. While others have congratulated the Minister of Finance I would rather extend my congratulations to the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) who has shown by his speech and actions to-night that political morality is not dead.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is the matter with the rest of us morally?

Mr. LEADER: I would like to congratulate the Manitoba Free Press, that journal that the Minister of Agriculture seems to take exception to. I want to congratulate the manager, whoever is in charge—I do not know who is. There was a time when I was not in sympathy with the doctrines taught by the Free Press or with the men who guided its policy. I understand that Sir Clifford Sifton is still guiding the destinies of the Free Press, and I want to take this opportunity of congratulating him for the stand he is taking for the common people of this country.

Canada, in common with other countries, is crying out for honest men to guide and guard her destiny, and that destiny is what God meant it to be—a great free British commonwealth, inhabited by a prosperous and contented people.

On motion of Mr. Casgrain the debate was adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 105, respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 154 (from the Senate), to incorporate Trans-Continental Assurance Company.—Mr. Carroll.

Bill No. 155 (from the Senate), to incorporate National Surety Company of Canada.—Mr. Mitchell.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 171 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Teague.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 172 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth McKinley.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 173 (from the Senate), for the relief of Algernon Cecil Aubry Moran.—Mr. Baxter.

Bill No. 174 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily Adlene McCausland.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 176 (from the Senate), respecting The Northern Trusts Company.—Mr. Hudson.

Bill No. 177 (from the Senate), respecting The Subsidiary Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 178 (from the Senate), for the relief of Winifred Scatcherd.—Mr. Church.

On motion of Mr. Graham, the House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Wednesday).

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1923

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=First, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negatived. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Live Stock Acts Amdt.

Abbott's Harbour, N.S., breakwater, 4563

Abitibi Region
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Transcontinental railway, 2833

Abolition of Capital Punishment. *See* Capital Punishment

Abolition of Grand Jury system. *See* Grand Jury

Academy of Arts. *See* Royal Academy of Arts

Accidents
Automobile, 3958
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Industrial and other, 3957
Insurance, 3978

Accounts. See Board of Audit Act; Finance

Accredited Herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Acland, Mr. F. A. *See* King's Printer; Printing Bureau

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* National Defence.

Actuarial Computations. *See* Labour, Annuities

Adams, Dr. Frank, the coal situation, 1265

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 9, 34, 54, 75, 99, 122
Mover (Mr. Putnam) 9
Seconder (Mr. Rheaume) 16
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) 65; neg. 178
Amdt. to (Mr. Shaw) 72; neg. 177
Motion agreed to, 179

Address—*Con.*
Speakers, Messrs: Bancroft, 99; Baxter, 132; Black (Yukon) 85; Brown, 47; Carroll, 80; Drayton, 153; Duff, 108; Evans, 145; Fielding, 89; Forke, 34; Graham, 54; Hoey, 63; amdt. 65; Hughes, 123; Kellner, 106; King, Mackenzie, 27; Lewis, 117; Lucas, 75; McConica, 166; McMaster, 172; Martell, 101; Meighen, 17; Millar, 50; Neill, 174; Raymond, 160; Robinson, 72; Shaw, 66; amdt. to amdt., 72; Stewart (Leeds), 169; Stork, 149; Woodsworth, 41

Acknowledgment of by Governor General, 1256

Legislation referred to in, qu. 2612

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration. *See* Government

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Admiralty Act Amdt. Bill (Deputy Local Judges and Deputy Registrars) Res., 1080, 2051; 1r., 2r., com., 2052; com., 3r., 2204

Adulteration of Grain. *See* Grain

Adulteration of Mill Feeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Advertising. *See* Immigration; Labour; Magazines and Periodicals; Press; Publicity

Advisory Council. *See* Research

Advisory Fuel Committee. *See* Fuel Supply.

Advisory Tariff Commission. *See* Tariff

Advocate, N.S., wharf, 4560

Aeronautics, etc. *See* Air.

Aeroplanes. *See* Air; National Defence, Canadian Air Force

After War Conditions, 1231. *See also* War

Agassiz experimental farm. *See* Agriculture

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agricultural Conditions. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Implements. *See also* speeches on Budget; Reciprocity with United States; Treaties, French Treaty
- Comparative prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
- Duties, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff
  - Complaint of, 2863
  - Increased by increased price, 2848, 2975
  - Reduction of, 2743
- Free admission to United States, 3017, 3062, 3499
- French Treaty, 2001, 2246
- Georgia pine, importation for, 3411
- Imports, qu. 617
- Live stock, required to purchase, 1408
- Manufacturing of, 2247
- Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., speech in 1911, 2848, 2974
- Prices, 2836, 2991, 3070. *See also that title*
  - Comparison with United States, 2739
- Standardization, 789, 805
- Stumping machines, duty, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
- Taxation of, 1850
- Wheat, bushels required to purchase, 1912 and 1922, 1408

Agricultural Institute. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Instruction Act. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Farmers; Immigration; Labour

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration
- Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals
- Agricultural conditions, 641, 1165, 1189, 1190, 1192, 1196, 1201, 1231, 1357, 1398, 1402, 1407, 1423, 1438, 1841-47, 1880, 2797, 2810, 2815, 2829, 2830, 2861, 2872, 2928, 2961, 3002, 4038. *See also* Western Provinces
  - Aird, Sir John, 1407
  - "Calamity howlers", 2928, 2977

Agriculture—*Con.*
- Agricultural Conditions—*Con.*
  - Canada generally, 2763
  - Farmers' profits, 2873
  - Financing. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits
  - Great Britain in. *See that title*
  - Interest rates 2962
  - Larcombe, Mr. Samuel, statement, 2873
  - Parliament difficult to convince, 2730
  - Past and present price comparison, 2978
  - Pioneering, 2870
  - Prince Edward Island, 2972
  - Production costs and prices, 2835
  - Special Committee
    - Appointed, 706
    - Bradshaw Mr. Thomas, statement, 2829
    - Evidence, 2972
    - Inquiry as to, 667
    - Leave to report, 911
    - Leitch Prof., dairying industry, 1843, 1845, 1851, 1858
    - Oleomargarine, 3271
    - Railway and shipping combine, 1395
    - Reports qu. 2612
      - First, 911
      - Second, 986
      - Third, 1136
        - M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 1209
      - Fourth, 2127. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
        - Interim, printing, 2181
      - Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh
        - M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 4295, 4363
      - Fifth, 4007
      - Sixth and Seventh 4075
    - Tariff Commmission evidence, 2296
    - United States. *See that title*
    - Western provinces 1885, 2845. *See also that title*
- Agricultural Credits. *See* Credits
- Agricultural education 2869
- Agricultural exports, 1904. *See also* Imports and Exports
- Agricultural fairs. *See also* Exhibitions
  - Horse-racing, 726, 750
- Agricultural Instruction Act, 3315. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
  - Grant 607
  - Renewal of, qu. 490
- Agricultural lands, 1344. *See also* Immigration; Lands
- Agricultural loans. *See* Credits
- Agricultural products 1857, 2716
  - Beans, 2981
  - Distribution, 1852, 2868

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Products—*Con.*
Duties on, qu. 1992
Comparison with United States, 2958
Reduction by order in council 2650
United States tariff against 2649, 2650
Exports, 1390, 1838, 3061. *See also* Imports and Exports
Freight rates, 3195. *See also that title*
French treaty, 1978, 2006, 2247. *See also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports, 445, qu. 617, 2708, 2917, 2958, *See also* Imports and Exports; United States
United States from, 1249
Markets, 1410, 1414, 2869, 3066, 4027. *See also* Markets; Treaties, French Treaty
Competitive, 1804
Disorganized, 2861
France, 2235
Great Britain, 1905, 2714
Marketing agent in, 4675
Home market fallacy, 2849
Marketing and quality, live stock, 2862 *See also* Live Stock.
Prices, 1168, 2731, 2748, 2861, 2928, 3018, 3069. *See also* Prices
Europe in, 1052
Manufactured products and, 1083, 1407, 1851, 1885, 1907
Production cost, 1858
United States, 2810, 2910. *See also that title*
Agricultural representative in Great Britain, 3291
Agriculture and Colonization Committee
Changes in personnel, 2926, 3261
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3266
Reports
First, 666, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Assistance to, 2947, 3237. *See also* Bounties
Bacon production. *See* Bacon
Bacteriology, 462
Bad farming, 1887, 2809, 2810, 2812
Banking system and, 4014. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill; Banks and Banking; Credits; speeches on Budget
Bee-keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Biological laboratories, 580
Bonus, 3239
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Agriculture—*Con.*
British Columbia, increased production, 1432
Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
Canadian Council of. *See that title*
Cereals, milling and baking test, 463
Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
Combines and, 2786, 2787. *See also* Combines
Commissioner. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See under this title,* Agriculture and Colonization
Conditions. *See under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Co-operation, 1400, 1852, 2869. *See also* Co-operation; Markets
Dairying Industry. *See that title*
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Department
Commissioner of. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Cook, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
Deputy Minister, 2065
Salary, 611, 4669
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Dryden, Mr. W. A., qu. 384
Trip to South America, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705
Employees, 815
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3303, 3988, 4074
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See that title.*
Officials attending fairs, 285
Salaries and contingencies 610, 3303
Seed branch, 4621
Staff, 2756
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179
Depression in, 1083, 1889. *See also* Immigration, and *under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Destructive Insect and Pest Act
Administration, 595, 3988. *See also,* Insect Pests
Diseases of Animals. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Economic organization, 1857, 1858, 1863
Eggs. *See that title*
Entomological branch 3988
Forest destruction by insects, qu. 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Experimental and illustration farms, 456, 3237
Agassiz, 457
Botany, division, forest destruction, 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Brandon, 457, 459
British Columbia, 458

Agriculture—*Con.*
Experimental Farms—*Con.*
Buildings, 4629
Cap Rouge, 459
Central, Ottawa, 456, 465, 485, 2869
Buildings, 4631
Charlottetown, 460, 470
Fredericton, 460, 471
Grain, new varieties, 483
Harrow, 466
Indian Head, 459, 472
Irrigation, Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
Kapuskasing, 459
Kentville, 460
Lacombe, 458, 471
La Ferme, Quebec, 471
Lennoxville, 460
Lethbridge, 458
Livestock, 460-485. *See also that title*
Nappan, 457, 460
Dairy herd, experiment with, 2863
Morden, 459
M. (Mr. Leader) to reduce appropriation, neg. 486
Overlapping, 4633
Publicity, 463, 470
Rosthern, 460
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, 460, qu. 1028
Scott, 458
Summerland, 464
Swift Current, 458
Farm credits, 1088, 2869, *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm homes, 1215. *See also* Housing
Farm labour, 1166 ,1174, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Immigration; Labour
Competition with protected industries, 2731
Demand for, 1168
Immigration of, 1100
Farm loans and mortgages, 170-1, 2763, 2962, 4041. *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm products. *See under this title* Agricultural Products
Farm women, 1844
Farmers. *See also that title*
City man and, 2869
Earnings, 2813, 3023
In parliament, 2787. *See also* Progressive party
National policy, 2917
Feeding Stuffs, adulteration. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Fertilizers. *See that title*
Field crops, 1889, 2861
Competitions, 600, 602
Production of, 2846
Value, 2845, 2934

Agriculture—*Con.*
Forage plants, 463
Free land available for settlement, 1087
French treaty, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Fruit. *See that title*
Grain-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grants to provinces, qu. 490
Grasshoppers, 2774. *See also under this title*, Destructive Insects; Insect pests
Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock
Hudson Bay region, possibilities of, 1065
Immigration and, 1186, 1228. *See also* Immigration
Income tax. *See also* Taxation
Agricultural forms, 4498
Payments by farmers, qu. 1259
Insect pests and fungus diseases, 2774. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Insect Pests
Interest rates in western Canada, 1088. *See also* Bank Act; Budget speeches; Credits
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Land. *See also* Dominion Lands; Lands
Along national railways, price, 1087
Sale of in western provinces. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Live stock. *See that title*
Maritime provinces, conditions in, 1132
Markets. *See under this title* Agricultural Products; *also* Markets
Methods, 3071
Mixed farming, 2747, 2772, 2862, 2953
National policy and, 2786
Needs of, 3065
Noble Foundation farm, 2813
Noxious weeds, 1887, 1888, 2305. *See also* Seed
Organizations, 2976
Plant pathology, 463
"Plutocrats and profiteers," burden of, 1417-18
Poor farming, allegation of. *See under this title* Bad farming
Potatoes. *See* Vegetables
Production, cost of, 640, 1190, 1410
Profitable lines of, 2862
Publications. *See* Government Publications
Review of. *See under this title* Experimental Farms
Sacrifices, 3065
Seed. *See that title*
Seed testing. *See* Seed
Single-crop farming, 2862
Specialized, 2763
Stability, 3068

Agriculture—*Con.*
Tariff and, 1355. *See also* Budget; Tariff
Two ministers of, 3313
Votes for, 3237
Wages of farm labourers. *See* Labour
Weed menace, 1887, 1888, 2305
Wheat-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Air Board, annual report, 4510

Air Force. *See* National Defence

Air Service. *See also* Canadian Air Force, under National Defence
Destructive insects and pests, control of, 597
Forest patrol. *See* Forests and Forestry

Aird, Sir John
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Prices, agricultural implements and farm products, 1409

Alaskan, steamship, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330

Alberta. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 1435, 1438, 2766. *See also* Agriculture; Freight Rates; Immigration
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045, 4048
Bituminous sands, 3198
Butter shipments to China, 1840
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal, 790, 1262, 1265, 1275, 1281, 1282, 4692. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Consumption in Ontario, 1276
Freight rates on, 1280, 2781, 2828
Mines, 3424
Crown lands, revenue from, qu. 2515
Dairying industry, 1839, 1851, 2766
Production 1921, 2774
Destitution, 1440
Dominion forest reserves, 1256, 2061
Dredging, 1012
Farms, abandoned, 67
Freight rates, 1957, 1958. *See also that title*
Grain production, 1435
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Hemp production, 2780. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Highways. *See* Canada Highways bill;
Immigration, 1476. *See also that title*
Indians, 2145
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Iron ore, 2512
Irrigation, 1436, 3428
Liberal Convention, 2995

Alberta—*Con.*
Mixed farming, 2772
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Oil, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling, 2508
Prospecting and developing, 780
Political patronage, 522
Privy Council decision, 2559
Public buildings, 1023
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1155
Settlers' relief, 3447
Tax sales, 4062
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tourist traffic, 3438
United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 1440
Vermilion, town lots, qu. 489, 1307, 2417

Alcohol, denatured. *See* Inland Revenue

Alderson Claim. *See* Live Stock

Alfred peat plant. *See* Fuel Supply.

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Naturalization Act Amdt.
Convicted, deportation of, 2123
Enemies.
Citizenship, 1380
Immigration, restriction of, 1128. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Property, 2499. *See also* War Claims
Claim of Canada against United States, 2496, 3823
Custodian of, qu. 1486
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointed as Commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Securities held by United States custodian, 2496

Alliances, Political. *See also* speeches on Budget; Political Parties
Liberals and Conservatives on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245

Alpine Club grant, 3414, 3444, 3954

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminium Company of America, Massena plant, 659

Ambassador, British, at Washington. *See* British Ambassador; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Ambassador to United States. *See* Canadian Representation

Amendments. *See* House of Commons

American Bank Note Company, postage stamps, printing, 1818

Americanization. *See* Magazines and Periodicals

Amery, Colonel L. C., 1328
Economic conditions in Great Britain, 1205
West Indies steamship service, 3392

Ammunition. *See* National Defence

Ampthill, Lord, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Analyst, certificate of. *See* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Anchor-Donaldson Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Anderson, Captain, report on Hudson bay, 1042

Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1823

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Brant hospital, closing of, 1995
Budget, 2837. Colourless budget drafted for political effect, 2837; Right Hon. Mr. Fielding; reciprocity; free trader in opposition, protectionist in power; tariff record of Liberal party; the tariff; average rate of duty; National policy, adoption by minister, 2838; Minister of Agriculture convert to protection; revenue tariff and incidental protection; excise and customs duty; cost of living; Minister of Interior convert to protection; tariff a tax; who pays? excise taxation, 2839; sales tax and cost of living; collection of tax on domestic and foreign goods; sales tax increase in and revenue; question as to origin of finished articles, 2740; turnover tax; automobile industry; customs duty and sales tax 52 per cent; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; reported statement of Minister of Finance on North Essex election; tariff stability, 2841; economy; balanced budget; public debt; cost of government; expenditure, rapid increase of; reciprocity; Treaty of 1854, 2842; depression following abrogation; Fordney-McCumber tariff; time inopportune for negotiations; lines of transportation; interprovincial and world trade; trade with British Empire; imports and exports; trade lines running East and West; wheat, market for, 2843; immigration, reported statement of Sir Henry Thornton; Bishop Lloyd, 2844; amendment; a political gesture; Progressive platform; attitude of opposition towards budget; western provinces, conditions in; rural income tax-payers, bank stock shareholder; field crops, value by provinces, 2845

Anderson, Mr. R. K.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 534
Customs officials, Halton county, 914
Dundas street highway, qu. 708
Duties on farm and animal products, qu. 1992
Elevators, Ontario, 2037
French treaty, 455
Highways, grant to Ontario, qu. 620
North Oakville post office, 914
Pensions
Disability entitling to, 679
European war and active militia, 3726
Private abattoirs, 185-6
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 394, 429
Return, inquiry for, 2008
Sales tax on automobiles, qu. 1993, 2841
Soldier Settlement, 2029
Trade and Commerce dept. staff, 2035

Anglo-Canadian commerce. *See* British Preference; Trade

Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449. *See also* Japan.
Restriction of provincial rights 1453

Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426

Angouleme, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Animal Contagious Diseases. *See* Dairying Industry; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
(Compensation for slaughter, reduction of)
Res., 666, 2647; 1r., 2r., com., 2048; com., 2131; 3r., 2138
Sections and subjects discussed:
Abortion infective, 2867
Glanders, 2868
Hog cholera, 2867

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Internal parasites, 2867
Research work, 2867
Tuberculin test 2867
Tuberculosis, 2867
Immunization from, 2866
Watson Dr., chief bacteriologist, 2866

Animals. *See also* Live Stock
Inspection of. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.
Products, duties on, qu. 1992
Wild. *See* National Parks and Reservations
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 597

Annapolis Royal, wharf, 941

Annual Drill. *See* National Defence

Annuities, Old age. *See* Labour; Pensions

Anti-Combines bill. *See* Combines bill

Anti-Dumping. *See* Customs and Excise

Appeal Boards. *See* Pension Act Amdt bill; Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Appeals
Attorney-General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2521
Canada Grain Act 781, 2045
From convictions, inquiry, 4250
Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136
Right of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Yukon Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appointments. See Civil Service

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 103 (Interim Supply—for $44,725,058.25 for 1923-24) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1539
2. Bill No. 202 (Interim Supply—for $46,558,391.58 for 1923-24) Res. 3705; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3706
3. Bill No. 252 (for $18,202,105.66 for 1922-23 and $196,870,229.79 for 1923-24) Res. 4735; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4736

Appropriations set forth in Estimates. *See* Canadian National Railway bills; Estimates

Arbitrators. *See* Judges

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4099
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1503
Belgian Exposition, 496
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Budget, 2879. Income tax, 2879; proposed changes; exemption on account of children; community of property; earned and unearned incomes, 2880; income derived from (a) inheritance, (b) accumulated capital, (c) profession or trade; revenue; dividends, 2881
Business of the House
Questions, as orders for returns, 939
Inquiry for, 3507
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Disposal of scrap material, etc., qu. 1138
Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 528, 567
Civil Service, temporary employees made permanent, qu. 814, 1385
Code Napoleon, 1526, 1558
Contrecœur, wharf, 952
France, reconstruction, 2012
French treaty, 445, 2009, 2262
Grand Trunk, list of shareholders, 940
Greece, loan to, 2010
Imperial conference, 4653
Income tax, exemption for children, M. 1382, 2128, 2880, 4502
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4502
Levis dry dock, 1261
Liberal platform, taxation of luxuries, 2011
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2086, 2640
Return, inquiry for, 3507
Montreal post office
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Political patronage, 528
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Rhineland occupation, qu. 2696
Roumania, loan to, 2010
Trade commissioners, 856

Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290

Architects. *See* Parliament Buildings; Public Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Expeditions, 4012
Correspondence, 814
New ship, purchase of, 4702
Publication of reports, 3360
Wireless stations. *See* Yukon

Argentine Republic, Senate, 1373

Arichat, wharf, qu. 2180

Armouries. *See* National Defence

Army. *See* National Defence

Army and Navy Veterans, petition, 4536

Army Officers, settlement in Canada, 1432

Aronovici, Mr. A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris offices

Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Arsenault, Mr. H. P. *See* House of Commons, Staff

Arthur Young Company. *See* Civil Service

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4509
Budget, 3033. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff platform of 1921; failure to implement; agricultural implement duty; boots and shoes; tariff changes offset by increased sales tax, 3033; cheque and receipt taxes inconvenient and discriminatory; net increase in duties under budget of 1922; budget of 1923 disappointing; British preference; direct importation through Canadian ports; hardship to the woollen industry; sugar duty; raisins and dried currants; scrap iron; paint ingredients, 3034; potato duty; Fordney-McCumber tariff; crude petroleum bounty; cost of living; French treaty; reductions of duties on luxuries, wines and spirits; favoured nation; prohibitionists and wine duty; 3035; sales tax; pyramiding; freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement; railway receipts reduced by $20,000,000; reduction made at expense of shipper; rates on lumber, pulpwood and ties; immigration policy; Canada Colonization Association; differences of opinion amongst Liberal and Progressive members, 3036; "blue ruin" speeches; immigrants from Stornoway; northern Ontario and Quebec; agricultural and business conditions, 3037
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 2179
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4673
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 329
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4560
Housing Act, administration, 2171

Arthurs, Mr. James—*Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2429
Mail carriage by subsidized steamships, 2172
Military hospitals, neurological cases, 696
Murray Stewart, vessel, purchase, 3355
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Pensions commission, report, 2128
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Public buildings, new, 4614
Sales tax, 3033-36, 4181
Soldier Settlement Board, loans, qu. 2207
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Terrebonne public building, 4614
Unemployment relief, 690
Vetcraft shops, 696
Vocational loans, 687
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3355

Artificial Silk. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Textiles, Silk

Artillery. *See* National Defence

Artisans. *See* Immigration; Labour

Arts
Academy of. *See* Royal Academy of Arts
Recognition. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Ascension Day, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Ash Wednesday, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatics. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries; Immigration

Assassination. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Assay Office. *See* Mines and Minerals

Assessors. *See* Judges

Assignments. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Assiniboine River
Encroachments of, 999
Expenditure on dyking, etc., qu. 3264
Floods, 993, 998, 3041

Assisted Passages. *See* Immigration

Astrophysical Observatory, Victoria, 3242

Athabasca, Lake, discovery of iron ore, 2512

Athletics. *See* National Defence, Cadet training; Olympic Games

Atlanta Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Atlantic Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Atlantic Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Halifax; Ports; St. John

Attendance of Members. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2521

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Board of. *See* Board of Audit Act

Auditing. *See* Bank Act; Canadian National Railways

Auditor General. *See also* Board of Audit
Appointment, qu. 2298, 2710, 3307, 3987, 4355, 4512
Payments to temporary postmasters, 1823
Report
Referred to Public Accounts Committee, 434
Tabled, 8
Salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy. *See under this title,* Appointment

Australia
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
British immigration, preference for, 2932
Budget, 2984
Chinese immigration, 2313
Dairying industry, 3297
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Hughes, Premier, statement at Imperial Conference of 1921, 4663
Immigration policy, 1882
Land settlement, 1389
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis
Pearce, Hon. Senator, 1849
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Raisins and currants, duty, 2990, 3017, 3069, 3474
Senate, constitution of, 1370
Tariff shutting out Fiji Islands fruit, 1848
Trade treaty with, 36, 245, 1848, 2815, 2964, 2990, 3069, 3474, 3476
Visit of Minister of Trade and Commerce to, 1849. *See also* Robb
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Austria
Bean-growing industry, 2982
Senate, constitution of, 1371
West Ukrainian Republic. *See that title*

Authors. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill.

Automobiles
Accidents, 3958

Automobiles—*Con.*
Admission fee to national parks, 3942, 3943
Automobile industry, protection, 2841
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Civil servants, and, 1772
Customs and sales taxes, 2841
Duty on, 2908, 3075
Farmers, and, 100, 2812, 2874
Ford car, farmers and, 1466
Ford Motor Company
Organization and efficiency, 2544
Prices, fixing of, 2525
French treaty, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Gasoline
Price, 2547
Short measure, 810
Highways. *See* Canada Highways
Immigration of United States garage owners, 1416
India, shipments to, 508
Insurance, 3147, 3977
Ottawa, in, 2874
Purchase of by instalments, 2874
Railways and, 1619
Sales tax on, qu. 1993, 2841
Saskatchewan in, 82, 148
Taxation, 52%, 2841
Western provinces, 1889

Autonomy. *See* Canada's participation in War; Imperial Conference

Aviation. *See* Air Service

Aylesworth, Sir Allen, decisions. *See* Disallowance

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Bacon. *See also* Live Stock
Bacon industry, 2864
British market, 2864
Canadian, selling price in Great Britain, 1905
Corn-fed, 2865
Danish, 2864, 2865
Grades, 590.
Hog grading, 590
Imports and exports, 938
Pork products, and, 1978
Price of, 2585, 2933
Salty, 3301
Wiltshire sides, 2864

Bait. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Baker, the Late Colonel G. H., M.P.
Memorial to
Special Committee, report, 435, 730, 1256, 1991

Balance of Trade. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Annual training, 875

Baldwin, Mr. W. K.—*Con.*
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1822
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1054
Immigration policy, 1247
Labour, demand for, 1248
Military expenditure, 875
Rural mail service
Carriers, remuneration, 1822
Spur lines, 1826
Tariff protection, 1249
Taxation, increase of, 1822
Woollen industry, 3470

Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824

Baldwin Tinplate Industry, 2819. *See* also Tinplate

Balfour, Colonel N. H. *See* Canadian National Railways

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Roumania

Bamfield, B.C., public building, 1024

Bananas
Production in Fiji Islands, 1848
Trust, 2979

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Address in reply, 99. Mr. Carroll and prosperity of the western farmer, 99-100; farmers and automobiles, 100; condition of the West, 100-101; causes of emigration; mixed farming, 101
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035
Budget, 2736. Liberal tariff policy; amendments moved when in opposition; high cost of living; duties upon necessaries of life; reciprocity; tariff plank chief issue in last election, 2736; rejection of Conservative policy by western provinces; low tariff sentiment; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks almost identical; mandate clear and unmistakable; Tory reactionaries in garb of official Liberalism; tariff; protection responsible for immigration; high prices; reduced purchasing power, 2737; United States largest free trade area in world; per capita customs tax; United States and Canada; prices, comparison of United States and Canada; mail order catalogues, 2738; clothing; sewing machines; paints; agricultural implements; harness, 2739; nails; wire fencing and poultry netting; washing machines; dairy supplies; tools; rubber boots safety razors; prosperity impossible with present production costs; barriers obstructing development of natural industries, 2740
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, 3251
Drawbacks on steel, coal and woollen goods, qu., 1994
Dredging, Grassy Narrows, 1013
Emerson public building, 4628
Grain for exhibition purposes, 1455
Highways, federal grant, 519
Homesteads, improvements, 3251
Indian Affairs, department, salaries, 2165
Indians
Manitoba, 2153
St. Peter's reserve, 2153
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4283
Lake Manitoba, flooding, 999
Masters and mates, 2610
Parliament buildings, Commons chamber, lighting, 1728
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Penitentiaries, 771
Privilege—titles—amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1308
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Royal military college, expenditure, 4628
Rural credit system, 4035
St. Andrew's dam, fishway, 1000
Selkirk wharf, 1000
Shipping combines, 4283
Soldier settlement, 2021
Steamship services, 2173, 2174
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655

Banff National Park, 3434
Calgary Power Company and, 3442, 3750, 3938
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electric plant, 3949
Hotel, 3435
Power privileges, 496, 3750
Water powers, 3420

Banff-Windermere Highway, opening, 3584

Bank Act. *See* also Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Credit; Finance
Revision, 26, 70, 77, 170, 496, 634, 638, 644, 858, 4014, 4035. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget
Alberta legislature, res., 2084
Canadian Council of Agriculture, 255, 4016, 4041, 4045
Proposed extension of charters for twelve months M. (Mr. Spencer) 683, ruled out of order, 643

Bank Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Bank Act; Banks and Banking
Res., 1167, 1310; 1r., 2r., 1314; ref. to

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Com., 1314; com., 4013, 4014, 4077, 4133; 3r., 4162; Senate amdts. 4058
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agency, 4093-8
Agreement of sale, 4138
Amendments to Bank Act, 4052, 4056
Antagonism of financiers and farmers, 4044
Assets, sale to another bank, 4134
Audit, chartered accountants, 1311. *See also under this bill,* Shareholders
Australian Commonwealth bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
Bank charters continued to July 1, 1923, as to some particulars, 4014
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) extending charters for one year 4017, neg. 4075
Amdt. (Mr. Good) to M. for 3r., 4141, neg. 4147
Bank circulation redemption fund continued
Amdt. (Mr. Coote) interest on, neg. 4093
Bank loans, approval by directors, 4098
Bank may sell assets to another bank, 4134
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Bank statements, 4020, 4030, 4047, 4085, 4139
Banking and Commerce Committee
Evidence, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Banking monopoly, 4045, 4047, 4050, 4087 4103, 4157, 4166
Banking system, 4016, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Business and powers of the bank, 4093
Amdt, agency (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4093; withdrawn, 4094
Amdt., insurance, agents for (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4094, neg. 4098
Canadian Bankers' Association, representation before Com. 4058
Cash reserves in Dominion notes, 4091
Centralization, 4079
Circulation, 4092
Security of, 1312
Co-operative banking, 4067
Criticism of the banks, 4039
Currency, 4072
Depreciated, 4027
National, 4048
Definitions, 4014
Delay in 1909, 1910 and 1911, 4033, 4035

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Directors, 1313, 4084
Amdt. (Mr. Good) 4084 neg. 4084
Attendance at meetings, 1313
Qualifications of, 4077
Discount, 4509
Discussion, opportunity for, 4063, 4225
Dividends, 4039, 4121, 4124
Division between East and West, 4040
Divisions
Bank charters, renewal of, amdt. (Mr. Good), 4141, 4147
Interest rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest rate, maximum, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Right of association of officers, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Failures, 1312, 4037
"Fantastic" schemes, 4038
Federal reserve system, 4069
Financial system, re-adjustment of, 4053, 4057
First lien upon seed grain and crop, 4102
First meeting of subscribers, 4075
Gold standard, 4021, 4027, 4047, 4093
Government audit, 4020, 4030, 4087
Government inspection, 1310
"Gramophones" 4058
Hicks, Mr. T., and Merchants Bank, 4059
Industrial conditions, 4054
Insurance, agency, 4093, 4509
Interest at 7 per cent may be charged, 4103
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4105, neg. 4119
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4125, neg. 4131; 4149; neg. 4149
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. on div. 4148
Interest rates, 4119, 4020, 4028, 4047, 4050, 4062, 4065, 4509
Locality and security, 4120
Interlocking directorates, 4022, 4157
Investment bankers, 4157
Liberal and Conservative union, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245
Loans
Live stock, 4103
Officials, to, 1313
Wholesale dealers, 4101
Merchants' Bank investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. on div. 4161
Mergers, 1311, 4031, 4050, 4071, 4072, 4080, 4134

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Money
Nature and function, 4020, 4055
Purchasing power, 4067
Trust, 4026
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4125, 4142
Mortgages and hypothecs of realty and agreement of sale, 4099
Property exempt from seizure, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4099, withdrawn, 4133
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Com. not debatable
Ruling (Mr. Speaker), 4013
National currency, 4048
Notes, issue of, 4092, 4122
Officers
Appointment of, 4048
Right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4084, neg. 4085; 4161, neg. on div. 4161
One vote for each share, 4085
Particulars of act of incorporation, 4075
Pension fund, 1313
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
Price level, stabilization of, 4069
Prices, control of, 4047
Prior claim of bank over unpaid vendor, 4103
Prior liens, 1312
Private bankers, licensing of, 1314
Production and consumption, 4054
Profits, 4121, 4124
Property, 1313
To be sold within certain time, 4101
Protection of the public, 1312
Questionaire and answers, 4062, 4128
Re-discount system, 4081
Returns of interest rates charged, 4119
Revision, postponement of. *See* Bank Act
Rural credits, 4015, 4028, 4035, 4037, 4039, 4041, 4066. *See also* Credits
Shareholders' audit, 1311, 4037, 4087
Auditors to report to Minister, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4090, neg. 4091
Government audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 4090
Short title, 4014
Small banks, 4077
Stability, 4078
Statement of liabilities, assets, etc., 4085
Stock, allotment of, 1312
Taxes, refusal to pay, 4099
"Unholy alliance," 4031
United Farmers of Ontario, co-operative stores, 4068
Unpaid vendor, 4509
Warehouse receipts and bills of lading, 4101
Weyburn Security bank, 4509. *See also* Banks and Banking

Banking and Commerce Committee
Bank Act, proceedings, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Inquiry by, 2937
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Members in attendance at, 2167, 2171
Personnel, 2639, 2926, 3261
Reports
Inquiry, 2612
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Rural credits, 2929. *See also* Credits
Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Bankruptcy
Farmers, 1412. *See also* Credits
Number of failures, 648

Bankruptcy Act. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.
Administration, 780
Amendment or abrogation, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1490, withdrawn 1528
Assignments
Preliminary expense, 1412
Since 1916, 1495
Galipeault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Girouard, Judge, law of 1864, 1497
Perrault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Taschereau, Hon. L. A. 1499
Assignments, 1916-1922, qu. 937

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Trustees; custodian; sales of property; landlord's privileges; examination of debtor; composition; discharge of trustees; claim of wife; examination of relatives; distribution between assignment and composition; doubt as to interpretation)
1r., 2252-2253; 2r., 3085-3091; com. 3091, 3209; 3r., 3222; Senate amendments, 4201
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Abstract of receipts and disbursements, 3116
Application by trustee for discharge, 3116
Assignment
Authorized, 3106
For general benefit of creditors, 3110

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Assignment—*Con.*
Form of, 3110
Bankruptcy proceedings, cost of, 3090
British North America Act, 3095
Canadian Credit Men's Association, 3088, 3093
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 3093
Commencement of act, 3127
Composition, extension or scheme of arrangement, 3110, 3209
Debtor
Conditional discharge, powers of court, 3125
Description of property, 3115
Discharge of, 3086
Examination of, 3124
Examination of bankrupt by official receiver, 3121
Farmers, 3211
Claims of, 3214
Fees of attorney and trustees, 3087, 3090
Hypothecated immovable property, sales of, 3114
Jurisdiction, 3095
Landlords, claim of, 3086
Marriage settlement, 3087
Married woman, claim, 3087, 3121
Meetings of creditors, 3117
Objections to, statement, 3098
Officer to be assigned to duty by Chief Justice, 3126, 3220
Official receivers, 3087
Petitioning creditor secured, 3108
Priority of claim, 3214
Proof of debt, 3119
Publication of notice, etc., 3110
Quebec, sales in, 3114
Release of security, 3116
Remedy of creditor against property, 3109
Repeal of, 3091
Right of manufacture, 3114
Secured creditor to value security, 3119
Security to be furnished by trustee, 3111
Short title, 3091
Stay of proceedings, 3109
Tariff of costs and fees, 3126
Trustees, 1412, 3088, 3113, 3210
Remuneration of, 3116
Vestment of property in, 3109
Voting by proxy, 3119
Wife's claim, 3087, 3121

Banks and Banking. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Advances to chartered banks, 4249, 4408. *See also* Finance Act Amdt. bill
Agricultural credits. *See* Credits, Rural
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Bank Note Act, 4093
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank of Commerce
Aird, Sir John, 1407
Domestic debts, 1343
Overgovernment and taxation, 1391
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1409
Bank clearings, increase of, 3055
Bank directors dominating industrial and commercial affairs, 4022
Bank draft tax, 3925
Bank notes
Bank Note Act, 4093
Issues, 4408
Substitution for national notes, 4408
Bank returns
False, 4030
M. (Mr. Coote) 3264
Bank robberies, 776
Bank statements, 4020, 4047
Banking system, 634, 4016, 4017, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Borrowings, 4030
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Capital, control of, 4026. *See also* capital
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739, 4406
Circulation
"Bank specials" 1739
Security of, 1312
Combinations, 2578, 4083
Commission on banking and credit, 2929
Cost of living and, 1409
Credits. *See also that title*
Control, 631, 2725
Financial machinery, control of, 2725
Monopoly, 2725
System, 1252
Dividends, 4121, 4124
Dollar, stabilizing of, 4666
Dominion Bank, statement as to economic conditions, 1394
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Employees, married, 4084
Farmers' bank, 4034
Farmers
Credits. *See* Credits
Pressure on, 1202
Shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Treatment of, 2929
Federal jurisdiction, 2592
Federal reserve bank, 4067
Financial influence in parliament, 2733
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Gold, percentage of national wealth, 2720

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Government audit, 4020
Hail insurance, 4509
Immigration and, 1133, 4042
Interest rates, 635, 2812, 2962, 4020
Western Canada, 1088, 1440
Interlocking directorates, 636, 4022, 4157
Legislation, 3060. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Lobbyists, 4029
Merchants' Bank, 70, 1310, 3990, 4020, 4025, 4028, 4029, 4031, 4034, 4036, 4042, 4047, 4049, 4057, 4058, 4066, 4087, 4139, 4145, 4150, 4297
Government action, 2576
Investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Proposed resolution, 4068, 4069
Merger with Bank of Montreal, 4031
Mergers, 1311, 4019, 4031, 4134. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Money. *See also* Credits; Money
Nature and function, 4020
Origin and meaning of exchange, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 4666
Monopoly, 636, 4018
Montreal, Bank of
Directorships, 4022-25
Merchants' Bank merger, 4031
Statement of agricultural exports, 1390
National City bank, bulletin on potatoes, 2820
National Land bank, 4366
Nationalization of banking system, 2728
Northern Crown bank, 4080
Note issues, 4405. *See also under this title,* Bank notes
Nova Scotia, Bank of, 4079
Officers, right to organize, 4084, 4161
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Ottawa, Bank of, 4081
Payments in bank notes instead of gold, 4249
Penny Bank of Toronto. *See that title*
Profits, 1209, 4121, 4124. *See also under this title,* Dividends
Promissory notes, taxation, 3923
Quebec savings bank, 4183, 4392, 4405
Rural bank shareholders, 2846
Rural credits. *See* Credit
Salaries and wages, 4084
Savings deposits, increase of, 3055
Security market and, 4157
Small banks, establishment of, 4019

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Toronto, Bank of
Gooderham, President, debt, aggregate and per capita, 2721
Union Bank, position of, 4225, 4250, 4272
M. (Mr. Forke) to adjourn the House to consider, 4296; withdrawn, 4300
United States Federal Reserve bank, 3059, 4106, 4407
Universities and educational institutions, 4025, 4073
Vancouver, Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Weyburn Security bank, 2813, 4081, 4122, 4509
Widows and orphans, stockholders, 2743

Banting, Dr. F. G., discoverer of insulin, 703, 1285-1287
Annuity, 4645, 4676
Expression of nation's gratitude, 4437
Patenting of insulin, 2077

Barnardo, Dr., child immigration. *See* Immigration, Child

Barnhill, Mr., 60

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D. *See* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry

Barrow, Hon. E. D., Asiatic immigration, 1900

Bartlett, Captain, Hudson Bay railway, 1017

Basic Industries. *See* Industries

Battlefields Memorials. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic sites; Martell; Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge Memorial

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 132. Necessity for economizing time of session, 132; Mr. Hoey's speech, 133; government ownership of railways, 133-134; Sir Henry Thornton, 134; national railways and political patronage; regional administration of Canadian National Railways, 135; Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136; sectionalism; potato-growers and grain growers, 136; freight rates on potatoes, 137-138; lumber rates on; Canadian ports, development, 139; the Conservative party in Quebec, 140; achievements of government; Near East crisis; Imperial centralization, 141; League of Nations; amdt. and sub-amdt.; amdt. of Mr. Fielding in 1921, 142; standard of living, 143; waste of time in legislating, 144
Automobiles, insurance, 3977

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-3127, 3220
Banks, federal jurisdiction, 2592
Belle River harbour, 4607
Board of Commerce Act, 2590
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3500
Boulay, Mlle., postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750
British North America Act, amendment of, 2592
British preference, limitation to Canadian ports, 1757, 2678
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act amdt. bill, 3973
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3377
Canadian National Railways
Advances
Additional amount, 3376
$73,000,000, 3629
Branch lines construction bill, 4304
Express and electric lines bill, 2481
Management, responsibility and powers, 3638, 3697
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 3197
Paris offices, 3637, 3697
Providence, R. I., building, 1755
St. John
Station, 3645
Train shed, 3188
Terminals
Atlantic division, qu. 1363
Maritime regions, qu. 1662
United States, 1755
Toronto office building, 3629
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3955, 3960
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Combines bill, 2589
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2590
Privy Council decisions, 2590
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4210-4217
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Criminal Code, combines clause, 2592
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2362
Distressed seamen, 3974
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Exchequer Court, judgeship, 2499
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4350
False Creek bridge, 3375
Freight rates, Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136, 3239
French Treaty bill, 2243
Fuel supply, 803

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Government publications, waste, 1734
Grain and grain trade
Shipments from Portland, St. John and Halifax, qu. 1484
Shipping rates on, 2517
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick wharves transferred to Dominion govt. 947
Nova Scotia, 942, 4566
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Historic sites, 3407
Hoppe leases, 3128
Hudson Bay railway, construction vote, 4683, 4685
Immigration
Maritime provinces and, 1131
Policy, 1130-32
Immigration Act Amdt, bill, 2430
Exclusion, 2436
Ship's crews, 2435
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4497
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt, bill, 3977
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Lake Grain Rates inquiry, 247
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4173, 4178
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Lumber, sales tax, 3181, 4418
Marine dept. salaries, 3373
Maritime provinces, secession, 1757, 2245
Martello tower, St. John, 3444
Matapedia bridge, repairs, qu. 4184
Motion, increasing taxation, 3936
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2110, 2196, 2437 2462, 3984
British system, 2438
Consolidation of the law, 2437
Judges, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Negro Point breakwater, 4587
Official report of debates, abolition of, 1734
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Penitentiaries, 774
Petition of Right Act Amdt bill, 3128
Pilots, pensions, 3359
Preston, W. T. R., Mr., qu. 206, 247
Printing bureau new building, 1733, 1737
Public buildings, renting or building, 1734
Public ownership, 3640
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4350
Railway Commission, 3188
Railways, surveys and inspections, 3648

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Registration of ships purchased from foreigners, 3973
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. John
Harbour improvements, 2676
Station and train shed, 3188, 3645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4418
Salmon river protection work, 946
Secession, Nova Scotia 1757, 2245
Shipping combines, statement in Toronto Globe qu. 1362
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3374
Steamship services, 3397
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies, 3390
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Wheat board, 2592

Bay of Fundy, icebreakers, 2615

Bayfield, Ont., pier, 981

Bean-Growing Industry, competition from abroad, 2981

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of the C.P.R.
Appointment as President, 373
Bank director, 4024
Immigration 1337-8

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Assiniboine river, flooding 998
Auditor General, appointment, qu. 2298
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2414
Drainage, 3257
Grain dockage, 783
Grand Trunk arbitration, payments to Hon. Howard G. Taft, qu. 1157
Immigration
Empire settlement scheme, 1461
Policy, 1461
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1092
Indians, St. Pie reserve, fencing, 2154
Lake Grain Rates bill 4285
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 299, 305
Political patronage, 3348
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Public Works expenditure, Manitoba, 998
Sawdust pollution of rivers and streams, 3364
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655
Wheat, grading of, 305

Beck, Sir Adam. *See* Hydro Electric Power.

Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, qu. 283, 816

Bee-Keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675

Beef. *See* Live stock; Meats

Beer. *See* Liquor.

Beet Sugar. *See* Sugar.

Behring Sea Fisheries. *See* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

Beland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 704, 4438
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Business of the House, 3750
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates, time of presentation, 4703
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4565
Health, Department of
Estimates, 2167, 2170
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Quarantine stations
Grosse Isle, 2168
St. John, 4614
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Leprosy, treatment of, 702
Pharmaceutical preparations, 3261
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Venereal diseases, 705
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Insulin treatment for diabetes, 704
Maple products industry, 1810
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Medical advisory boards, 677, 697
Medical inspection of immigrants, 702
Meighen, Right Hon., alleged speech in North Essex, 670, 708
Military hospitals, 670
Mental cases, 671
Neurological cases, 696
Nursing hospitals, 686
Motions, opportunity to speak to, 3583
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 1136, 2114, 2116, 2124
Deportation of convicted alien, 2123

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 698, 3149. *See also under this title,* Narcotic Drugs
Prosecutions, 698
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401, 3748, 3848-85
District appeal boards, 4703
Senate amdts. 4744
Pension regulations, review of, 3851
Pensions
Appeal boards, 677, 681, 697, 4703
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166 3706, 3718, 3735
Fenian raid and Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, Board of
Interpretation of act, 2640
Report, 4736
Salaries, etc., 2168, 3742
Royal Commission, 288
Recommendations, legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 2983, 3400
Reports
First, interim, on second part of investigation, 1631, 2166, 2167, 2926
Printing, 1992, 2128, 2983
Opportunity for discussion, 674
Printing, 3401
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Printing bureau, new building, M. to reduce item, 1730
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Public buildings, new, departmental, 1729
Redistribution committee report, 4736
Returned soldiers, emigration to United States, 691
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3582, 3743, 3892, 4734, 4751
St. John river, pollution of, 701
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Department
Estimates, 668, 2166, 2168
Expenditure, 3893
Reduction of, 2032
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Vancouver employees, 3085, 3822
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Hospitals, Brant House and Euclid Hall, closing, 1995, 4075
Interest on war service gratuity, 689
Operating expenses, etc., 690
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment relief, 690, 695
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3648, 3745, 3892, 4750
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4727

Belanger, Mr. U., agent at St. Moise, 1489

Belgium. *See also* Germany Reparations
Belgian exposition, 496
Butter, export to, 2217
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration from, 1085, 1096, 1173. *See also* Immigration
Imports and exports, 1977
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with, 246

Bell, the late Dr. Alexander Graham, contributions to scientific knowledge, 1287

Bell, Major Graham A. *See* Railways and Canals

Bell, the late Dr. Robert, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Belle River Harbour, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610

Belleville harbour commissioners, qu. 490

Belloc, Mr. Hilaire, European situation, 1231

Benoit, Mr. A. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, Mr. H. Milburn, qu. 1138
Grand Trunk arbitration
Doherty, Right Hon. Charles J., pension, qu. 1029
Purchase, arbitrators, fees, profit and loss, qu. 1257
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029; qu. 1661
Introduction of, 3
Judges
Pensions, qu. 492
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Metric system, qu. 914
Welland canal, towing, qu. 4132

Bernasconi, Mr., report of, 4723

Berne Convention. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Patents of Invention bill

Bernier, Captain. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Berry Containers. *See* Fruit

Best, Mr. C. H., associate of Dr. Banting, 703, 4439

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Betting
Tax on in Great Britain, 2824

Beverages, tax on, 2979, 3046. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206

Big Bay Point, wharf, 981

Big Interests. *See also* Combines bill
Political parties and, 2856, 3070

Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C. *See* Canadian National Railways

Bill of Exchange. *See* Taxation

Bill of Rights. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills, *See* their individual titles
For Private Bills. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Bilodeau, Mr. Jean, qu. 1487

Binder Twine, 2780
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Duty removal of, 2965, 4379
Imports and exports, 2965
Industry
Discrimination, 2964
History of, 2965
Manufacture, amendment of act respecting, 3231
Prices and abolition of duty, 2965, 4379
Production in Canada, 2780

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Bindings. *See* Books; Public Libraries

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Hawkesbury government offices, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Judges' salaries, qu. 491
Ottawa river, Pointe Fortune water power, qu. 1974.
Peat investigation at Alfred, qu. 1487

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Biological Board Act Amdt. Bill (Representation of Marine and Fisheries department and fishing industries)
Res., 1r., 3820; 2r., com., 3974; 3r., 3974

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Agricultural conditions, 1861
Agriculture, economic organization, 1863

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4029, 4150
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. 4150, neg. 4161
Point of order, interruptions, 4064
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, 4013
Bright, John, free trade in Great Britain, 3051
Budget, 2787. Minister of Agriculture and Moose Jaw election; speech of Mr. Raymond; tariff stability, 2787; taxation, experiments in perpetuation of crude methods; income tax, costly and inequitably graduated; well-to-do not bearing fair share; unearned and earned incomes; war profits; inheritance tax, 2788; business profits tax; sales tax; luxury tax; taxation, indirect; taxing the consumer; necessities of life, taxation of; apportionment of taxes in Great Britain, 2789; emigration to the United States; Winnipeg *Free Press,* statement of; Minister of Agriculture and Free Press; Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, reported statement as to emigration in New York *Tribune,* 2790; taxation and immigration; agriculture pushed into background by industrialism; governmental neglect of the farmer; world organization of farmers; National Farmers' Union of Great Britain; Farmers' Bloc in United States; Progressive Party in Canada, 2791; future of farmers' organizations; principle of protection; no difference between Tory and Liberal budgets; tariff variation not over two and a half per cent; 2792; the Big-endians and the Little-endians, two parties but one policy; total of tariff taxation for 50 years; tribute to Minister of Finance; violation of pledges by Liberal party; Progressive party, policy, 2793; political ideals; patriotism and love of country, a transformed country-side; Mr. Fielding's budget speeches past and future, 2794
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4688
Civil Service, deputy ministers, 368
Combines bill, 2625
Crowsnest pass agreement, Progressives and, 2855
Drainage of agricultural lands, 3257
Emigration to the United States
Meighen, Mr., reported statement in New York Tribune, 2790
Winnipeg, from, 1975

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Great Britain, free trade and protection, 1862, 3051
Hemp bounty bill, 4388
Homesteaders, relinquishment of holdings, 3257
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Construction vote, 4688
M. (Mr. Knox) 1037
Income tax, total assessment, qu. 2393
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Merchants' Bank merger, 4029, 4030, 4031, 4050, 4061
Napoleonic wars, problems after, 1233
Non-confidence, M., (Mr. Irvine) 225
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3567, 4387
Political parties and big interests, 2856
Progressive party, economic not political, 1863
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 760
Rules of the House, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1303
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Taxation, luxury taxes, collections, qu. 2393
West and protected industries, 1222-3

Bird Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations bill

Birmingham, Bishop of, on immigration, 1205

Birth Rate, 1197. *See also* Population
Decline in, 1195

Bituminous Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Bituminous Sands, Alberta, 3198

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Address in reply, 85. Visit of their Excellencies to the Yukon, 85; the Yukon territory, its history, and mineral wealth, 85-89
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3112
Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1557
Liquor law, administration of, 2419
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2419, 2428
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3683
Chinese Immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service list, publication, qu. 3134
Contracts with newspapers and printing companies, 1974, 2394, 2614
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155

Black, Mr. George—*Con.*
Customs and Excise dept. legal work, 856
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, qu. 938
Farmers, shareholders in banks, qu. 1486
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Income tax, farmers paying, qu. 1486
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Mining fees, Yukon, 1636
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2467
Judges, Yukon Territory, 2458
Secretary of State, administration, 2458, 2467
Northwest territories
Administration, 3949
Wireless telegraph service, 3945
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 2927
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3544
Pension Act Amdt. bill
District review board
Appeals, amdt., 3875, neg. 3881
Appointments to, amdt. 3875, neg. 3875
Pensions
Commuted, qu. 4132
European war and active militia, 3732
Royal commission, qu. 207
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Quartz-mining claims, Yukon territory, 249
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1143
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Vancouver, Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 767, 4247
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516
Minerals, exhibit at British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Quartz-mining claims, 249
Telegraphs, qu. 1662, qu. 2206, 3945
Revenue from, qu. 2417

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4034
Bayfield harbour, 981
Customs and excise taxes and collections, qu. 814
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Income tax collection, cost, qu. 733
Merchants' bank case, 4034
Toronto seed branch building, 4623

Black, Mr. W. J. *See* Immigration

Black Point, N.S., breakwater, 941

Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M.P., references to, 4, 6, 8, 102

Blackfeet Indians. *See* Indians

Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856

Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513

Blind. *See* Canadian National Institute; Soldiers

Blind River wharf, 981

Blondin, Mr. Charles E., Pierreville postmaster, qu. 4511

"Blue Ruin" speeches. *See* Immigration

Board of Audit Act (Inquiry into auditing and accounting system) Res., 4249; 4355; 1r., 2r., com., 4356; com., 3r., 4369; Senate amdts., 4733

Board of Commerce. *See also* Combines
Repeal of Act, 2521
"Wooden gun" 2564

Board of Grain Commissioners. *See* Grain

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pensions

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boats. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine and Fisheries; Vessels

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Indemnity of members, 4008, 4236
Joint Committee on legislation, report, 3887, 4007
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Members, attendance of, 4008
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-46
Deduction for non-attendance, 4244

Bolshevism
Bolshevists, socialists, communists and anarchists, 2744
Children of Russian and Polish parents at Welland, 2844
Discontent and, 2982
Farmers, 4045
Oriental immigration, 505
Russia, example of, 2744
Trade unions bulwark against, 2887

Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138

Bonaventure
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Railway facilities, 4186

Bonded Warehouses. *See* Liquor

Bonds. *See* Canadian National Railways; Finance; Loans

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Book-Making. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Books. *See also* Copyright Act
Purchase of. *See* Library of Parliament
Sales tax on, 1870

Bootlegging. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.; Liquor; Tobacco

Boots and Shoes. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Duty, 2849, 3033
French treaty, 1990, 2240
Prices, increased, 2873
Sales tax, 2999
United States markets, free entry to, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499

Borden, Camp. *See* Camp Borden

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Administration, 2815
Canada, constitutional development, 4465
National debt, diminution of, 2920
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Treaties, signing of, 4465

Border States. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Botany Yarn. *See* Textiles, Silk

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Agriculture department, employees, 815
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3562
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere experimental farm, qu. 1028

Boucher, Mr. Aime (Yamaska)
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1510

Boucher, Mrs., postmistress, Pierreville, qu. 4511

Boudreau, the late Mr. Rodolphe, 1805

Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613

Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750

Boulay, Mr. Hermengilde, Sayabec post office, 3750

Boundaries. *See* International Boundaries; Surveys
Forest areas. *See* Dominion Forest Reserves

Boundary Waters, Pollution of, 700, 3362

Bounties, 2948. *See also* Trade and Commerce
Advances to be repayable, 4369, 4376
Agricultural and manufactured products, 1196
Agriculture and, 3237
Artificial silk, 2931
Binder twine, 4369
Copper bars or rods, 2646, 2709, 2734, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 2944, 2958, 3017, 3031, 3035, 3069, 3231, 4369, 4376
Cordage, 4369
Fishing, report on, 911
Hemp, 2647, 2709, 2778, 2780, 2823, 2827, 2931, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3017, 3031, 3911, 3963, 4376
Extension of time, 3911
Resolutions, 3911
Increased, demand for, 3076
Iron and steel, 4371, 4381
Linen thread, 2647, 2897
Loans, repayable, 4369, 4376
Manila fibre, 2657, 3231, 3242, 4369
News, 3062
Oil. *See under this head,* Petroleum
Permanent when established, 2957
Petroleum, 2648, 2657, 2949, qu. 3262, 3914, 3963, 4392
Administration of, 780
Protection and, 2778
Wheat, on, 1196
Wool, 2866

Bounties on Copper Bars or Rods, Act Respecting Res. 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4369; 3r., 4376
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4369, neg., 4376

Bounties on Manila Fibre, Repeal Bill Res. 2657, 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 3r., 4369

Bourassa, Mr. Henri, Nationalist party, 2924

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis county postmasters, qu. 519
Nolin, Mrs. J., postmistress, St. David, 1489
Quarantine station, Levis, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Boville, Mr. T. C., service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Bowder, Mr. W. R. *See* Immigration

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Grain surveys, qu. 4131

Boy Scouts Association, 114, 879

Boyer, Dr. G. F., appointment, qu. 2418

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Ammunition, 887
Received from England, 1741
Annual training, 874
Annuities, old age, 1640
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Cost of at various ages, 1641
Postmasters as agents, 1642
Atherley bridge, 3648
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1506, 1513
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3085-3127
Big Bay point wharf, 981
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business of the House
Easter adjournment, 1162
Empire day adjournment, 2795
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Gazette, printing, 1709
Canada-West Indies Steamship service, 3384
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden, 1749, 4565
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Canadian National railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4327
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620
Paris offices, 3630
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Canadian Press, Limited, 1464
Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031
Combines bill, 2621-37
Commissioners, appointment of, 2629
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2144
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2053
Debates, official report, omission of undiscussed item in supply, 1638
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740
Evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, bill, 2053
Excise taxes, use of postage stamps, 1820-1
Exhibitions, 1465
Federal printing company, 1623
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church), amdt. (Mr. Carroll) 1281

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Grain elevators, Montreal, qu. 1663
Harbours and rivers
Nova Scotia, 4564
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 969
Highways
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Hamilton-Brantford, 2493
Statement of, 3174
Hopper barge construction, 3351
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1323
Agreement, 1104
McRae, General, salary, 1324
Policy, 1095
Income tax, unearned income, 2882
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1629, 1655, 1706, 2062.
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3147
Labour
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Department
Estimates, 1621
Staff, reduction, 1671
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, printing, 1622-1625, 1709
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Lindsay arsenal, 883
L'Islet wharf, 970
Lunenberg harbour, dredging, 4578
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Matane harbour improvements, 970
Meaford-Clarksburg highway, 4565
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater, claim, 4574
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden 1749, 1777, 4565
Militia payments, qu. 205, qu. 344, 386
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184, 2193
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Old age annuities, 1640, 1683. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Ontario government savings office, interest rate, 1697
Parliament buildings, 1719
Committee on, 1724
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723, 1726
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2075, 2079, 2086, 2099, 2129
Peat, experiments, 3199
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
European war and active militia, 3739

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Widows, 681
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, new building, 1733
Quebec wharves, 977
Railway lands, purchases or sales, 1739
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744
Revenue and postage stamps, 1820-1
Rural mail service.
Carriers, remuneration, 1780, 1785
Spur lines, 1822, 1826
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506
Steamer Murray Stewart, purchase, 3356
Steamship services, 2173
Canada-West Indies, 3384
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Toronto union station, 4326
Trade Mark and Designs bill, 2063
Trent canal, qu. 205, 3648
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Unemployment relief, 690, 1655, 2169
Vocational loans, 687

Bracken, Premier of Manitoba, on immigration, 1123

Bran and Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Branch Lines. *See* Canadian National Railways

Brandeis, Judge Louis, on banking, 4022

Brandon, Man., damage by flood, 999.

Brandy. *See* Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Brant Military Hospital, closing, 677, 1995, 4075

Brantford binder twine industry. *See* Binder Twine; Hemp Bounties bill

Brazil, constitution of Senate, 1373

Breadner, Mr. R. W. *See* Taxation, Commissioner of

"Breezes Blowing in Mulberry Trees." *See* Secession

Brenner, Meyer, release on parole, 1975

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herd system, 577, 586, 3303
Bacon, salting, 3301
Cheese grading, 3295
Experimental farms, 483

Brethen, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Grain, new varieties, introduction, 483
Health of animals, 586
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Potatoes, prices, 2821
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 751
Shire horses, gift from Great Britain, 2253
Weights and Measures inspector, qu. 492

Breweries. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Liquor

Brick. *See* Building

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Atherley, 3648
Buffalo and Fort Erie, 1834
Burlington channel, 2682
Burrard inlet, 4709
Calumet-Bryson, 1014
Clair, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 4590
Edmundston, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 1014, 2342, 4589
False Creek, 3375, 4708
Fredericton, 3645, 4310
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Grand Etang, 4589
Hawkesbury, 4589
International, 2342, 3647
Interprovincial and, 2342
Isle Perrot, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Kingston, 2682
Lachine canal, Montreal, 2299
McAdam-Vanceboro, 2342
Matapedia, Restigouche river, 1014
Repairs, qu. 4184
Michigan Central at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Montreal-Longueuil, 2086, 2615, 2640
Report of harbour commissioners, 3507
Orleans island, 3646
Ottawa-Hull, 1015, 4590
Roads and bridges, 1014
St. Croix river, 2342
St. John and Quebec railway, 3644
St. John river, 2342
Second Narrows, Vancouver, qu. 1258, 4708
Trent Valley canal, qu. 205
Vancouver-North Vancouver, 1008

Bright, John
British free trade movement, 3050
Repeal of Corn Laws, 3013

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Patents of Invention bill, 2096, 2103
Postmasters, appointment of, 1828-9
Woodbridge postmaster, 1828

Britain. *See* Great Britain

British Admiralty, war claims. *See* War Claims

British Ambassador at Washington. *See also* Treaties
Signature of treaties, 2403
Halibut Fishery Treaty, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664

British and Foreign News Service, 4712

British Columbia
Aerial forest patrol, 1776
Agricultural conditions, 2769
Agriculture, increased production, 1432
Associated boards of trade, letter of Hon. Mr. Carvell, 1915
Bootlegging, 2419. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Attorney General and, 2407
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Columbia Prohibition Association, 2408
Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Bill, 2284
Correspondence, 1032, 1307
Canadian air force, 1748, 1776
Canadian Northern railway guarantee, 1946
Canadian Pacific railway, construction, 1916
Chilliwack reclamation project, 3431
Chinese immigration. *See that title*
Civil Service appointments in, 372
Claims against federal government, 708
Coal
Competition of fuel oil with, 1245
Deposits, investigation, 3198, 3202
Production, 1244
Copper bounty, 2734
Creosoting industry, 1245
Creosoted piling, use in, qu. 1137
Debt, per capita, 2941
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061
Dredging, 1014, 4590
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Experimental farms, 457
Fisheries
Commission, 1453, 1540, 3372
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540
Japanese engaged in, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Forests, fungus and insect control, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1003
Freight rates
Discrimination, 1936
Equalization of, 1911, 1914
Fruit-growing industry, 2942
Fuel oil, importation, 1245
Geological survey explorations, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 1002, 2671

British Columbia—*Con.*
Highways, 2341, 2941, 3186. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Hindu franchise and, 4640-4651
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1096, 1112, 1327
Indian army officers, settlement in, 1096
Indians, 2152, 2163
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Schools, 2164
Iron ore deposits, 2505
Japanese fishermen, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Kootenay flats reclamation scheme, 3431
Labour conditions, 1125
Legislation, disallowance of, 1261
Life-saving appliances, 1659
Liquor
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
Exportation of, qu. 1260
Importation, 2404. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Liquor laws, administration, 2419, 2423
Corruption, charge of, 2412-13
Ottawa Citizen, editorial, 2412
Public accounts com. investigation, 2410-13
Purchases, 2410
Warehouses, qu. 1974
Bonded, qu. 1260, qu. 1971, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866
Lumber industry, 1245
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Oil companies, 2505
Oliver, Hon. John, freight rates, 1915, 2505
Correspondence, 1307
Orientals
Business interests of, 1896, 1901-03
Correspondence, 1307
Fishery licenses, 1541. *See also under this title,* Japanese
Immigration, 1217. *See also* Chinese Immigration; Immigration, Oriental
Restriction, 1453
Steveston fishing industry, 1901
Public buildings, 1024
Railway grades, 1917
Resources, 2940
Salmon-canning industry, 1540
Steamship services, 4003
Sumas lake reclamation project, 3431
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2683, 3946
Terms of union, 1916
Trade with Britain via Panama canal, 3053
Unemployment, 1678
Relief, discontinuance of Federal aid, 1658

British Columbia Fisheries Commission 1453, 3372
Salmon-canning licenses, 1540

British Columbia Salmon Canners' Association, licenses, 1541

British Constitution. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

British Dominions, Senates, constitution of, 1370, 1375

British Empire Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

British Empire Settlement Board. *See* Immigration, Empire Settlement

British Empire Steel Corporation, 1391. *See also* Labour, Strikes
Letters from Messrs. McNeil and McLachlan to Prime Minister, 1704
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704

British Goods, importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty. *See* Japan

British Market. *See* British Preference; Grain; Live Stock, Cattle Trade

British National Labour Party. *See* Labour

British North America Act
Amendment of, 2592, 4660
Bankruptcy legislation, 3095
Constitution, control over, 2895
Intercolonial railway and, 1765
International labour conference, 1645
Labour organizations, jurisdiction, 2891, 2892
Readjustment of representation. *See* Redistribution bill
Right to revise, 1378, 3059
Unemployment relief, responsibility, 1680

British Preference, 2734, 2948, 3082. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty
Australia, 1850
British goods free, 3039
Canadian industry penalized, 2957
Cattle embargo and, 3053. *See also this title under* Live Stock
Clothing, 3032
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 1757, 1772, 2645, 2678, 2734, 2898, 2948, 3015, 3039, 3053, 3068, 3082, 3454, 3895
Goods via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454, 3895
Transhipment at port in British colony, 3895

British Preference—*Con.*
Discount of 10 per cent, 2645, 2650
French treaty and. *See that title under* Treaties
Hudson Bay railway and, 2878
Increase, 453, 2243, 2713, 2741, 2832, 2854, 2898, 2907, 2937, 2989, 3034, 3039, 3053, 3454, 3487
Benefit to maritime provinces, 2968
Fifty per cent of general tariff, 2718, 2928, 3039, 3048
Knitting industry, 2958
Petition against, 2958
Woollen industry affected, 2958
Introduction of, 2832, 3009
Liberal policy and, 3007
Limitation to Canadian ports. *See under this title,* Direct Importation
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Progressive party and, 2776, 2777
Rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809
Sugar, 2651
Ways and Means committee, 3454
Woollen industry, 2989, 3034, 3458

British Shipping Board, loss of Llandovery Castle, 1745

British Subjects, definition. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill

British War Medals. *See* War, Medals

British Wars, participation in. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Near East Crisis

Broadcasting Stations. *See* Radiotelegraphy

Bronze Powder industry. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 47. Inheritance and pride in family traditions, William Lyon Mackenzie, 47; conditions in the West; lake grain rates; cattle embargo, 48; inquiry into grain trade; the British Empire, 49; national obligations, 49-50
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Annuities, advertising, 1642
Breweries and export liquor houses, Licenses, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, 1866
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3691
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 566
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1009
Elevators, overages, 2043

Brown, Mr. J. L.—*Con.*
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Conference, 606
Fishing schooner race, 115
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1934
French treaty bill, 2223
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 194
Health of animals, 576
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway, 3784
Iron ore discovery, Lake Athabaska, 2513
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill (value of citizenship) 2441
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Proportional representation, 402
Public buildings, New Brunswick, 4613
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 716, 743
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3783
School lands, unpaid balances, 1385, 4203
Seed inspection, 196,198
Steamship services, 2172
Toronto seed branch building, 4621, 4623
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Vocational training, 687
Welland canal construction, 3783

Brown, Mr. M. A., Medicine Hat. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Browntail Moth. *See* Insect Pests

Bruce County pioneering conditions, 2870

Brussels Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Bryant's Landing, wharf, 950.

Bryce, Lord, proportional representation, 390

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Alterations in budget of 1922 and results, 2988
Amendment (Mr. Forke) 2717, 2755, 2776, 2787, 2803, 2809, 2817, 2820, 2822, 2837, 2845, 2854, 2861, 2884, 2932, 2944, 2947, 2955, 2966, 2973, 2976, 3010, 3014, 3015, 3023, 3039, 3051, 3073, 3077; neg. on division, 3082
Planks of Liberal platform included in 2861
Balanced, 2986, 3005, 3078. *See also* speeches on Budget
Changes, 3082
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469,
Debate on, 2701, 2741, 2795, 2837, 2898, 2928, 2984, 3046
Precedence, 2694

Budget—*Con.*
Deficits, 2784
Divisions
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com. agreed to, 3084
Finance Minister
Record established by, 2852
Seventeeth budget, 2657, 2852
Speeches, 2701, 3074
Liberal and Conservative, no difference between, 2792
McMaster, Mr., attitude on budget, references, 3013, 3022, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 3055, 4393
Presentation, form of, 2818, 2984, 3001, 3077
Record established by Minister of Finance, 2657, 2852
Resolutions, 2650, 3084, 3229, 3454, 3895, 3963, 4369, 4392, 4408, 4409. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Amended, 3046
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to necessity for M. for Ways and Means, 2640
Speakers in debate: Messrs. Anderson, 2837; Archambault, 2879; Arthurs, 3033; Bancroft, 2736; Bird, 2787; Church, 2817; Denis (St. Denis), 3038; Drayton, Sir Henry, 2657; Drummond, 2973; Evans, 3067; Euler, 2852; Fielding, 2701, 3074; Findlay, 2883; Fontaine, 2814; Forke, 2711, amdt. 2717; neg. on div., 3082; Gould, 2951; Grimmer, 2898; Harris, 2804; Hopkins, 2980; Hudson, 3060; Hughes, 2919; Humphrey, 2940; Kellner, 2809; King, Mackenzie, 3046; King (Huron), 2908; Leader, 3039; Lovett, 2944; Lovie, 2871; Maclaren, 2948; Maclean (Prince), 2967; Maclean (Halifax), 3000; Maclean (York), 3055; McBride, 3031; McKillop, 2981; McMaster, 3012; Manion, 2746; Marler, 3022; Martell, 2904; Meighen, 2984; Morrison, 2928; Motherwell, 2756; Pritchard, 2730; Raymond, 2741; Reed, 2830; Robichaud, 2935; Ross (Kingston), 2832; Ryckman, 2912; Senn, 2957; Sexsmith, 2784; Spence, 2976; Stansell, 3062; Steedsman, 2835; Stewart (Argenteuil), 2795; Stork, 2733; Tolmie, 2861; Ward, 2959; White, 2964; Woods, 2846; Woodsworth, 2718
Statements omitted, 2860, 2926
Inquiry, 2898
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion on, 2771, 2853. 2946

Buffalo
Elk island park, 3435
Lamont park, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 3941, 4702
Tuberculosis, 3439
Wainwright herd, 2773, 3941

Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company. *See* Bridges; Private Bills

Building. *See also* Housing; Labour
Bricklayers' wages, $12 per day, 2165, 3017
Building materials
Brick 3017
Cement, free admission, United States, 3017
Firebrick duty, 3481. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Freight rates, 1961, 3036
French treaty, 1982
Prices, 2164, 3004
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Farm homes, 1178. *See also* Housing
Fuel supply and house construction, 3203
Increase of, 3055
United States, activity in, 3004, 3017. *See also* Emigration to United States
Wages, building trades, 2165, 3017. *See also* Labour, Wages

Building Stone, Hudson bay region, 1073

Building Trades. *See* Labour.

Bukowina. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Bunyan, John, imprisonment, 3157

Burdis, Mr. W. D., salmon canners, 1541

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4101, 4136
Officers and employees, right to organize, 4162
Beckett, Matt C., dismissal, 816
Bonded liquor houses, New Brunswick, 1212
British preference, Canadian ports, 3457
Building trades, 1812
Business of the House
Estimates, method of discussion, 4615-6
Legislation pending, 3265
M. to increase taxation, 3937
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Cadet services, 877, 879
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4306
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canned salmon shipment, Panama canal to Halifax, 2615, 3272

Bureau, Hon. Jacques—*Con.*
Cheque tax, 3926, 3929
Civil service, political partisanship, 286
Customs and Excise
Department, estimates, 3272
Duty on goods from one Canadian port to another, 2615, 3272
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3928
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 3273
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Experimental farms, 471
Hamilton customs house, 3278
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4360
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Certificate of analyst) 3749, 3969, 4131, 4207, 4528
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1810
Marking Act, 931
Masters and mates, 2610
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Inspection bill, 3969, 4248, 4276
Pilot boats, 3358
Postage stamps, for revenue purposes, 1815, 3298
Post Office
Postmasters, appointment, 1830
St. Baranabe Nord, Mr. Gelinas, 1830
Superintendent of Mail Contracts, 1814
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4680
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, 3280
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Reciprocity. "No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4429
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 245, 923
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-4246
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3345, 3374
Special War Revenue Act, M. (Mr. Stevens) 245, 923
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3863, 4207
Toronto
Customs building, 3278, 3282
Viaduct, 4441
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 931, 936

Bureau of Standards, 788

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burke, Edmund
Function of Parliament, 3018
Relation of member to constituent, 3022

Burne, Mr. Joseph, Immigration department, qu. 3141

Burns, Mr. Pat, price of live stock, 1101

Business Depression, 2798. *See* Address; Budget; Immigration

Business of the House. *See* House of Commons

Business Profits Tax. *See* Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, Amdt. Bill (Removal of restrictions as to liability for)
Res. 4440, 4489; 1r., 2r., 4491; com., 3r., 4492

Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act; Dairying Industry

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* Governor General; reference to in address

Cabinet. *See* Government

Cables. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Cabot Strait, ice obstruction, 2614

Cadet Services. *See* National Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Belle River harbour, 4600
Business profits tax, 4490
Canadian exhibition in France, 4711
Canadian Press Limited
Bill, 1464
Subsidy, 4727
Combines bill, 2628
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1133
Empire settlement scheme, 1132
Policy, 1132
Reference to speech on, 1209
St. John immigration building, 1460
Newspaper combine, 4728

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Paternalism, excess of, 1133
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4513
Railways, Canals & Telegraph lines Com., report, 2252
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4490
Rural depopulation, causes of, 1133
Supply, relevancy, 4719
Tariff, immigration and, 1133

Calcium Carbide, free admission to United States, 3017

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service, Superannuation

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Accredited herd system, 577, 582, 585, 626
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Agricultural publications, 598
Agriculture department, salaries, 610
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2048, 2133, 2136
Annual drill, 4637
Audibility of debates, 976
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4115
Bonded warehouses, New Brunswick, 1212
Business of the House
Private members' days, 574
Prorogation, postponement of, 4754
Questions, as orders for returns, 938, 1386
Butter, British market for, 3298
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill 3973
Coasting regulations, 4276
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4311
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4401
Rejection by Senate, 4698
Capital punishment, 768
Civil government estimates, form of, 610
Dairying industry, 609, 1845
Destructive insects and pests, 596
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads), 4365
Duties, revenue loss and smuggling, 3231
Emigration to the United States, 1845
Execution in Carleton county, 778
Exhibitions, 1465
Experimental farms, 484
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4273, 4541
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Fertilizers, duty on, 3486
Fisheries
Fishways in Salmon river, 3362
Pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 819
Fox-breeding industry, 588
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 810
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grand Falls railway, 4311
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of Animals, 582, 586, 3989. *See also under this title,* Accredited herds; Animal contagious diseases
Hector celebration, 4637
Highways, 3188
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business
Acoustics, 1722
Members' rooms, lighting and ventilation, 1728
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Child, 1470
Indians
Tobique reserve, 2154-55
Victoria reserve, roads, 2153
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3231
Intercolonial, employees' pensions, 3196
Interest rate, 4115
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Judges' Act. Amdt. bill, 3265
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
Lake Grain rates bill, 4232
Live stock, 587, 588
Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken) 835
Manitoba Plup and Paper Company, 3256
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 308
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3271
Parliament buildings, 1718
Acoustics, 1721
Reconstruction committee, 1724
Patents of Invention bill, 2077, 3154
Penitentiaries, earnings of inmates, 772
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-3884
Widow who marries after disability appears, amdt. 3882, agreed to, 3884
Pensions, royal commission, 674, 681
Recommendations, 2394
Point of order (Mr. Carroll) 3267
Potatoes
Duty, 2707
Grading, 598
Growing and marketing, 308
Wharfage tolls, 975
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Privilege (Mr. Carroll) 3268, 3270
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Root vegetables bill, 937

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
St. John and Quebec railway
Connection with Eastern Maine railway, 4311
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John river, pollution of, 701, 3362
St. John-Westfield branch line, 4312
Seed inspection, 197
Soldier settlement, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 669
Salaries and contingencies, 669
Soldiers, venereal diseases, 705
Spruce bud worm, 596
Steamship services, 2171
St. John-Digby, 2176
Taxes, unpaid, 3258
Testing dairy cattle, 1307
Vancouver harbour bill, 332
Wharfage tolls, 974

Calgary
Customs examining warehouse, 1023
Post office, 629, 1024
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679, 1683

Calgary Power Company, 3442
Banff national park, power rights, 3750, 3939

Calves, inspection of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Camp Borden. *See* National Defence, Canadian Air Force

Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections; Senate and House of Commons bill

Campbell, Mr. A. W. *See* Highways

Campbell, Commander, report, St. Andrew's harbour, 2900

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Agricultural conditions, 1402
Agricultural implements, standardizing, 805
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
Bank Act Amdt. bill, interest rate, 4118
Binder twine duty, removal, 4387
Canada-West Indies service, 3379, 3386
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3798
Advance, 3824
Shipping combines, 3845
West Indies service, 3379, 3386

Campbell, Mr. Milton N.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Advance of $73,000,000, 3651
Capitalization and fixed charges, qu. 3323, 3680
Paris offices, 3197
Transcontinental, condition of, 3680
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1406
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Cheque tax, 3934
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads) 3982
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 3240, 4631
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1406
Fort Churchill townsite, qu. 284
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 3194
Fuel supply, 806
Governor General, expenditure, 4628
Grain-growing and freight rates, 3194
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4387
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Land, qu. 283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1070
Immigration
Land settlement, 1406, 1883
Policy, 1402
Soldier settlement board, 1406
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interest rate, 4118
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-34
Land settlement policy, 1406, 1883
National Gallery, 1018
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3983
Northover, Major H. R., claim, 4635
Passports, issuing of, 3988
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4750
Prices, farm and manufactured products, 1403
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Public archives, 3985
Quebec elevator, grain shipment, 4233
Rural depopulation, 1406
Taxation, burden of, 1403
West Ukrainian republic, M. 651, 657
Western provinces, conditions in, 1402
Wheat board, 2857

Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626

Campbellton wharf, 945

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill; Petawawa

Canada Colonization Association. *See this title under* Immigration.

Canada-France Convention of Commerce. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Canada Gazette, 1707

Canada Grain Act. *See* Grain

Canada Highways Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Highways, (Time for earning and receiving payment of grant extended for two years.)
Res. 2253, 2338; 1r., 2343; 2r., com., 2469; 3r., 2470

Canada, Status of, 40, 165. *See also* British North America Act; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties, Halibut treaty

Canada's Claims. *See* Germany, Reparations

Canada's Constitutional Development, 4455-80. *See also* Treaties, Halibut

Canada's Participation in War, 4655. *See also* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis
M. (Mr. Power) 1529

Canada Shipping Act. *See also* Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Announcement of legislation on lake freight rates, 3507. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Certificates to masters and mates; pilotage
Res. 2418; 2668; 1r., 2668; 2r., com., 3r., 3146
2. Distressed seamen; certificate of registration; certificate of inspection
Res. 574, 3969; 1r., 2r., com., 3973; 3r., 4207
3. Restoration of ships purchased from foreign subjects; loading of grain cargoes; port wardens; returns by surveyors
Res. 3749, 3961, 4235; 1r., 4236; 2r., com., 3r., 4276

Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Capitalization, 1391
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 3208
Shipping combine, 4278
Sifton, Sir Clifford, director, 4285
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Traffic, exchange, 2983, 3208

Canada Steamship Lines Limited—*Con.*
War claims, qu. 3142

Canada Temperance Act, 2942. *See also* Liquor
Administration, 2495
Plebiscites under, 2495

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill (Importation into prohibition province prohibited)
Res. 574, 767; 1r., 767; 2r., 2284; com., 2284; 2404, 2419; 3r., 2428; Senate amendments, 4732
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. McQuarrie) 2414-15, neg. 2428
Amdt. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 2419, agreed to, 2428
Blending, 2408, 2419
Brewers, 2404
British Columbia
Administration of law, 2404-13
Correspondence with, 1032, 1307
Exportation, 2404
Government control, 2406
Importation prohibited, 2404, 2419. Exceptions, 2404, 2419
Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney General of British Columbia, 2412
Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C., opinion of, 2408

Canadian Air Force. *See* National Defence

Canadian Ambassador at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

Canadian Athletic Team at Olympic Games, 4706

Canadian Authors Association. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998. *See also* Treaties, French

Canadian Citizenship. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Canadian Council of Agriculture
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Res. respecting, 255

Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307

Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876

Canadian Credit Men's Association. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Canadian Domicile. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Canadian Economic Conference, Sir Charles Gordon, 4023

Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Forestry Association, 3409. *See also* Forests and Forestry

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 110, 2172. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canals; Freight Rates; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
- Advances to, 2641, 3830
  - $1,700,000, 3376
  - $1,500,000, 3798, 3824
- Assets and liabilities, 3804
- Atlantic combines, qu. 2613
- Cattle shipments, 2758, 2807, 3040, 3811
- Coal cargoes, 3807, 3814, 3826
- Committee, 2474
- Construction, 3780
  - Cost per ton, 957
  - Without tender and contract, 957
- Deficit, 2928, 3006, 3038, 3072, 3377, 3798, 3802, 3843
- Directors, 3811
- Expenditure, 3802
  - Earnings and, 1868
- Flour, discrimination against Canadian, 2761
- Freight rates, regulation of, 3806
- Grain trade, 2828, 3263, 3812, 4234
- Insurance, 1568
- Lake grain-carrying trade, 3776, 4223, 4284. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates bill
- Lease of freighters to Great Lakes Transportation Company, 3848
- Loan to, 113-114. *See also* under this title, Advances
- Management, 3637
- Mediterranean service, qu. 1488, 1636
- Milburn, Mr. H., qu. 1138
- Negotiations for sale of 27 ships, 1975. *See also under this title,* Vessels, sale of
- New York pool, 3806
- North Atlantic Conference, 2127, 2761
- Ocean rates, 2760
- Policy, 3798, 3827, 3830
  - Unemployment, 3828, 3846
- Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, 4708
- Public ownership, 3798
- Return cargoes, absence of, 2928
- St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, service on, qu. 2613
- Sailings, qu. 4511
  - Arrangements for 1924, qu. 4751
- Scrap metal and material, qu. 1138
- Shipping combines, 1395, 2127, 2760, 3848, 4223
- Ships, sale of. *See under this title,* Vessels
- Subsidized steamship services, competition, 3378
- Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
- Thornton, Sir Henry, 3811
  - Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
  - Utilization of boats for cattle, 3040
  - West Indies service, 3379
- Trade with Fiji Islands, 1848
- Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
- Transportation combine. *See under this title* Shipping Combines
- Vessels
  - Earnings, etc., 3324, 3399
  - Laid up, 3379, 3386
  - Sale of, 1975, 2518, qu. 2613, 2828, 3385-6, 3705, 3813, 3822, 3846
- Vote under closure 4598
- West Indies and South American trade, 3378, 3808, 3835, 3840

Canadian Government Railways. *See this title* under Canadian National Railways

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Canadian Magazines, Encouragement of. *See* Magazines

Canadian Manufacturers Association. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
- Bankruptcy, 3093
- Canada Colonization Association, disbursements to, 1164, 1171
- Canadian Trade Index, 2217
- Copyright, 2142, 2289
- French treaty, 1997, 2001, 2209, 2229
- Greater production campaign, 2725
- Shaw, Mr. J. B., fuel policy, 1265
- Trade Mark and Designs Act bill, 2293

Canadian National Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 693

Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites, 3406, 3432. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Administration, 66
Automobiles, admission fee, 3942
Banff National park
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electrical equipment, 3434, 3949
Springs and cave, 496
Waterpowers, 496, 3420, 3750
Power rights, Calgary Power Company, 3750, 3442, 3939
Buffalo in. *See* Buffalo
Commissioner, location in Western Canada, 3436
Elk Island buffalo park, 3435
Expenditure, 3941
Further amount, 4702
Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406, 3432, 3435
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Historic sites commission, 3406
Golf course, Jasper park, 3435
Minette Hot springs, 3949
Moose mountains pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal government in, 3436
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Nova Scotia historical society, 3406
Quebec battlefields commission, 3406, 3432
Playgrounds, 3432
Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Preservation of, 3249
Roads and bridges, 1014
Supplementary vote, 3948
Timber wolves, destruction by, 597
Tourist traffic, 3435
Revenue, 3942
Wainwright, slaughter of buffalo, 4702
Waterton lakes park, 3435

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways and Canals;
Accounting, 4328. *See also* Board of Audit
Unification of, 3196
Acquisition, history of, 55
Advances, 2641
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650, 3676
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681, neg. 3701
Statement of appropriations, 1922-23, 1923-4, 3789
Additional
$1,550,000, 4692
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 1764, 3376
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 56, 61, 2471

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Amalgamation—*Con.*
Causes of delay, 56
Economies resulting from, 1616
Orders in council effecting, 34, 53, 3620
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Appointments, 2472
Balfour, Col. H. N., reported, 2794, 2828
From outside Canada, 2827
Promotion, principle of, 3621
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported, 2794, 2828
Appropriations, statement of, 2898, 2926, 3789
Atlantic division, boundaries, qu. 1363, 1754-62, 1770-72
Atlantic ports, 1754. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports; Terminals
Audit staff, Moncton, removal, 574, 1756
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Betterments, 1562
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors.
Board of management. *See under this title,* Directors; Management
Branch lines, 1568, 3626, 4688. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bills
Advances, 4329
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain, 4189, 4197
Bruederheim, 4199, 4316
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie, 4699
Construction of, 1185, 3625
Cost per mile, 4327
Dunblane-Aylesbury, 4308, 4333
Dunlane-Mawer line, 4201
Eston branch, 4201
Expenditure
Appropriations, 4303, 4329, 4337
Authorization by Parliament, 4515
Financing, 4304, 4319, 4329
Grand Falls, 4310
Grande Fresniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312, 4326
Grande Prairie, 1185, 4200
Halifax-Musquodobit, 4317
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 4321
Hanna-Warden-Loverna, 4308, 4322, qu. 4436
Inverness railway, 4198
Inverness and Richmond, 4324
Kamloops-Okanagan, 4314
Kent Northern, 4189, 4197
Lockeport railway, 4326
Long Lac-Nakina, 3224, 4194, 4310, 4326
Meductic-International boundary, 4309, 4311
Melfort, 4319
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls, 4189, 4197

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Branch lines—*Con.*
Okanagan, 4314
Oliver-St. Paul, 4323
Paddockwood, 4319
Peace River, 4324
Peebles-Lampman, 4325
Prince George to Peace River, construction, 1434, 4701
Purchase of, 3646
St. John and Quebec, 4305
St. John and Westfield, 4312
St. Peter's-Louisburg, 4319, 4324
Sunny Brae-Guysborough, 4316, 4320, 4321
Thunderhill, 4311, 4315, 4322
Waterous-Swift Current, 4308
Windsor-Chester, 4333
Yorktown-Willowbrook, 4308
British mails, delay in, 2695
British preference and, 3053
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business cars, 489, 4527
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Exchange of traffic, 2983, 3208
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian government railways
Advances, 1565
Audit office, transfer, Moncton to Montreal, 574, 1756
Deficit, 1560
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Canadian National Safety League, 3956
Canadian National telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Canadian Northern, 1760. *See also under this title,* Annual Statement of Minister
Acquisition of, 56-57, 1937
Advances, 1565
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Amalgamation, causes of delay, 56-58
Arbitration, 56
British Columbia guarantee, 1946
Embezzlement of funds, 381
Fixed charges, 1565, qu. 3323
Gratuities to directors and officials, disclosure of, 2962
Insurance, 1568
Manitoba, agreement with, 1932, 1939
Securities, 1564
System, 55-56
Canadian Northern Express Company. *See under this title,* Express

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian ports, 3454. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports, Terminals
Capital expenditure, control of, 2827
Capitalization, 3192
Fixed charges and, qu. 3323
Reduction of, 3058
Car shortage, 62
Champlain market station, 4446
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760-1770
Coal. *See also that title*
Freight rates on, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Purchases, 1277, 1561, qu. 4303, 4708, qu. 4752
Alberta coal, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Maccan and river Hébert, mines, 1027
United States, in, 1277, 3493, qu. 4511
Transportation, 1264
Commitments, 18-19
Committee on, 2473
Construction, new, 1562, 1922
Co-ordination, 18, 28, 34, 53, 56, 61, 1616, 2471, 3620
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Cost of taking over, 92
Courtesy, 2859, 2971
Debt, 2802
Deficits, 1613, 2658, 2802, 2827, 2831, 3006, 3024, 3038, 3078, 3610, 3620, 3651, 4190. *See also* speeches on Budget; Supply
Taxation and, 3006
Directors, 36, 60, 62, qu. 1973, 2833
Additional, for Quebec, 34. *See also this head,* Talbot
Address and occupation, qu. 1973
British Columbia appointment, 373
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3811
Cattle shipments, 2758
Dawson, Mr. F. G., 373, qu. 1973
Gratuities to, 1687, 2962
Inspection trip, qu. 489
Labour, representation of, 1652, 1656, 3636
M. (Mr. Lapointe) 1653-56
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1654
New board of, 13
New Brunswick representation, qu. 282
Private cars, qu. 489
Removal of late board, correspondence, 3962
Responsibilities and powers, 2478, 3610, 3653. *See also under this title,* Management
Retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Sinclair, Mr. John A. statement, qu. 1363

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Directors—*Con.*
Special train, qu. 489
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258, 2004
Doctors, qu. 814
Dominion Express Company. *See also under this title,* Express
Dorchester employees, qu. 2086
Earnings, 3620, 3651
Eastern division
Brown, Mr. L. S., superintendent, 2971
Improved situation, 2971
Moncton headquarters, 2971
Eastern Land Company, purchase of land at Capreol, 626, 1635
Efficiency, 2859
Electric lines, sale of to municipalities, 2475. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203, 3422, 3425
Employees, 55, 3621
Pensions, 14, 288. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Equipment, 1561, 4692
Orders, 2701
Estimates, 1566, 1619, 1764
Expenditure, 2987, 3078, 3620, 4305
Authorization by Parliament, 3615-40, 4304, 4397, 4515
Express. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Canadian Express Company, 2470
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Canadian Northern Express, 2470
Dominion Express Company, termination of contract with, 2473
Intercolonial Express Company, 2470
Rates, 2876
Fish, on, 3365
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Finance
Advances by government, 1565
Consolidated income figures, 1564
Financial statement, inquiry, 666
Financing in 1922, 1564
Securities, approval of, 4402. *See also under this title,* Securities
Fixed charges, qu. 708, qu. 814, 1565
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633
Fredericton bridge, 3645, 4310
Freight cars, 4692
Interchange with United States, 4697
Purchase of in United States, 4692
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Coal, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
General conditions, 1559
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Grades, 1965
British Columbia, 1917
Grain shipments, qu. 1484. *See also* Grain
Canadian and United States ports, 1756
Diversion to American ports, 2899
Portland, 1756
St. John, 1768
Grand Trunk, 1562
Additions and betterments, 1564
Advances, 1565
Amalgamation, delay in, 18, 56
Arbitration, 59, 1154, 1307
Arbitrators, fees, etc., qu. 624, qu. 1257
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029, qu. 1661, 2813
Assets, disposal of, 1665
Atwater, Mr. A. R., gratuity, qu. 1632
Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C., gratuity, qu. 1632
Central Vermont
Deficits, 1563
Operating results, 1613
Transportation Company, 1564
Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Company, 1563
Coal purchases, 1564
Commitments, qu. 206, qu. 207
Crowsnest pass agreement, rates, 1563
Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deer, Mr. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deficits, 1563
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203
Elevator, Montreal, qu. 1974
Equipment, all lines, 1564
Galloway, Mr. D. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Grades, 1965
Gratuities to retiring directors and officials, 1664-68
British board of directors, qu. 1632
Disclosure of, 2962
Payments out of insurance, 1632, 1665
Progressive party and, 1687
Refund, 1667
Royal commission, 1665
Congdon, Mr. F. T., appointment, 2297, 2710, qu. 3131
Order in Council, tabled, 2347
Inquiry, 1976, 2297
Income account, 1563
Insurance, 1568
Insurance fund, payment of gratuities out of, 1632, 1665
International bridge company, 1563

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Grand Trunk—*Con.*
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Logan, Mr. R. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Management, personnel, 1612. *See also under this title,* Directors; Management
Martin, Mr. H. G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Montreal and Southern Counties Railway, 1564
Montreal Warehousing Company, 1564
Norman, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Ocean ports, 1758. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Providence, 1755, 1762
Operating results, 1560-3
Oshawa Railway, Rail and River Coal Company, 1564
Pensioners, annual passes, qu. 2418
Pension rights of employees, 14
Preference and common shareholders, representations, 3960
President, retiring allowance, 2785
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664
Profit and loss, qu. 1257
Pullen, Mr., 2472
Purchase price, qu. 1257
Robb, Mr. W. D., gratuity, qu. 1632
Rosevear, Mr. J. M., gratuity, qu. 1632
Scott, Mr. Frank, gratuity, qu. 1632
Separately-owned companies, 1563
Shareholders, list of, 939
Stock, 61
Terminal Warehousing Company, 1564
Terminals in United States, 815
Portland, 1755, 1758, 1768, 2898
Providence, 1755, 1762
Thousand Island railway, 1564
Ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Traffic, 1563
Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59, 152, 1761
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Bell, Mr. G. T., gratuity, qu. 1632
Construction, cost of, 1918
Debenture holders, representation, 3507, 3581
Fixed charges, 1565
Hansard, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Hinton, Mr. W. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Loan of $15,000,000, 2920
Porter, Mr. S. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Gratuities. *See under this title,* Grand Trunk
Refund of, 1667
"Greatest railway in the world," 3056
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Halifax terminals, qu. 4518. *See also under this title* Terminals

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1612, 2050
Director, Canadian Steamship Lines, 3208
Retirement, 1666
Gratuity, qu. 1632
Hayes, Mr. 2471
Headquarters, 62, 3224. *See also under this title,* Moncton
Divisional, 63
Montreal, 1757
Hotel Scribe. *See under this title,* Paris Offices
Hotels, 938, qu. 1257
Deficits, 2976
Manager, qu. 1257
Hudson Bay railway and. *See that title*
Immigration, 1121
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Conference, 1193
Income account, 1559
Inquiry into, 19
Insurance, 1567, 1616. *See also* Canadian National Railways bill, Insurance
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and Mitchell, Mr. A. J., interests in, 2050
Mortgaged premises. *See this title under* Canadian National Railway bills
Rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 135, 1756, 1760, 1765
Atlantic ports, 1754-62
British North America Act and, 1765
Express. *See under this title,* Express
Moncton headquarters, 13
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Pensioners, annual pass, qu. 2418
Pensions, 3195
Kelley, Mr. Howard, 1612, qu. 1632
Labour, representation, 1561. *See under this title, also,* Directors; Moore
Land
Contiguous to, 1880
Purchases or sales, 1739
Legislation, qu. 4300. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Management, 1616, 2832, 3041, 3623. *See also under this title,* Directors
Details of, 2472
Liberal resolution of 1921, 3685, 3688
Non-interference with, 2473, 3670
Personnel, 3058
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3620, 3623, 3653, 3811. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices; Thornton
Capital investments. *See under this*

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
title, Paris Offices
Maritime provinces in, 126-130
Maritime region, 1754, 1757
Mileage, 55, 1765, 3197
Cost, and, 914
Operated, 1558
Traffic and, comparison, 2949
Minister, acting, statement by, 55-63
Minister's annual statement, 1558; operated mileage, 1558; general conditions, 1559; income account, 1559; net operating deficit, 1560; decreased operating expenses, 1560; operating ratio, 1560; traffic results, steam lines, 1561; operating expenses, 1561; labour, 1561; locomotive coal purchases, 1561; equipment, 1561; betterments, 1562; new construction, 1922, 1562; Grand Trunk, 1562; income account, 1563; Grand Trunk traffic, 1563; separately-owned companies, 1563; employees and compensation, 1564; equipment, Grand Trunk, all lines, 1564; coal, 1564; additions and betterments, 1564; finance; consolidated income figures, 1564; financing in 1922, 1564; advances by government, 1565; fixed charges, 1565; estimates, 1566; reorganization, Sir Henry Thornton, 1566; insurance, 1567; tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Mitchell, Mr. A. J.,
Insurance, interest in, 2050
Retiring gratuity, qu. 1632, 1667
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Montford railway, 4199
Moore, Mr. Tom
Labour representative, directors, 1652, 1654, 3636
Statement on immigration, 1167
Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257
National Transcontinental. *See under this title,* Transcontinental
Net operating deficits, 1560
New positions and salaries, 2701
Niagara and St. Catharines railway, 2475
Niagara Central railway, 2480
No politics order, 3623
Ocean ports and terminals, 1754, 1757-1762, 1767, 1768, 2898, 2899, 2937, 3454. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Official cars, 3621
Officials, retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Operation
Costs, 1919
Deficits, 3701
Expenses, decreased, 1560, 1561

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Ratio, 1560
Orders in council, 815
Over-capitalization, 2860
Ownership, 3192, 3224
Page, Supt., alleged statement, 4514
Paris offices, purchase of Hotel Scribe, 3197, 3208, 3224, 3279, 3610, 3610-46, 3650-76, 3676-3708, 3811, 3813, 3838, 4514
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 3664, ruled out of order, 3667
Aronovici, Mr. A., 3612, 3652
Peace river
Branch lines, 1434, 4324, 4701
Survey, 4898
Policy, 1764, 3620
Pre-audit, 3701
Preferential treatment of localities, 1762
President, appointment of, 2827
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Prince Rupert, 2734
Printing, 1623
Contracts, 3144
Winnipeg, qu. 3323
Private cars, 489, 4527
Property, purchases and sales, 1739, 2518, 3324
Prospects of success, 2830
Providence, Rhode Island, building, 1755
Public ownership, 1614, 1618, 1770, 2859, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Quebec terminals, 446
Railway Commission and, 666
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rates. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Real estate, 1739, 2518, 3324
Regional areas, 135, 3621
Regulations, 496
Reorganization, Thornton, Sir Henry, 1566
Report, 3223
Retirement fund, 1667
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1483. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Revaluation, 2859
Earning power, 2860
Replacement, 2860
Revenue, detailed, 2898
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Robb, Mr., qu. 1632, 2471
Rolling stock and equipment, 61, 1561, 3962
St. Croix, 2899
St. John and Quebec railway, 3403
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John terminal, 3645. *See also* St. John, *and under this title,* Terminals
St. Malo repair shops, 4447

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Scarfe Varnish Works, purchases, qu. 1485
Service, improved, 2859, 3041
Settlement along, 1185
Shannon, Mr. L. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Shipping. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Combine, 2127
Steel, lifting of, 1664
Strategic advantages, 3057
Superannuation fund, qu. 2418
Tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore. *See under this title,* Directors
Teakle, Mr. R. B. letter as to cattle shipments, 2758
Telegraph service, Canadian Press, 4728
Terminals. *See also under this title* Ocean ports
Atlantic division, qu. 1363, 1771
Halifax, 1756, 1759, 1768, 4713, qu. 4751
Maritime region, qu. 1662
Ocean. *See also under this title,* Ocean Winter ports, 2902
Portland, Maine, 1755, 1768
Providence, 1755, 1762
St. John, 1756, 1759, 1768
Thornton, Sir Henry, 13, 52, 1566, 1612, 2833. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices
Appointment, 2828
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Assistants, reported appointment of Messrs. Balfour and Thomas, 2794, 2828
Atlantic division, 1771
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Cattle shipments, 2758
Coal transportation, 1264
Criticism of, 3640
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1966
Financial statement, 666
Freight rates on Alberta coal, 1268
Immigration, 1167, 2795, 2840
Maritime boards of trade, conference, 1755, 1771
Ocean ports, 1758-69
Operating costs, 1919
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3615, 3653
Radial railways, sale of, 2476
Rate discrimination, 1914
Sale of 27 ships, 2828
Speeches, 3637
Ties, purchase of, qu. 516
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4447
Connection between lines, 3224

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Toronto—*Con.*
Level crossings, 2477
Office building, qu. 814, qu. 1663, 2481
King and Yonge Streets property, qu. 1994, 2518, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 517, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442
Toronto Eastern railway, 2475
Toronto Suburban railway, 2181, 2475
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Traffic, 3041
Results, steam lines, 1561
Staff, removal from Truro to Halifax, 4708
Train to carry troops to Sydney, qu. 624
Transcontinental, 1760
Branch line to Montreal, qu. 2393
Cattle shipments, 2807
Development of northern Ontario and Quebec, 2833
Fortin & Moffat claim, 3646
Freight rates, 3680
Operating results, 1560
Strategic advantages, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix projected route, 2898
Transportation combine, 1395. *See also* Freight rates
Truro subway, 4454
Unification of system, 1615, 1666, 3196, 3223
Union stockyards, 2762
United States
Lines, 3197
Terminals, 1755, 1762, 1768
Value of property, 55
Wages, reduction, qu. 1363. *See also* Labour
Waterways, 3057
Canadian National Railways Bills
1. Insurance of mortgaged premises
Res. 1635, 2048; 1r., 2050; 2r., com., 2105; 3r., 2107
2. Express business and sale of electric lines; radial railways
1r., 2392; 2r., com., 2470; 3r., 2481
3. Construction of branch lines
Res. 3961, 4185; 1r., 4201; 2r., 4303-4308; com., 4308; 3r., on div. 4397, 4401
Sections and subjects discussed:
Advances for government railway lines, 4329
Advances pending issue of guaranteed securities, 4344
Amdts. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Guarantee of securities of other lines up to $40,000 per mile, 4339
Lines connecting with Canadian government railways and constructed by company, 4327

Canadian National Railways Bills—*Con.*
Construction of branch lines—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Nature and form of securities, 4339
Power to construct described in schedule, 4308
Rejection by Senate, 4753, 4688, 4689, 4694, 4695
4. Securities, approval of
Res, 4012, 4402; lr., 4405; 2r., com., 4515; m. for 3r., amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to refer back neg., 4732; 3r., 4732
Senate amendments, 4754
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4527, neg. 4528
Form, term and amount of securities to be approved, 4515

Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953

Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Assets, obligations, etc., qu. 625
Attitude towards Canadian National Railways, 3056
Banff hotel, 3435
British Columbia, qu. 626, 1916
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Pacific "party", 3056
Cattle shipments, 3043
Chinese sailors, 2334
Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company, 3235
Construction, 1880, 1916, 1918
Crowsnest pass agreemet, 1620. *See also that title.*
Dividends, 1203, 1392, 1406, 3190
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Earnings, 1919
Net, 1130
Surplus, 1130
Efficient service, 127
Express charges, 2876
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Freight Rates. *See also that title*
Copper bounty and, 3239
Dividends, and, 1134
Ocean, 2127

Canadian Pacific Railway—*Con.*
Grades, 1965
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Conference, 1193
Russia, 1340
Labour, shopmen, resolution of, 1338
Land, 3704
Sale contracts, revision of, 2930
Lanigan, Mr., freight rates, 1918
Operation, cost of, 1918
Quebec terminals, 815
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1458
Shares, transfer under Treaty of Versailles, 2496
Steamship lines, British mails, 2695
Telegraph service, Canadian press, 4728
Toronto, level crossings, 2477
Union stockyards, 2762

Canadian Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Ports; Treaties, French and Italian

Canadian Press Limited. *See Press*

Canadian Representation in the United States, 65, 2735, 3016, 3085, 4001, 4664. *See also* Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Delay, 3085

Canadian Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Canadian Trade Index, 2217

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Wheat Board

Canadians
Distressed, relief of, 1456
Emigrating. *See* Emigration
Repatriation of. *See* Immigration

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence Waterway
Canadian National railways, and, 3057
Cornwall, employees, political partisanship, qu. 3135
Freight rates, water transportation, 1914
Georgian Bay construction, 2816
Grain shipments and, 2808. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Lake Grain Rates
Improvement of, 1619
Isle Perrot bridge, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Panama. *See that title*
Rideau
Improvements, 4691
Water powers, qu. 622

Canals—*Con.*
St. Lawrence. *See that title*
Trent
Bridges, qu. 205
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Expenditure, qu. 4301
Improvements, 3647, 4691
Traffic, qu. 4301
Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Welland
Construction, 3760
Contracts, qu. 1489
Deepening, 2979
Expenditure, 3073, qu. 3820
Inquiry into, 3006
Request for, 3073, 3766, 3772, 3773
Grain shipments, 2808
Grenville by-election, 4606
Hudson Bay railway, 1054, 1068, *See also that title*
Importations of lumber for, qu. 1867
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Towing, qu. 4132

Canned Goods and Fish, freight rates, 1915

Canned Meats Act, inspection, 2202

Canning Licenses. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3090-3105
Business of the House, closure, 3668
Business profits and income taxes, qu. 1157
Canadian National railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3623
Dorchester county employees, qu. 2086
Management, 3623
Details of, Liberal res. of 1921, 3685
Responsibility and powers, 3623, 3684
Paris offices, 3684
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), ruling, 3667
Civil Service
Dismissals after 1911 election, 3347
Quebec city and district, 387
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern, 1933
Grondines wharf, 964
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 981
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3560
Point of order, letter reflecting on House, 4060
Portage la Prairie sewage system, 996
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 754
St. John immigration building, 1461
Toronto Harbour improvements, 985
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Votes of parliament and pledges, 3536

Canso, N. S. wharf, 941

Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 950

Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 1763, 2469

Cape Breton Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Capital. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance
Attraction of, 2802, 3050
Basic industries, and, 3239
Canadian National railways, ownership of, 3192, 3224
Capital levy to pay war debt, 2728, 2743, 2909
Capitalistic system
Control of educational agencies, 2725
Defence of, 2743
Failure of, 2722
Government, influence over, 2726
Labour organization and, 2895
Political parties and, 2810
Capitalists, position of, 2583
Carvell, Hon. F. B., and, 3191
Centralization of, 4047
Control of interlocking directorates, 4026
Definition of, 3068
Diverted by income tax to tax-free bonds, 2914
Domination of, 4026
Farmers, 4045. *See also that title*
Investment in production, 2720
Investment, knowledge as to conditions, 2966
Natural resources, development of, 3027
Rights of, Abraham Lincoln on, 2967
Tariff and, 3025
Taxation of, 2801, 2879, 3010

Capital and Labour. *See also* Labour
Royal commission on industrial relations, report, 2890

Capital Investment, power to make. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris Offices

Capital Punishment
Abolition of, 487. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carleton county execution, 768

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, qu. 204, 1258, 2938, 2939

Carbonic Acid Gas. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Carleton Point, Que., lightkeeper, qu. 285

Carleton County, N.B., execution in, 768

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Annual training, 868
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 255, 4110
Butter factories in new districts, 3284
Canadian National parks, automobile admission fee, 3942
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4201
Cheque tax, 3932
Divorces granted, qu. 622
Dominion Lands Act, school lands, 4202
Eston branch railway, 4201
Grain Commission, salaries, 787
Indians, 2153
Interest rates, 4110
Military hospitals, 672
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2123
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 699
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2113
Penitentiaries, 770
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 735
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
School lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4202
Seed grain advances, 3444
Vancouver harbour bill, 260

Carnegie, Colonel, 1648

Carney, Stephen P., conviction, qu. 3582

Caron, Mr. E., postmaster, Tadoussac, qu. 3139

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Address in reply, 80; unemployment decrease; anti-combine legislation, 80; immigration, desirable types; United Farmers of Alberta and immigration 81; prosperity of western farmers; Soldier Settlement board as an aid to immigration, 82; amendments; Vancouver harbour expenditure, 83; coal resources of Canada, 83-84; strikes, 84; the farmers and larger markets; question of tariff reduction, 85
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3088-3121
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie railway, 4700
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Chinese immigration bill, 4537
"Merchants" definition of, 2483
Civil Service appointments, postmasters, 377
Coal
Eastern and Western Canada, 3204
Freight rates, 3204
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4231
Cold storage warehouses, 189
Combines bill, 2529, 2626

Carroll, Mr. William F.—*Con.*
Dairy Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Notice of M. for 2r., 3402
Renovated butter, 4262
Estimates, method of discussion, 4616
Fuel supply, 3203. *See under this title,* Mines and Minerals
M. (Mr. Church)
Amdt. proposing reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Grain shipments, 4230
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs., detention at border, 3157
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2428
Record of immigrants, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4643
Inverness-Richmond railway, extension, 4324
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Mines and Minerals Committee
First report, 1384
Third report, 4436, 4592, 4743
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2462
Repatriation, M. 1379
Oleomargarine, 4263
Committee on Agriculture, discussion, 3266
M. to permit manufacture, importation and sale, 1382, 3399, 3508, 3573
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3327
Peace river railway, 4324, 4700
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3850-3881, 4747
Pensions
Appeal board, Ottawa, 3731
Royal commission on, opportunity for discussion of report, 674
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128
Privilege, Com. on Agriculture, 3266
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Railway Commission, criticism of judgment, 1916
Registration of ships, 3973
Renovated butter, 4262
St. Peter's Louisburg railway, 4324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Taxation, 2837
Wheat board, Manitoba legislature, 2836

Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See* Labour, International Labour Conference

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Eastern Lands Development Company, 1635
Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Cartwright, Right Hon. Sir Richard, on protection, 3070

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4189
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102, 4509
Bankruptcy Act
Amdt. or abrogation, M., 1490, 1528
Repeal of, 1158
Business of the House
Audibility, 4594
Private members' day, 1158
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4189
Chairman, ruling:
Comittee report not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Combines bill, 2549, 2618, 2627
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4189
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) point of order, 3570
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Senate and House of Commons, bill, 4244

Cattle. *See this title,* under Live Stock

Cattle Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases, Live Stock, Health of Animals

Cattle Embargo. *See* Live Stock

Caucus, Party. *See* Lack of Confidence

Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031

Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture, adjournment, 1685

Cedar Rapids power, Aluminium Company of America, 659
Cement, French Treaty, 1984

Central Research Institute, 788

Census. *See* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics

Central Supply Association, decision, 2593

Chair, Rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman. *See* Deputy Speaker

Champlain Dock. *See* Quebec (port)

Champoux, Mr. J. E., Sorel postmaster, qu. 1487

Chanak Affair. *See* Near East Crisis

Chapel Cove, N.S., breakwater, 941

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Apple-grading, 194
Artificial silk, duty, 3489, 3491
Atlanta exhibition, 1465
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and, 1171
Canadian National railways
Express and electric lines bill, 2480
Grand Trunk, gratuities, 1667
Toronto office building, 2481
Civil government estimates, form of, 611
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054, 2060
Cold storage companies, 186
Experimental farms, 480
Firebrick, duty, 3481
French treaty, 453, 1977, 1995
Analysis of, 1978
Bronze powder, 1979, 2217
Customs index, 2269-70
Butter, 2273
Cobalt products, 2263
Cotton, 2263
Silks, 448
Wines, 442
Government elevators, 2036
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu., 813
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 945
Nova Scotia, 4566
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 968
Highway, Canboro-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Contributions of Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1164, 1171
Policy, 1171
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty bill, 2401
Labour department
Staff, 1672, 1678, 1699, 1701
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Technical education, director of, 1674
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Little Anse breakwater, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4573
Macdonald, Sir John A., reciprocity, 2922
Maritime provinces, dredging, 4569
Military properties, maintenance, 889
National defence
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 884, 1741, 1744
Estimates, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 902
Niagara Central railway, 2480
Patents of Invention bill, 2073

Chaplin, Mr. James D.—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, 774
Point of order, Mr. Caldwell, 3267
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, 1710
Quebec
Arsenal, 884, 1741, 1744
Wharves, 978
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Seed grain advances, 3446
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269
Wedge, Mr. George, qu. 2697

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlottetown public building, 4614

Charlottetown-Pictou steamship service, 2171

Chartered Accountants Association of Canada. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Bank. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Immigrants
Overcharging at Quebec, 3324
Supplies, 496
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1993
Scarfe Varnish works, qu. 1485

Chateau Laurier. *See* Canadian National Railways, Hotels

Chatham, Ont., wharf, 982

Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry

Chemical Industries, Canadian Society, 2069

Chemicals
Freight rates, 1920
French treaty, 1985

Cheque Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 362, 546, 554, 556
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal of, qu. 4512
Ottawa government workshops, 4619

Chicago
Chicago Drainage Canal, 2993
Diversion of water, qu. 3821
Exhibition, 1454, 1466

Chicago—*Con.*
Fat Stock Show, 1398

Chicoutimi wharf, 950

Chicoutimi-Saguenay county
Postmasters, qu. 3138
Telegraph lines, qu., 3138
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, qu. 3148

Chidley, Cape. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Chief Electoral Officer, salaries and contingencies, 4001

Children
Chinese, born in Canada. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Deaths through fuel shortage, 751, 1657
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Income tax exemptions for, 1382, 2128, 3038, 4502
Mortality of, 1179
Oleomargarine, effect on health. *See* Oleomargarine
Playgrounds, 3407, 3432

Chili, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Chimes. *See* Parliament Buildings, Tower

Chimney Corner, N.S., wharf, 941

China
Bandits in, 2932
Butter shipments to, 1840, 1853
Canadian trade commissioner, 1840
Cheese shipments to, 1853
Chinese Consul General, immigration 1488
Civilization of, 2486
Conditions in, 2316
Immigration from. *See* Chinese Immigration; Immigration
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in, 2695, 2795
Political disturbances, 2325
Trade relations with, 2313, 2316, 2320

Chinese Immigration. *See also* Immigration

Chinese Immigration Bill (Entry limited to diplomatic corps; Chinese children born in Canada; merchants and students) 1r., 768; 2r., com., 2308, com., 2481; 3r., 2489; Senate amendments, 4536
Sections and subjects discussed:
Admission for specified period, 2329
Agreement with China, 2317
Appeal to Minister, 2331
Arrest and deportation, 2334
Canadian officers in China, 2308
Chief controller, Department of Immigration, 2308, 2482

Chinese Immigration Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Chinese
Children, 2484
En route, admission, 2488
Landing in violation of act, 2336
Not to leave ship without permit, 2333
Sailors on Canadian vessels, 2334
To register within 12 months, 2333
Women, 2310, 2318, 2484
Representations from British Columbia, 2310
Conductor to furnish list of Chinese persons carried, 2333
Definition, 2308
Deportation, 2488
Entry and landing, 2309
Vancouver and Victoria only, 2327
Evasions, 2315, 2324
Exclusion, 2324, 2482
Head tax, 2312
Identification and registration: certificates, 2331
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Jurisdiction of courts, 2337
Labourers, 2310, 2316
Liability of transportation companies, 2334
Merchants
Definition of, 2317, 2319, 2487
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2320
Students and, 2310
Evasions, 2324
Wives, 2318
Nationality, 2309
Number carried on ship limited, 2333
Offences and penalties, 2488
Officer in China, 2322
Officers in other countries, 2308, 2482
Organizing, unlawful courts, 2337
Passports, 2325
Powers of Governor in council, 2308
Prohibited classes, 2327
Re-entry, 2333
Registered person, 2488
Status, substantiation of, 2487
Students, 2310, 2316, 2324
Violation of act or fraud, 2488
Violation of act, order or regulation, 2337
Wives, 2484. *See also under this title,* Chinese, Women; Merchants

Chisby, Captain, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Eastern harbour improvements, 4569
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743

Chisholm, Hon. C. P. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Abbott's harbour, breakwater, 4563
Address, legislation referred to, in, qu. 2612
Agricultural Conditions, report, qu. 2612
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4068
Banking and Commerce Com. report, qu. 2612
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 703, 4439
Basic industries, assistance, 2822, 3238
Best, Mr. C. H., recognition of, 703
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Board of Commerce, 2583
Budget, 2817; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2817; delay in bringing down budget; tariff not political but economic question; Liberal-Conservative party always protectionist; National policy made Canada great, 2818; protection budget introduced by Minister of Finance; home market; Ontario farmers and protection; Progressive party plank; amendment; industrial conditions preceding adoption of protective policy; tariff stability; Baldwin tinplate industry; loss of due to tariff uncertainty, 2819; government, change of policy; tariff proposals high protection; amendment, Mr. Forke; national policy should be brought up to date; conservation of industries and markets; free trade in potatoes; prices, 2820; eggs, importation from United States; butter; western provinces, conditions in, 2821; houses for harvesters; tendency from free trade and towards protection; industrial conditions in Great Britain; strikes of agricultural labourers; adequate protection of basic industries; unemployment; emigration to United States; industrial possibilities, 2822; wool-combing; hemp industry; skilled workmen going to United States; tariff not responsible for exodus; climate and high taxation; causes of depression; world conditions; high taxation and prices; United States not free trade country; Fordney-McCumber tariff; thirty-five per cent duty on wheat; economy, preaching and practising; deficit in Canada, surplus in Great Britain, France and United States, 2823; Drury government and economy plank; United Farmers of

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Ontario; Ontario, increase of expenditure and debt; British budget, reduction in taxation and expenditure; taxation, increase in Canada, reduction in Great Britain and United States; taxation of luxuries and necessities; "free breakfast table;" coal and food prices; postal rates, reduction of, 2824; public debt; inheritance and income tax; income tax, federal and municipal; cigarette duty; sugar duty, 2825; receipt tax; evasion of; cheque tax; provincial amusement tax, 2826; copper bounty; hemp bounty; wool-combing industry; old age pensions; public health; mother's pensions; railway deficit; Canadian National Railways; capital expenditure; President, appointment of; Col. H. N. Balfour and Mr. A. J. Thomas, appointment of, 2827; principle of promotion; Sir Henry Thornton; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of ships; shipping combine; rates; grain-carrying trade; export tax on pulpwood; water powers, export of electrical energy; Canadian coal, freight rate on, 2828; agricultural conditions; Mr. Thomas Bradshaw, evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; agricultural conditions in United States; rural credits; rural depopulation; prices, spread between producer and consumer; reciprocity, 2829
Business of the House
Committees, reports, qu. 2612
Private members' day, 1160
Progress of, 2469
Sessional programme, 2469
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Returns, 3399
Sale of ships, qu. 2613, 2828, 2518, 3846
Shipping combines, 3846
Canadian National railways, 2828
Advance $73,000,000, 3619
Management, 3620
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Rates, 1761
Securities, 4526
Toronto office building, qu. 1663, 2518
Canadian Press Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games, 4707
Capital and labour, 2583
Chicago drainage canal, diversion, qu. 3821
Civil service, underpaid, 4672
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel Supply

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Freight rate, 2828
Imports, qu. 516
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2583
Combines bill, 2583, 2634
Combines, prosecutions of, qu. 1662
Copper bounty bill, 3238
Cost of living inquiry, qu. 3703
Deputy ministers salaries, 4672
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Elevators
Edmonton, 4721
Ontario, 2038, 4719, 4721
Emigration to United States, 2822
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Euclid hall and Brant house, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Expenditure on wharves, 4568
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4742
Freight rates
Operating costs and, 1761
Railway rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1969
Shipping, Railway Commission control, qu. 2611
Fuel supply
Freight rates, 1268, 2828
M. for a national fuel policy, 1262
Nova Scotia coal, 1269
Special committee, appointment, qu. 617
Transportation, 3200
Grain shipments, 3775
Grand Trunk. *See also under this title.* Canadian National railways
Commitments, qu. 207
Electrification, qu. 283
Halifax elevator, 4721
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4562
Historic sites, preservation of, 3249, 4707
Housing, legislation, qu. 2517, 2822
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4681
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement of, 2774
Hydro electric, power supply, 1266, 1270, 2828
Imperial conference, 4661
Income War Tax Act Amdt, bill, 4493
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Judges serving on royal commissions, 3604
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Military hospitals, 696, 4075, 4303
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 4743
Moose Jaw election, 2774
National fuel policy, M., 1262
Near East Crisis, 1266
Newsprint, export duty, 1267

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Ontario grain elevators, 2038, 4719, 4721
Old age pensions, legislation, qu. 2517, 2827
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3873, 4749
Pensions
British Expeditionary force, 3885
Fenian raid, 3873
Royal commission, report, qu. 2516
South African war, 3873
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779, 2824
Post office salaries, 1780
Prices, high, 2583, 2820, 2822
Proportional representation, 424
Public ownership, 2475, 3622, 3847
Pulpwod, export duty on, 2828
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Railway excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Redistribution Committee report, qu. 2612
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3773
Power development, qu. 490
United States, negotiations, 3208, 3705, 4513
Shipping combines, 2828, 3846, 3848
Soldiers, destitute, burial of, 695
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, 3507
Steamship services
Extension to Great Lakes, 2175
Rates, control of, 2174
St. Lawrence-Great Lakes, ships, qu. 2613
Taxation
High, 2583, 2823
"Taxed to death," 4493
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 3282, 4621, 4624
Postal receipts, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Post office building, 1780
Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506
Union station, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 4011, 4441, 4442
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Unemployment relief, 690
United Farmers of Ontario, 2824
Co-operative stores, 4068
Platform, 4661
Water powers
Electrical energy, export, 2828
National policy, development, 1270
Welland canal construction
Expenditure, qu. 3820
Request for, 3774

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Woollen industry, legislation to assist, 2823, 2827, qu. 4184
Churches, capitalistic system and, 2725
Churchill, Fort. *See* Hudson Bay Railway
Cigars and Cigarettes. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Inland Revenue bill; Taxation; Tobacco
Civil Rights. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Labour, right to organize; Woodsworth
Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power); Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references, generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Act. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence
Appointments, 208. *See also under this title,* Commission
After 1911 election, 2920
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Local committee and, 2816
Postal, 1800. *See also* Post Office
Postmasters. *See* Post Office
Promotions and, 330
Returned soldiers, 386, 1797, 1799
Services and, unnecessary, 2969
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, qu. 2297
Temporary employees made permanent, qu. 4814
Year 1922, 3324
Arthur Young Company, cost of, qu. 1137
Bonus, qu. 204, 1664, 1812, 3352
Employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Dependents, non-resident, 1811
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, employees, 1751, 1752, 1772
Interim supply bill, 3705
Salaries and, qu. 2179
Vote, 1811
Calder Act, 2926, 3266. *See* also Public Service Retirement Act
Statement of, 3402
Civil service list, publication of, qu. 3134
Classification. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Commission.
Abolition, proposed. *See* Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power)
Advice by local committees, 2816
Agricultural produce marketing agent in Great Britain, 4675
"A joke; a farce," 3347
Alleged partisanship, 3347
Anderson, Mr., 1821

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Annual report tabled, 3887
Appointments
British Columbia in, 372
Combines, staff, 2661
Delay in making, 1086, 3292
Fruit inspectors, 3150
Immigration Department
Black, Mr. W. J., 2664
Immigration agents, 1188, 2663
Bowder, Mr., 1199
Chinese immigration officials, 2308, 2482
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085-6
May, Mr., 2663
Indian affairs
Agents, 2151
Doctors, 2160
Live stock Act, inspectors, 3150
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3284, 3290, 3303. *See also* Marshall
Montreal post office, qu. 1361
Postmasters, 1798, 1800, 1801, 1823. *See also* Post Office.
Clementsport, N.S., 1795
Disregarded, 1821-22
Returned soldiers as, 1799
St. Peter's N.S., 1795
Soldier advisers, 3747
Temporary, 2663
Without regard to politics, 3345
Civil Service Act, withdrawal of positions from 561, 914
Commissioners, appointment of, 3348
Cost of, 370, 525, 530
In 1917-1922, qu. 1137
Employees, number of, 370, 3986
And cost, 2970
Temporary, 1385
Employment service, director of, 1676
Examination, 366, 2816, 3986
Exceptions, 1821
House of Commons staff, 2691
Jurisdiction
Positions exempted from, 561, 914
Removal of certain classes from, qu. 278. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Technical officers, removal of, 519
Lightkeepers, 3351
Political patronage, 3347
Postmasters, appointments and dismissals. *See* Post Office
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2502
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Report, 812
Roche, Hon. Dr., 354, 3348

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Staff, number of, See under this title Employes
Unconstitutionality of, 2816
Committee of the House. *See* Civil Service Act
Cost, 2756, 3076
Deputy ministers
Committee, report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Powers of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Salaries, 4557, 4667
Dismissals, 856
Appointments and, after 1911 election, 2817, 2920, 3344, 3345, 3349
In 1922, 3324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, employees, 3252
Economy in. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Employees, number of, 2970, 3264
And salaries, 1912 and 1922, 2712
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Examinations, 366, 2816, 3986
Exemptions, 354, 367
Expenditure, 2785, 2915, 2987, 3027
Reduction in England, 1803
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Cost of, qu. 1137
Verrett, Mr. Hector, 1826
History of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Hours, 1427
Holidays and, 24
Inside service, employees, 911
Interim supply bill, 3705
"Lady who rides to work in automobile" 1772
List, publication of, qu. 3134
Merit system. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Murray, Sir George, report, 3343
Offensive partisanship, dismissals for, 285, 3344
Political patronage, 2816, 3344. *See also* Civil Service Act
Positions excluded from Act, 1156
Post Office department
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Postmasters, dismissals. *See* Post Office
Public Service retirement. *See that title*
Quebec and district employees, 387

Civil Service—*Con.*
Reform, 39-40, 409
Reorganization, 24. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826, 2817
Responsibility, 368
Retiring allowances, Printing Bureau, 3949
Returned soldiers, 1772
Appointments, 386, 1797, 1799
Dismissals, 1772
Salaries, 2805, 3070, 4672. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Bonus and, qu. 2179
Revision,, qu. 204, 1794
Statement by Prime Minister, 1811
Total expenditure, qu. 2086
Seasonal or temporary employment, *See* Civil Service Act Amdt. bill
Statistics, qu. 207
Superannuation, 4593. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Boville, Mr. T. C., qu. 3135
Calder Act, 2926, 3266
Cost of, 2785
Coulter, Dr. R. M., qu. 3135
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, qu. 3135
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 940, 3266
Statement of Prime Minister, 4593
Technical and professional officials, 367, 815
Temporary employees, made permanent, 1385
Underpaid, 4672
Whitley councils, 1654
Women, employment of, 1772
Work outside regular duties, 1675

Civil Service Act. *See also* Civil Service
Abolition of. *See under this title,* M. (Mr. Power)
Alleged violation of, 1794
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 519
Amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for special committee, 534; agreed to on div. 571
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
"Notwithstanding anything in Act" 3276
Special Committee of inquiry, 2970
Appointment of, 936, 986
Membership, change in, 2417
Order of reference, 1256
Pope, Sir Joseph, evidence before, 2970
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4248
M. to concur, withdrawn, 4592-3
Privilege, Mr. Martell, 4363

Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt. Bill
(Seasonal or temporary employment)—Mr. German—1r., 666

Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Repeal of clause permitting additions to term of service) 1r., 2896-7; 2r., com., 3146; 3r., 3147

Civilization, evolution of, 1856

Citizen's Liberty League, 715

Citizenship. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3093-3126, 3219
British Columbia
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Fishing licenses, M., 1540
Oriental immigration, 507, 1217, 2310
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Privilege, equalization of rates, 1911
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2404-06
Canadian Air Force, Hudson Bay route, 1748, 1750
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1920, 3274
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-19
Students, 2314
Creosoted lumber and timber
Duties, qu. 813
Use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Vancouver Creosoting Company, limited, 3231
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 1920, 3274
Equalization of railway rates. *See under* this title, Freight Rates
Firebrick, duty, 3896
Freight rates
Railway rates, equalization of, M. 1284, 1490, 1910, 1914, 1956
Original motion, effect of, 1953
Privilege, 1910
Westward from prairie provinces, 1159
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Immigration
Oriental, 507, 1217, 2310-19
Policy, 1217
Liquor
Export, qu. 1260
Warehouse licenses, British Columbia, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Medical staff, 675

Clark, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Military hospitals—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
New York, Canadian customs officer, 1920 3274
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Panama canal, competition, 1920
Pension Act, administration of, 682
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3867-3886
Amdt. death within five years, 3884; agreed to, 3885
Senate amendments, 4745
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3730
Federal appeal board, 4703
Royal commission on, report, 675
Privilege, equalization of railway rates, 1910
Salmon-canning industry, licenses, 1540
Soldiers
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment, 695
Vetcraft shops, 695
Stanley park foreshore protection, 1008
United States army, mental tests, 1219
Vancouver harbour bill, 268
Vancouver income tax offices, qu. 912

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534

Clifford, Mr. L. O. (South Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Orin D., claim, 626

Climate
Emigration and, 2747, 2823
Winter conditions in Canadian Northwest, Nebraska and Iowa, 1423

Closure. *See* House of Commons

Clothing, duty on, 2981. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Textiles

Clyde, The, mechanics from, 1204

Coal. *See also* Freight Rates; Fuel; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Railways
Alberta, 709, 1247, 1262, 1264, 1268, 1275-82, 3424, qu. 4437, 4692
Freight rates on, 1268, 1272, 1275, 1282, 3009, 3781
Suggested rate of $6 per ton, 1276
Heating appliances for, 4629
Shipment
Hudson bay railway, 1055
Ontario, to, 1163
All-British supply, 1268
Anthracite
Duty, 3493
Supply, 1262, 4692
Welsh, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199

Coal—*Con.*
Areas in Canada, 1344
Bituminous, 83
Duty, 1275, 1278
Edmonton Board of Trade, res, 1275
Briquetting, 789, 3206
Brule lake deposits, 4699
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3807, 3814, 3826
Canadian National railways
Purchases, qu. 1363, 1561, 1564, qu. 4303
Alberta, qu. 4437
United States, qu. 4511
Chimney Corner, N.S., 941
Coke, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1273, 3199
Coke ovens, establishment, 788
Cost of. *See* Cost of Living; Price
Deposits, 2750
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994, 2654
Embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Export, 1275
United States, from, 1249, 1265, 1277
Freight rates, 795, 1268, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3621. *See also that title*
Mines and Minerals Committee, 4514
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502, 3128, 3146, 3222
Cancellation, 3146
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supplies, 1263
Hudson bay region, 1073
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Imports, qu. 516, 1266, 2828
And production, qu. 490
From United States, 1249, 1277
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
"Invisible" 1262
Lands, 1344. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Leases, 3424. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Petition of Right Act
Disbursements, repayments, 3129
Hoppe-Isenberg. *See under this title,* Hoppe and Isenberg
Lignite, 789
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206
Duty, 3493
Miners
Importation of from Belgium, 1177
Oriental, 1901
Strikes. *See* Labour, Strikes
Mines, 2785
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Public ownership, 2727, 3205
Mines and Minerals Committee report, 4743
National fuel policy, M. (Mr. Church) 1262
New Brunswick, 804

Coal—*Con.*
Northern Ontario, 1050
Nova Scotia, 83, 800
Freight rates, 3781
Miners' strike, 1627
Ontario, reported discovery, 2512
Peace river district, 1433
Price, 2824, 3198
Production
British Columbia, 1244
Canada, 2780
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Public ownership, 2785, 3205
Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Purchase of in United States, 3493, qu. 4511
Rates on, 1272. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association, 1275
Resources, 83, 1264
Scarcity, 254
Substitutes, 3199
Tariff, bituminous coal, 1275, 1278
Transportation, 789, 1264
United States embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Welsh anthracite, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199
Quality of, 1279

Coal Tar Derivatives, French Treaty, 1986

Coast Range Steel Company, 2508

Coastal Regulations. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Freight Rates, Shipping
Suspension of, 4219, 4222, 4231, 4235, 4276, 4290

Cobalt Products. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Cobden, Richard, British Free Trade, 3050

Cobourg, Ont., breakwater, 981

Cochrane, the late Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1033, 1046

Code Napoleon, 1558, 1526

Coke. *See* Coal

Cold Storage. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dairying Industry
Canadian-Australian boats, 1848
Co-operative, 2054
Dairying and, 2764, 2978
Eggs, producer and consumer, 1852
Incorporated companies, 2058
Mechanical, 2056
Montreal, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204, 3289

Cold Storage—*Con.*
Municipal, 2054
Plants, 104
Montreal, qu. 2204, 3289
Quebec Harbour Commission, 2055

Cold Storage Act Amdt. Bill
(Subsidy contracts with co-operative societies or associations and municipalities)
Res. 184; 1r., 191; 2r., 271-276; ref. to Com. on Agriculture 276; com., 2054; 3r., 2086, 2199

Collison, Mr. B. W., Rocky Mountains park, 1739

Colombia, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Colonial Status. *See* Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Colonization. *See* Agriculture; Building; Farm Homes; Immigration, Canada Colonization Association; Labour; Soldier Settlement

Colt Machine Guns. *See* National Defence

Combines, 145, 3072. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Prices; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Transportation
Agriculture and, 2786, 2787
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2521, 2527
Banana trust, 2979
Banking system, 4019, 4047, 4083
Big business, 2603
Big interests, 2559
Great Britain in, 2726
Political parties and, 2855
Binder twine, 4376
British North America Act, amendment, 2592
British Parliamentary Com. on trusts, 2544
British preference, 2989
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canadian Press, Limited, 4727
Coal situation and, 254
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Control, 2725
Co-operative buying and, 3018
Cotton manufacturers, 2534, 3464
Dominion Textile Company, 2563
Duties, reduction of, 2608

Combines—*Con.*
Federal jurisdiction over. *See* speeches on Combines bill
Legislation, 39, 145. *See also* Combines bill
Lumber, 2593
Master Plumbers & Steamfitters' Association, decision, 2593
Milk, 2526, 2559, 2569, 2593
Modern business organization, 2524
Money, 648, 4026
Newspaper, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, qu. 2613
Price-fixing, 2606, 2786
Printing, 1623
Privy Council decisions, 2585
Prosecutions, qu. 1662
Restaurant trust, 2584
Sherman anti-trust law, 2602
Shipping, 1440, 2127, 2174, 2578, 2583, 2584, 2613, 2666, 2828, 2928, 2954, 2960, 3789, 3845, 3848, 4077, 4223, 4226, 4277. *See also* Agricultural Conditions, Special Committee; Freight rates, shipping
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613
Great Lakes, qu. 1362
Statement in Toronto Globe, qu. 1362
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Tariff and, 2714
Transportation, 1395. *See also* Freight Rates
United Farmers of Ontario, 2584
United Shoe Machinery Company, 2557, 2560
Webb, Mr. Sydney, report, 2545, 2551
Wheat Board, 2547, 2616, 2857
Wheat pool, 2526
Wholesale grocers case, decision, 2051, 2521

Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2521
Appeal Court of Ontario, decisions, 2527
Privy Council decisions, 2527, 2590

Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Repeal, 2521

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill, (Investigation of alleged combines) Res. 938, 987; 1r., 993; 2r., 2519-2609 on division, 2609; com., 2610, 2615, 2659, 3r., 2701; Senate amendments, 3505
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for investigation, *See under this title* Investigation
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2521, 2527

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Big interests, 2584
Combination no crime, 2527
Combine, definition of, 2520, 2525, 2560, 2595, 2615, 2666
Commissioners, appointment of, 2522, 2626
Competition
Control of, 2526
Lessening of, 2526
Complaints, 2521
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Counsel
Conduct of investigation by, 2632
Representation by, 2618
Division on M. for 2r., 2609
Documents, 2521
Enforcement of, 4229
Experts, employment of, 2631
Inquiry as to, 496
Inquisitorial, 2527, 2608
Investigation
Application for, 2616
Restricted to British subjects, 2617
To be made by six persons, 2617
Grand Jury system of, amdt. (Mr. Church) 2585
Powers of registrar, 2626
Private, 2522
Under Enquiries Act, 2522
No person excused, 2631
Parliament
Jurisdiction, 2521-2609
Right to investigate, 2666
Power to reduce tariff, 3049
Patents, revocation of, 2522
Prices, fixing of, 2520
Privy Council decision, 2559, 2590
Proceedings in private, 2632
Profits, regulation of, 2558, 2585
Publicity, 2522
Registrar, 2522, 2616
Appointments of 2628, 2660
Power to investigate, 2626
Shall cause inquiries, 2618
To report and minister to decide as to further inquiry, 2626
Regulations, 2665
Report, distribution of, 2632-4, 2659
Re-sale price, 2525
Staff, appointment of, 2660
Tariff, reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561
Technicality not to invalidate proceedings, 2665

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Trade unions not affected, 2666
Witnesses, evidence and production of papers, 2631

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade and Commerce

Commercial Agents. *See* Trade

Commercial Intelligence Service. *See* Trade and Commerce

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions, government by. *See* Civil Service Commission; Government

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Prices, 1083, 1851. *See also* speeches on Budget; Prices

Commonwealth Club of California, immigration, 1195

Community Clubs. *See* Immigration

Companies Act Amdt. Bills
1. Mining companies, permission to pay dividends out of capital—Mr. German—1r., 435
2. Private company; shares without nominal or par value; capital, etc.—Mr. Copp—1r., 3261; 2r., com., 4208; 3r., 4218; Senate amendments, 4736

Sections and subjects discussed:
Amount of capital required, 4210
Annual meeting, 4215
Annual returns, 4215
Borrowing powers, 4213
By-laws for increase or decrease of number, 4215
By-law to be sanctioned, 4214
Capital
Increase of, 4213
Reduction of, 4213
Change of name, 4211
Commission for securing subscriptions, 4212
Directors
Powers, 4212
Qualifications, 4215
Dividends payable out of wasting assets, 4214
Issue of shares without nominal or par value, 4208

Companies Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Meetings of creditors, 4216
Private company may become public company, 4212
Prospectus, requirements as to particulars, 4212
Repeal, 4212
Stock of other companies, purchases, 4212
Subscriptions in return, 4215
Summary to be filed, 4216
When company may be created a private company, 4208

Compensation for Cattle. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock

Competitive Examinations. *See* Civil Service

Conciliation and Labour Act. *See* Labour

Concurrence. *See* Interim Supply; Supply

Condensed Milk. *See* Dairying Industry

Confectionery and Beverages Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Confederation. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Charlottetown conference, 1368
Debate, 1367
Intercolonial railway, 1756
Nova Scotia, attitude towards, 1376
Quebec conference, 1368
Senate, nominative or elective, 1366

Conferences, 3411. *See also* Imperial
Disarmament, 2911, 4000
International Labour. *See* Labour

Confidence, Lack of. *See* Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Congdon, Mr. Fred T.
Appointment as commissioner, 2710, qu. 3131. *See also* Canadian National railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Correspondence with Justice dept., 2299

Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183

Connaught Park Jockey Club. *See* Race Track Betting

Connaught Place Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials, Ottawa

Conscription, 2816
"Infamous and anti-Canadian," 3038
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, and, 3015
Men and wealth, of, 2729

Conseil National des Métiers, qu. 3141

Conservative Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Political Parties
Administration, 1911-1921, 3038
Agricultural implements duty, 2974
Alleged understanding on Mr. Shaw's amendment to Address, 987
History of party. *See* Proportional Representation
National policy, 3067
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Pledges, violation of, 2974
Tariff policy, 3063
Tariff resolution of 1922, 2220

Constituencies, Redistribution of. *See* Redistribution Bill

Constitution, right of Canada to make her own, 1378

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Budget; Imperial Conference; Lack of Confidence Vote; Treaties; Halibut

Consular Agents. *See* Trade

Consumer. *See also* Address; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Prices; Purchasing Power; Taxation
French Treaty and, 3049
Italian treaty and, 3049
Oleomargarine, 3534
Prices. *See also that title*
Meat, 2877
Producer and consumer, 2829, 2972, 3029
Purchasing power, 2812
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Relief of, 2718
Renovated butter, 4251
Sales tax increases passed on to, 2859, 2804, 2998
Sugar duty, 2987
Tariff and, 2854, 3054
Taxation, 2789, 2801, 4415
Wheat board, 2857

Consumption Tax. *See* Taxation

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Containers, Fruit. *See* Sale and Inspection

Contrecœur wharf, 950-1008

Conventions, Trade. *See* Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Conversion Loan. *See* Loans

Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179

Co-operation
Agricultural products, distribution, 1852, 2869
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253. *See also* Markets; Prices
Co-operative association and societies, 3073. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt bill
Cold storage, 2054
Failure of, 1419
Co-operative credit associations, 4038
Industrial and financial organizations, 2589
Industrial relations, 2895
Town and country, between, 2972

Co-ordination. *See* National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agricultural and manufactured products, prices, 1851
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Agricultural implements, prices, 1407
Alberta
Oil bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling and prospecting, 781
Assignments in bankruptcy, qu. 937, 1412
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4072, 4077-4146, 4140
Interest
Circulation redemption fund on, amdt. 4093, neg. 4093
Maximum rate, amdt. 4125, neg. 4131; 4149, neg. 4149
Issuing of notes, 4092
Shareholders' audit, auditors to report to Minister, amdt. 4090, neg. 4091
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4145
Banks and Banking
Cost of living, 1409
Returns, 3264
British preference, cotton goods, 3463
Business of the House, bill not printed, 3974
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, grain shipments, qu. 3263
Canadian National parks, leasing, 3442
Canadian National Railways
Directors, address and occupation, qu. 1973
Hotels, 938
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Removal of, 3189
Statements of, 1869
Combines, shipping, 2613
Copper bounty bill, 3236, 3240
Cost of living increase, 1408
Crude petroleum bounties 781
Dairying industry, 1851
Dominion Textiles Company, securities and dividends, 3463
Dry Dock Subsidies bill, 3979

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Eggs, price of, 1851
Emigration to the United States, 1412
Experimental farms, 479
Farmers, purchasing power, 1408
Freight rates, increase, 3190
Geological survey, 2508
Grain and grain trade
Government elevator system, 3264
Grain Act, administration
Dockage, 782, qu. 3141
Grain Commissioners, board of
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Names, etc., qu. 2206
Grain Elevator Commission, qu. 1867
Montreal shipments, qu. 1973, qu. 1974
Shipping rates, M., 2517, 2613
Shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Hansard, subscription rate, 1715
Harbours and rivers, 948
Hemp bounty, 3913
Highwood river, power, 3427
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502
Immigration
Advertising, 1114
Policy, 1407
Immigration Act Amdt. bill 3981
Inflation, inequalities of, 1447
Iron ore, Alberta, 2512
Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpoena, 4145
National Gallery, M. to reduce vote, 1018
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Privilege—correction of press report, 2519
Public Works, expenditures by provinces, qu. 3887
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2494, 2500
Railway Commission, qu. 1973
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., statement of, 3188
Statements of, 1869
Robb, Hon. Mr., visit to Australia, 1850
Rugs, purchase of, qu. 1486
Rural depopulation, 1855
Seed grain advances, 3445
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement, 2030
Amounts due Dominion govt., qu. 814
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139
Vancouver elevator, qu. 1487
Vancouver harbour bill, 265
War claims, 2498

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Water powers, 3427, 3442
Woollen industry, condition of, 3463

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Civil Service
Commission
Annual report, 3887
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Employees, return showing, 911
Civil Service Act Special Com., report, 4248
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3261, 4208, 4217, 4736
Dorchester penitentiary, 770
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 1384, 2107, 2113, 2182, 2199, 2437-54, 3983
Discretion to Secretary of State, 2447
Judges, 2441, 2446
Justice department, opinion of, 2441
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1017
Public Archives, 3985
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2498
Returns, inquiries for, 3324
Secretary of State department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 2503
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500

Copper. *See* Mines and Minerals

Copper Bars or Rods, bounty on, 2703, 2709, 2778, 4369. *See also* Bounties

Copyright. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs
United States, 2289

Copyright Act. *See also* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
M. (Mr. Rinfret) 495

Copyright Act Amendment Bill
(Compliance with British and international copyright acts.) 1r., 487; 2r., com., 2139; com., 2287; 3r., 2436; Senate amendments, 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Robb) licenses and importation of books, 2291, agreed to on div. 2292
Ref. to, 2344
Authors, memorandum on behalf of, 3155
Berne Convention, 2139, 2288, 2343, 3155
Civil servant, alleged communication to Le Droit D'Auteur, 2140

Copyright Act Amendment Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Commencement of act, 2145, 2287
Great Britain and, 2140
Le Droit d'Auteur, 2140, 2343
Legislation, history of, 2343
Licenses, importation, 2139, 2287, 2291, 2344
Piracy, 2287
Song writers, 2287

Cordage and Rope
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp
Production in Canada, 2780

Corless, Dr., Hudson bay district, 1040

Corn Laws. *See* Great Britain

Cornwall Canal employees, qu. 3135

Corporations, profits, 1209. *See also* Combines; Immigration

Corsets, duty, 3048

Cory, Mr. W. W. *See* Interior

Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217

Cossar, Dr. George C., immigration, 1471

Cost of Living, 1394, 1812, 2704, 2736, 2835. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Combines; Consumer; Immigration; Labour, Unemployment; Prices; Taxation
Banks and, 1409
Budget and, 1410, 1812
Canada and Great Britain, 3468, 3472
Canada and United States, comparison, 3073
Canada, one of most expensive countries, 2715
Charts, 1700
Clerical classes, 3534
Coal, cost of, 1345, 1813. *See also* Coal
Combines and, 2599. *See also* Combines
Consumer and, 2585
Curve, formerly descending now ascending, 3000
Customs and excise duties, 2839
Decrease of, 1700, 1907
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3465
Dumping clause and, 2535
Emigration and, 2790. *See also* Emigration
"Free breakfast table" 2824
Freight rates and, 1958
Government investigation, inquiry, qu. 3703
Increase of, 1853
Labour Gazette figures, 1812
Liberal platform, 1410
Living within income, 2959

Cost of Living—*Con.*
Members of Parliament. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Michell, Prof., figures, 1700, 1812
Necessity for lower, 1412, 1437
Oleomargarine, 3508-3580
Prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Producer and consumer, 2713, 2972
Spread between, 2787
Production, cost of, 2815
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
R. G. Dun & Company, figures, 1812
Special Committee on, 2569
Standard of living, 2959
Statistics, 1684
Tariff and, 2737, 2839, 3048
Reductions offset by sales tax, 3033
Taxation, 2839. *See also that title*
Sales tax, 1813, 2839, 2997
Unorganized workers, 3534
Wages, 2890, 2982. *See also* Labour
Workingman, 2982

Cotton. *See* Textiles; Treaties, French

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, Vancouver dry dock, 1002

Coulter, Dr. R. M. *See* Post Office

Courtenay Bay. *See* St. John

Craig, Mr. Charles P., qu. 204

Cranfield, Mr. W. T., publicity agent in London, 2927, 2983, 4707

Crawford, Mr., letter to Minister of Immigration, 1396

Crean, Mr. Frank J. B., resources of northern Saskatchewan, 1060

Creditors. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Credits. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Finance; Housing; Loans; Money
Agricultural. *See under this title,* Rural Credit and industry, 626, 645, 650
Douglas credit scheme, 631
Economic problem and, 647
Farm. *See under this title,* Rural
Function and relation to industrial problems
M. (Mr. Irvine) for special com., 626
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to refer to Banking and Commerce Com. 645, agreed to, 651
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) ruled out of order, 643
Improved system, 1252
Monopoly, 648, 4018, 4045
New York loan, April 1922, 2963
Prices and, 4226

Credits—*Con.*
Rural, 639, 640, 1088, 1438, 1907, 2751, 2836, 2869, 2929, 3024, 3060, 3066, 4014, 4016, 4035, 4039, 4041, 4045, 4046, 4066, 4071, 4130, 4144, 4146, 4298
Interest rates, 2962
United States, 642, 2829, 2930
United States system, 4043
Withheld, 3074

Creelman, Dr. George. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Imports of farm produce, 1426

Creosoting Industry, 1245, 3234
Creosoted piling, use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Lumber and timber, customs duty, qu. 813
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3231

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette)
Banking and Commerce Com., retirement from, 2639
Civil Service statistics, qu. 207
Resignation as leader of Progressive party, 11, 35

Crime. *See* Criminal Code; Justice, Penitentiaries

Criminal Code. *See also* Criminal Code Amdts.
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051
Board of Commerce and, 2521
Combines, 2521, 2527, 2592. *See also* Combines
Enforcement of, 4229
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Labour, right to organize, 2890
Race-track betting, 709

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills
1. Capital punishment abolition of (Mr. Irvine) 1r., 180; 1r., second time by error in order paper, 487; explanation of error, 519; opportunity for consideration, inquiry, 1810
2. Scrip frauds. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 730
3. Registration of declaration of ownership by proprietors of newspapers (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
4. Opium joints; betting information; age of consent; carnal knowledge; illegal use of badge; appeals (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1483; 2r., com., 2281; 3r., 2284; Senate amendments, 4733
5. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 616

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
6. Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1971; 2r., com., 2053; 3r., 2054

Criminal Matters, procedure, qu. 1974

Crops. *See* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade

Cross Benches. *See* McMaster

Cross Point, Que., wharf, 955

Crown Lands. *See* Lands

Crowsnest Pass Agreement, 1563, 1620. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Railway; Freight Rates; Progressive Party
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
Extension, 2741

Crude Oil. *See* Oil; Petroleum

Crude Petroleum. *See* Petroleum

Cuba, trade with, 308. *See also* Steamship Services; West Indies

Cummings Cove, wharf, 945

Cunard Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Curie, Monsieur and Madame, discovery of radium, 1287

Currants. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Depreciated, 2988, 4027. *See* Money; Purchasing Power
Inflation. *See* Germany, Reparations

Currie, General Sir Arthur, directorships, 4025

Curzon, Lord, of Kedleston, signature of Italian treaty, 2403

Custodians. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation; Trade; Treaties
Average tariff rate 2838
Averages and valuation 90
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260. *See also* Liquor
British preference. *See that title*

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Canadian customs officer at New York. *See under this title,* New York
Collections
Cost of, qu. 814
For 1922, 22
Per capita, Canada and United States, 2738
Customs duties. *See also* Customs Tariff
Agricultural and animal products, qu. 1992
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2740, 2743, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
Automobiles, 2908, 3075
Collections, 1921-22 and 1922-23, 2838
Creosoted lumber and piling, qu. 813
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3272
Goods shipped from Vancouver to Halifax via Panama canal, 2615
Hemp seed, 3474
Lowering, 2221
Nursery stock, 4432
Reduction. *See* British preference; Budget; Treaties, French treaty
Tomato plants, 4432
Wool, 2866
Department
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283, 816
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4669
Employees, 3282
Estimates, 3272
Halton county officials, 914
Legal work, transfer of, 856
Medicine Hat employees, qu. 3505
Officials, salaries, etc., qu. 3892
Salaries and contingencies, 3272
Depreciated currency clause, 2988
Drawbacks, qu. 1484
Antiseptic surgical dressing, 2655
Artificial silk tops and yarns, 3489, 3896
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper in blocks or ingots, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Machinery and parts, 2655
Oil, 2655
Oleomargarine, materials for, 3503
Raw materials, qu. 1864
Imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259
Steel, coal and woollen goods, qu. 1994
Sugar, 2655
Dumping clause, 2646, 3072, 2988
Sugar, 3046
Excise. *See also* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation
Beer, qu. 518

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Beet sugar, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393. *See also* Sugar
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and beverages
Cigarettes, 2706, 2825, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 3229, 4392
Cigars and, consumption, qu. 516
516
Smuggling, 3230
Confectionery and beverage tax, revenue, qu. 624, 2644, 2656, 2707, 2979, 3046
Duties, 3026
Payment by consumer, 2839
Irritating taxes, 2858
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 1820, 2979 3927, 3937, 4435
Revenue, loss of, 1983
Taxation, 3010
Tobacco, duty collected, qu. 1259
Wines, 452, qu. 518, 1977, 2656, 2742, 3036, 3937, 4425
Canadian, 2643, 2710
Hawkesbury, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Inspectors, immigration, 1874
Marking Act, 931, qu. 616, 2988
Montreal
Customs house, and revenue 3280
Newsprint, 3046. *See also* Pulp and Paper
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272
Transfer of goods at, 3272
Printing presses, duty, 2858
Pulpwood, export tax on, 2828. *See also* Export Act
Raw materials, free, 2858
Seizures, qu. 620
Schooner Carrie L. Hirtle, qu. 3323
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 4621
Revenue, 3277
Valuation for duty, 90, 145. *See also under this title,* Customs duties
Customs Tariff. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill; Customs Tariff Items; Tariff

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill
Res. 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
Sections and subjects discussed:
British preference, discount of 10 per cent, 2650
Drawbacks, 2655
Reciprocity negotiations with United States, 2650
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Tariff changes, 2654

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
United States, duties against, reduction by order in council, 2650

Customs Tariff Items, 3454, 3895
Antiseptic surgical dressings, 2655
Artificial silk, 2645, 2820, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3069, 3075
Artificial fibre silk fabrics and, 2654, 3492
Manufactures, 2654
Tops and waste or artificial silk fibre tops and waste, 3489
Yarns, 2654, 3035, 3489
Barilla or soda ash, drawback, 2655, 3502
Beverages, 2979. *See also this title under* Customs and Excise
Bisulphate of soda or nitre cake, 2480, 2653, 3895
Boots and shoes, 2999, 3033
Boots, orthopaedic, 2654, 2750
Brass and copper scrap, 2653, 3483
Brass, iron or steel runners, rings, caps, etc. for umbrellas, 3501
Carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Casual donations, 2645, 2654
Cigarettes, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2825, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988
Coal, 2654
Anthracite and lignite, 3493
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental supplies, 2653, 3483
Cotton for manufacturers of pneumatic tires, 2654, 3487
Crude petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481
Cyanamid or lime nitrogen, 2654
Date when changes become effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 2653, 3480
Drawbacks, 3501. *See also this title* under Customs and Excise
Artificial silk tops and waste, 3896
Artificials silk yarn, filaments, etc, 3502
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper for manufacture of wire, 3503
Copper in blocks, ingots, pigs or bars, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Items enumerated in item 236, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Materials used in manufacture of goods enumerated in item 448c, 3503
Oil for manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502
Sugar, 2655, 3502
Dumping clause, 2535
Dry red lead, orange mineral, zinc white and white oxide of antimony, 2653, 3034, 3481
Emery and carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Firebrick, 2653, 3035, 3481, 3896
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, hatters' tips and sides, 2654, 3500
Hemp seed, 2645, 2651, 3017
Iron or steel scrap, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Linen yarn, 3897
Liquorice in rolls and sticks, 2653, 3480
Liquorice paste, 2653, 3017, 3480
Machinery for conversion of fish waste, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Machinery not made in Canada, 2645, 2653, 2655, 3503
Malt flour, 2645, 2652, 3480
Manufactures of artificial silk or artificial fibre silk, 3492
Milk bottles, 3033
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502, 3901
Paper caps for milk bottles, 3033
Petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481. *See also* Bounties; Petroleum
Porcelain for pumps, 3033
Potatoes, 2651, 2707, 2959, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Printing and photographic presses and type-making accessories, 3486
Printing machinery, 2645, 2653, 2858
Prunes and dried plums, 2651, 3474
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, 2651, qu. 2699, 2718, 2964, 2989, 3017, 3034, 3068, 3474, 3479
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474, 3479
Reciprocity with United States, 2649. *See also that title*
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Rolled iron and steel and cast steel for milling cutters, 2653, 3484
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Scrap iron, 3034
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Silks, 2645, 3046. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 2653, 3483
Staves of wood, 2654, 3487
Sticks or canes, 2654, 3501
Stumping machines, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Sugar, 2645, 2651, 2744, 2820, 2825, 2968, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3039, 3046, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping duty, 2646
Sulphate of copper, 3895
Typewriters and parts, 2653, 3485
Usual coverings containing goods not machinery, 3501

Customs Tariff Items—*Con.*
Value for home consumption, 2535
Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics, 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 2645, 2653, 3487

Czecho-Slovakia
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with France, 2219

Dairy Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Accredited herds, Health of Animals

Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. Bills
1. Butter substitutes and re-manufacture of butter. Res. 2518, 3150; 1r., 3154; M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3329, 3449, agreed to, 3451; notice of M. (Mr. Carroll) for 2r., 3399, 3402
Sections and subjects discussed:
Drafting, 3325
Oleomargarine, 3325
M. anticipating, 3326
Parliamentary counsel, 3325, 3449
2. Butter standard; renovated butter; milk or cream containing fat or oil other than that of milk. Res. 3961, 4251, 1r., 4344; 2r., com., 3r., 4510
Sections and subjects discussed:
Definition, 4510
Establishment of guilt for violation of act, 4510
Minimum standard of fat in butter, 4510

Dairying Industry, 609, 1851. *See also* Address; Budget; Dairy Industry Act; Live Stock; Oleomargarine
Alberta, 1839
Antipodean competition, 2765
Bacteriology, 462
Butter
Adulteration, 3150
British market, in, 2863
China shipments to, 1840, 1853
Compounds, 3152
Disease germs, 3295
Exports to France, 2217, 2273. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates 1961
Fresh, shipment from Enrope, 2273
Grading, 2765, 2864, 3151, 3283, 3297
Imitations of, 3152
Imports 2821, 2959
"Manna" 3152
Oleomargarine and, 386, 3508-81. *See also* Oleomargarine
Pasteurization, 3298
Price, 2821, 3513, 3533
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Butter—*Con.*
Quality 2863
Poor, 3516
Renovated, 3151. *See also* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Restrictions, 3153
Salt, too much, 2863, 3297
Standard of fat. *See* Dairy Industry Act
Substitutes, 3150
Weight, 3151
Certified milk. *See under this title,* Milk
Cheese
Acidity and bacteria, 3297
Bacteriology 462
China, shipment to, 1853
Cold storage, 2055
Disease germs, 3295
Grading, 2765, 3283, 3295
Imports, 2959
Prices, 3295
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Cold storage, 2978. *See also that title*
Co-operative, 2764
Cow-testing, 3284, 3297
Cream
Fermented, 3151
Pasteurizing, 3283
Dairy branch estimates, 609, 3283
Dairy cattle testing, 1307. *See also* Live Stock, Accredited herds
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Finch, combined cheese and butter factory, 3284, 3297
French treaty and, 1984
Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, 457, 2769
Leitch, Prof., evidence before Agricultural Conditions Com., 1843
Losses on cheese and butter, 2934
Markets, 2863
Milk
Certified, 3300
Fat or oil content. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Filled milk, 3152
Fraser Valley Association, 4265
Pasteurizing, 3283
Price of, 2559
Products, imports, qu. 617
Sale of in Toronto, 2731
Supply, monopolies and combines. *See* Combines bill
Modern methods, 2765
Montreal cold storage plant, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage
National Dairy Council of Canada, oleomargarine, 3269

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Products, grading, 2864
Representative in Great Britain, 3297
Research laboratory, 3297
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs., trip to New Zealand, 3283, 3288
Supplies, comparison of prices, 2740
Testing system, extension of, 3284
Unprofitable herds, 2863
Value of, 2863
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association, 4266
Whey, disease germs, 3299

Daly Building. *See* Public Buildings, Ottawa

Damage to Mortgaged Premises. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Canada's participation in war, 1536
Canadian National railways,, doctors, 814
Grand Trunk arbitration, 1307
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Newspapers and printing companies, 2298

Dartmouth, N.S. pier and dredging, 4568

Davidson Commission. *See* War

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Canadian National railways branch lines, 4195, 4323
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1051
Oliver-St. Paul branch line railway, 4323
Western provinces, treatment of, 4195
Wheat prices, 1886

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., deputy Governor General, 1809

Dawson, Mr. F. G., Prince Rupert. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Daylight Saving
Farmers and, 1427
Montreal post office, qu. 3143
Ottawa, qu. 2612
Parliament, departments and, qu. 2612

Deadman's Island, qu. 1362

Death Rate, 1197

Debates, Official. *See* House of Commons

Debt. *See also* Public Debt; Taxation
Capital levy, 2743
Domestic, 1343
Farmers and, 2768
Federal, provincial and municipal, per capita, 2720, 2721

Debt—*Con.*
Held in foreign countries, 1406
Immigration and. *See* Immigration
Outside of Canada, estimated, 2720
Pyramiding of, 2728
Readjustment of, 2981

Debtor. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Deceased Husband's Brother, Marriage with, Bill—Mr. McMaster, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Deceased Members, tributes to memory. *See* House of Commons

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3538

Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Deep Waterways. *See* St. Lawrence

Defeat of Government Motion. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Defence. *See* National Defence

Deficits. *See* speeches on Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways

Deflation. *See* Credit; Finance; Money; Prices; Purchasing Power

Delay in British Mails. *See* Post Office

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Grondines wharf, 968
Valcartier camp ground, qu. 2298

Demers, Mr. Amedee, mail contractor, qu. 1868

Democracy, Senate and. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Budget, 3038; sectional and local interests; tribute to Finance Minister, "the man of the hour"; Liberal and Conservative administrations; Conscription Act; extravagance in the name of freedom and civilization; change of government; improvement in financial situation; railway and shipping deficits; balanced budget; taxation, relief from; sales tax; income tax; exemption for children; taxation of dividends; unity of property; confidence in government; amendment, 3038

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration
Labour and, 1196
Policy, 1196
Montreal post office,
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
Waste paper, disposal, qu. 1028

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1519
Private members' days, 1158
Senate, M. for elective, 1364

Denmark
Bacon competition, 2864, 2865
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3296, 3515
Hog grading, 591
Immigration from, 1096
Land settlement policy, 1406
Oleomargarine, 3515, 3559
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Dennis, Mr. J. S. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Dentists, narcotic drugs for. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act

Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Act. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed mothers

Deportation. *See* Chinese Immigration bill; Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Narcotic Drugs

Depression, causes of, 2747. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration

Deputy Local Judges. *See* Admiralty Act

Deputy Ministers
Appointment of, 1805
Conference and report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Responsibility of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Retirement and superannuation, 891, 1822-5, qu. 3135, 3342
Salaries, increase, 4557, 4667

Deputy Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Rulings and statements. *See also* Marcil; Speaker

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Amendments
Form of, 65-66
Varying nature of grant, 4371
Bills
Amendments
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 3888
Proposed in committee, 4371
General argument not permissible on particular clause, 4063, 4073, 4244
Not printed, proceeding, 3968, 3974, 3976
Reading clauses, marginal notes sufficient, 3974
Relevancy, 3238, 3863, 4371
Chair
Criticism of, 2412, 4720
To be addressed, 897
Committee
Anticipation of clause, 4071
Items declared carried, 4704
Relevancy
General discussion permissible, 2414
Newspapers, reading from, 2412
Speeches in, 2137, 2309, 2342, 2414, 2481, 2482, 2624, 2664, 3239, 4025, 4051, 4054, 4058, 4063, 4074, 4191, 4374, 4534
Special, action not reviewable by Committee of Whole 4074
Conversation 4528, 4572, 4581
Debate
Interruptions, 4064
Mover closes, 657, 2602, 4361, 4363
Reference to matter sub judice, 3371
Relevancy, 1407, 1420, 2137, 4025
Debates, Official Report, 1638
Insertion of documents not read, 3174, 3789
Undiscussed item in supply, omission, 1638, 3285, 3292
Estimates, consideration en bloc, 4559, 4614, 4616
Interruptions, cannot prevent if member speaking does not object, 4192
Language, 4238, 4244
Letter reflecting on proceedings of House, 4060
Matters sub-judice, 3371
Member
May ask question but not make speech, 2774
Must confine remarks to section under discussion, 4244
Reflection on 4239
Speaking, not compelled to answer question, 1125, 4064

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Member—*Con.*
Speaking not to be interrupted, 1420
Motions
Amendments, 245
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 4720
Discussion allowed pending decision, 316
To be in writing, 866
To increase taxation 3935, 3936, 3937
Orders of the day
Explanation in detail not in order, 2255
Reading letters 2254
Questions
Already answered, 3913
Irrelevant 2624, 3863
Supply
General discussion not permissible, 4559
Items
Agricultural Instruction grant, 3285
Classification of, 3287
Consideration en bloc, 4612
Minister not required to give information twice, 3386
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Reconsideration of item by unanimous consent, 609
Relevancy, 486, 594, 608, 778, 888, 898, 1014, 1846, 1902, 2154, 3197, 3250, 3253, 3291, 3293, 3371, 3424, 4558, 4559, 4562, 4566, 4602, 4688, 4699, 4719
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3285, 3292, 3293, 3294
Urgency, 4731

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries, Wrecks

Desbarats, Mr. G. J. *See* National Defence

Descente des femmes, Que. wharf, 955

Descoteaux, Mr. J. F. (Nicolet)
Introduced, 2837

Desertions
Canadian Air Force, 2418
Seamen. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Designs. *See* Trade Marks and Designs Act

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Cedar Rapids power, 659
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 379
Electric power, export of, M., 658
Emigration to the United States, 1241
Gaspe, natural resources, 1242
Immigration
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Domestic servants, 1243
Labour, attitude towards, 1241

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1243
Policy, 1241
United States from, 1243
Labour, unemployment, 1242
Metagen analysis of, qu. 1867
Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912
Montreal
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Public Works, chief architect's branch, qu. 2517
Wheat shipments to Montreal, qu. 385

Despatches. *See* Near East Crisis

Destructive Insects and Pests. *See also* Insect Pests
Administration of Act, 595, 3988

Detroit River, regulation of traffic, 3357

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1546
Canadian products, duty of Canadians to purchase, 1244
Coal production in British Columbia, 1244
Creosoting industry, 1245
Emigration to the United States, 1244
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4353
Free trade, effect of, 1246
Fuel oil importations, 1245
Fuel supply, 1247
Hemp bounty bill, 4390
Hindu franchise, 4661
Immigration
Oriental, 1247
Policy, 1244
Imperial Conference, 4661
Lumber industry of British Columbia, 1245
Nanaimo and Victoria harbours, 1014
Port Renfrew wharf, 1008
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4353
Reciprocity, 1246
Tariff equal to that of United States, 1246
Western provinces, conditions in, 1246

Digby, N.S.
Dredging, 4568
Pier, 942

Direct Importation. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty

Direct Taxation. *See* Taxation

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Directory of government offices, qu. 2085

Disability Cases. *See* Pensions

Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. for Supply, 2347, neg, on div. 2391

Disallowance of Provincial Legislation. *See* Jurisdiction; Legislation

Disarmament. *See also* Great Lakes
Conference at Washington, 2911, 4000

Discrimination. *See* Freight Rates; Railway Act Amdt. bill

Diseases. *See* Health
Cattle, of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Dismissals. *See* Civil Service; Post Office,

Distressed Canadians. *See* Relief

Distressed Seamen. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Marine

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Divorces
Number granted, qu. 622
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971

Dockages. *See* Grain; Elevators

Doctors. *See also* Health; Military Hospitals; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Canadian National railways, qu. 814
Charges and standards of living, 2813
Indians, medical service, 2160
Medical and scientific discoveries. *See* Banting; Medical Research; Scientific Research
Narcotic drugs. *See that title*

Doherty, Mr Manning, cattle embargo removal, 2871

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization Act, 2447, 2463-65
Payments to, 1154
Pension, qu. 1029

Doherty Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill

Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, Ont., 3433

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic Servants. *See* Immigration; Labour

Dominion Archives. *See* Public Archives

Dominion Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Dominion Astrophysical Observatory. *See* Interior

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420

Dominion Cotton Mills. *See* Textiles

Dominion Elections Act. *See also* Elections; Proportional Representation
Amendments, inquiry as to, 1027
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Dominion Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways, Express

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See also* Forests and Forestry
(Description of areas 1r., 1256; 2r., com., 2060; 3r., 2086

Dominion Fuel Board. *See* Fuel Supply

Dominion Iron and Steel Company, industrial disputes, 1703

Dominion Lands. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands Act; Dominion Lands and Parks; Lands
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Drainage. *See under this title,* Reclamation
Free land available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Grants to railways, 1353
Grazing lands, 3424
Leases, sale of, 3424
Homesteads. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Patents in event of death or insanity, 3398
Pre-emption and purchases, qu. 1030
Reversion to Dominion government, 3257
Second. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
In southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Valuation and revision of, 3398
Homesteaders, relief, 3447
Hudson Bay railway, land sales, 1053, 1068
Indian title, extinguishment of, 3398
Interest rates on deferred payments, 1088-9
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, qu. 1031
Allocation to Hudson Bay railway, 1353, qu. 2393
Reclamation, 3257, 3428, 3430. *See also* Irrigation

Dominion Lands—*Con.*
Reclamation—*Con.*
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Carrot river district, 3431
Kootenay flats, 3431
Lesser Slave lake, 3430
Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Moose range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
Waterhen lake district, 3431, qu. 4303
School lands, 3398, 4202
Balance due on purchase price, 1385, 1389. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.
Reversion of, 3445
Southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Timber, permit to cut, 203, 3398
Unorganized districts, 3258

Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bills
1. Coal lands and mining rights, 1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3149; 3r., 3150
2. Homestead valuations; second homesteads; issue of patents in event of death or insanity; school lands; permits to cut timber; extinguishment of Indian titles. Res. 3398, 3982; 1r., 2r., com., 3983; com., 4201, 4364; 3r., 4369

Sections and subjects discussed
Governor in Council may authorize inquiry, 4206
Issue of patent after death of applicant, 4202
Issue of patent if applicant becomes insane, 4202
No employee to purchase Dominion lands, 4206
Sections set apart as school lands, 4202
Terms of payment for school lands, 4202
Timber limits, areas, 4206
Transfer to another homestead, 4202, 4364

Dominion Lands and Parks, 3938, 4702. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Appointments, 3252
Cloakey, Mr., 3254
May, Mr., 3254
Drainage, 3257
Moose Range, qu, 3144, 3259
Unorganized districts, 3258
Dwight, Mr. T. W., allowance, 4702
Estimates, 3406
Expenditure, 113
Forest reserves, roads and bridges, 1014
Fortier, Mrs. F. T. E., allowance, 4702
Homesteads, 3251
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Outside salaries, 3249
Rocky Mountain park
Claim of Hudson Bay company, qu. 2418
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Dominion Lands and Parks—*Con.*
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Unorganized districts, improvement, 3256
Wainwright buffalo reserve, 3407. *See also* Buffalo

Dominion Marine Association. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Dominion Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Power Board. *See* Water Powers

Dominion Textile Company. *See* Textiles

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B. *See* Public Archives

Douglas Credit Scheme. *See* Credits

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Downie, Mr. Donald. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Drain Tiles. *See* Taxation, Sales Tax

Drainage. *See* Dominion Lands, Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M. *See* Printing Bureau, King's Printer

Drawbacks. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 153. Speech of Mr. Meighen, 153, 154; sales tax; New York loans, 154-155; direct increase of Canada's obligations; surplus of previous years; railway expenditure, 155; Sir Henry Thornton and the railways; National railway board, 156; Intercolonial railway; Mr. D. B. Hanna, 157; Lanark election; domestic loan, 158; cost of placing loans in New York, 158-159; commissions on loans; increase in public expenditure, 159-160; Mr. Shaw's amendment, 160
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Department, salaries and contingencies, 610
Annuities, old age, 1696, 1698
Artificial silk industry, 2659, 2703, 2853. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Auditor General, vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4674
Automobile insurance, 3978
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314
Bank draft tax, 3925, 3928
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. 3097-3125, 3209-3222
Beet sugar duty, 2657, 2706, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597 4608
Board of Audit Act, 4355
Botany yarn duty, 3896
British Empire exhibition, 1910, 3949
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3458
Woollen goods, 3459
Budget
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1868 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Protective feature, 3468
Speech, 2657; congratulations to the Minister of Finance; Mr. Fielding's 17th budget; cigarette tax; beet sugar tax; French treaty; raisins and dried currants; tariff stability; United States prosperity, 2657; Canada, condition and prospects; financial situation; railways; debt; deficits; estimates for 1923-24; taxation, 2658; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty, 2659; trade and industry, 2701; comparison with other countries, finances; debt and deficits; budget; tariff, changes in; free trade, 2702; tariff stability; artificial silk industry; copper rods and bars, 2703; hemp bounty; silk; sales tax; cost of living, 2704; receipt tax, 2705; luxuries; cheque tax; income tax; cigarette tax; beet root sugar, 2706; confectionery and beverages; reciprocity with United States; potatoes, duty on; imports and exports, 2707; imports of agricultural products; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2708; copper bounty; hemp bounty; revenue and expenditure; deficits, 2709; French treaty; taxation of necessities instead of luxuries; political budget; government supporters appointed to Senate and Bench; jobs for political supporters; shipping rates; royal commissions, 2710; timber famine; amendment, opportunity for Progressive party to move, 2711
Reference to, 3074
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3439
Business of the House, 3127
Adjournments at 11 p.m., 1360
Bills, principle, on second reading, 3091

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Motion to increase taxation, 3936
Private members' day, 1161
Supply
Calling of, 2295
Undiscussed items not in official report, 3285
Business Profits War Tax bill, 4440, 4489
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada, constitutional development, 4466
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3146
Distressed seamen, 3969
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3814
Advances, 3814, 3824
Coal-carrying trade, 3826
Construction, 3814
Deficit, 3815
Sale of vessels, 3705, 3822
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3817
Canadian National Institute for blind, 694
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3441
Canadian National railways
Advances
$1,550,000, 4692
$73,000,000, 3789
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Col., reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-44
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4329, 4399
Finance, 4319, 4329
Comparison of votes, 1922 and 1923, 3702
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Deficits, 2658
Directors, Talbot, Col. O., 2004, 4525
Grand Trunk
Amalgamation, 56
Ocean ports, 1762
United States terminals, 815
Insurance of mortgaged premises, bill, 2048, 2107
Items, opportunity to discuss, 3703
Management, responsibility and powers, 3616, 3624
Ocean ports, 1759
Operating deficits, 3701
Orders in council, 815
Paris offices, 3611, 3660, 3683, 3701
Pre-audit, 3701
Robb, Mr., 2472
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Securities bill, 4515
Amdt. to refer back, neg. 4732

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Canadian National railways—*Con.*
Summary and allocation of vote, 3798
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, responsibility and powers, 3617, 3624
Toronto
Office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Viaduct and union station, 4445
Canadian ports, use of by United States fishermen, 3906
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Cheque tax, qu. 282, 332, 2706, 3925, 4409, 4423
Amendment, 3933
Enforcement, qu. 492
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Cigarettes
Consumption of, qu. 516
Duty, 2706, 3229, 4393
Civil government estimates, form of, 668
Civil Service, 1811
Bonus, 1811
Commission
Postmasters, appointments, 1821, 1823, 1827
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 350
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement bill, 3146
Combines bill, 2621-38, 2660-65
Civil Service Act appointments, 2662
Commissioners, appointments, 2627
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Coal, reported discovery in Ontario, 2512
Commercial union, 3906
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949, 4670
Confectionery and beverages, tax, qu. 624, 2707
Copper bounty, 2709, 3234, 4375
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287, 2288
Cory, Mr. W. W., Deputy Minister of the Interior, salary, 4667
Cost of living, Prof, Michell, figures, 1700
Credits, function, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 4408
Customs Tariff items
Artificial silk, 3489
Manufactures, 3492
Tops and waste of artificial fibre silk, 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Brass, iron or steel parts for umbrellas, 3501

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff items—*Con.*
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental purposes, 3483
Coverings and containers, 3501
Crude petroleum, 3481
Date when changes became effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Firebrick, 3482
Liquorice paste, 3480
Malt flour duty, 3480
Printing and lithographic presses, 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 3477
Rolled iron and steel hoops, etc, 3484
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Wool, botany yarn, 3489
Deputy ministers, salaries
Deputy Minister of Finance, 4670
Increase in, 4667
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3988
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill (Coal lands) 3149
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3249
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dominion Power board, 3427
Dredging by government dredges, 4569, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt., 3980
Electric power, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 662
Emigration to the United States, 691, 2400
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Estimates
Arrangement of, 610, 668, 1468, 3242
Civil government, form of, 668
Discussion en bloc, 4559, 4588
Supplementary, time of presentation, 4554
Exchequer court judgeship, 2501
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927, 3938
Exhibitions, 1455
Collection of exhibits, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Experimental farms, 456
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
External Affairs department, salaries, 3897
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4406

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Finance department, charges of management, 3987
France, exports and imports, 2004. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1960, 2852
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1959
French treaty, 443, 456, 2002, 2255, 2299-2303
Agricultural imports, 445
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Border states, agreements and concessions, 2219, 2273, 2395
Brandies and wines, 444, 3478
French brandy, Scotch and Canadian whiskies, 3478
Bronze powder, 2002, 2006, 2270
Competition with United States, 443
Embroideries, 2008
Favoured nation, 443, 2271
Luxuries, 444
Sales tax, 2279, 2280, 2299
Silks and silk manufactures, 2255, 2264, 2300, 2397
Treaty of 1907, 2004
United States trade with France, 2277
Velvets, velveteens, etc. 3488
Wines, duty, 438, 444, 3478
Wool, 447
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 2105, 3150
Fuel supply, 802
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Government publications, 811, 1712
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Grain inquiry commission, appeal, 1210
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Halifax
Exodus from, 2400
Grain elevator, 4713
Historic events, grants for celebration, 4705
Harbours and rivers
Engineers' reports, 4571
Nova Scotia, 4562
Morrison claim, 4573, 4722
Ontario, 4589
Prince Edward island, 4587
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
"Hector" celebration, 4705
Hemp bounty, 2659, 2704, 2709, 3912
Highways, Ontario, cost of, 2490, 2493
Hoppe leases, 3128
Housing, loans to provinces, 4705
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4686-9
Icebreakers and steamers, 3160

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Immigration
Advertising, qu. 518, 1103
Black, Mr. W. J., 2084
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Salvation army and, 1093
Chinese, 1445, 1447, 2309
Detailed information, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 667, 1096, 1473, 1480
Estimates, arrangement of, 1468
Medical inspection, 702
Ratio of British to foreign, 1105
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement, 2795
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4495
Indians, 2124
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1361
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4393
Cigarettes and beet sugar duties, 3229
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Insulin, patenting of, 2077
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3147, 3978
Interim supply bills, 1482, 3705
Interior department, salaries, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, survey, 3247
International bridge at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2400, 2437
Concessions to border states, 2395
Consideration postponed, 2304
Jugo-Slavia, 2396
Silks, 2397
Johnston, Mr. Alex, salary increase, 4668
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Labour, strikes in, 1922, 495, 815
Lake Grain Rates commission, 4710
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, 3989
Linen yarn duty, 3897
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4576
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Marketing of imported goods, qu. 616, 931
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3317

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Marshall, Mr. Duncan—*Con.*
Salary, 608
Visit to Great Britain, 4675
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, speech in North Essex, 670
Michigan Central bridge, sales tax, qu. 1257
Military hospitals, 670
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975, 3977
Mines and Geological Survey
Estimates, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse, 4573, 4722
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 3149.
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2107, 2437
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3281
Newspaper postage, 4528
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4483
Nova Scotia
Disallowance of provincial legislation, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Miners' strike, 914
Northwest Territories Act, 270
Ontario legal fees, 1155
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2114, 3149
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Parliament buildings, 1716, 1719
Estimates, M. to reduce, 1727
Members' rooms, allocation, 1729
Tower, completion of, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Patents of Invention bill, 2064, 2071, 2083, 2088, 2102
Commissioner, powers of, 2065
Penitentiaries, 706
Pensions
Commissioners, 685
Federal appeal board and district boards of review, 403
Royal commission, expenses, 691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Petroleum bounties, 3921, 4392
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Postage stamps, use for revenue purposes, 1815, 3927, 3938
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Post Office department
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1822
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Postmaster General, illness, absence, 1821
Postmasters, appointment of, 1821-1827

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Post Office department—*Con.*
List of appointments, 1830
Revenue not connected with service, 1815
Rural mail service, Anderson, Mr., 1821
Prince Edward island, terminals claim, 4676
Printing bureau
New building, 1731
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Promissory notes tax, 3925
Provincial rights, bankruptcy, 3097
Public expenditure, 2658
Total $548,750,714, 4554
Public works estimates, 4554
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Purchasing Commission, 3950, 4002, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, 2285, 3337
Railway and shipping strikes, 245
Railway statistics, 207
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2705, 3934, 4423
Revision, 4409
Reciprocity with United States, 2707, 2708
Offer to negotiate, 3906
Redistribution, delay, 2400
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers, emigration, 691
Riordan Company, business tax, 4490
Rural credits, 645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
St. Lawrence river waterway, 663, 3427
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3339
Sales tax, qu. 281, 2704, 4409. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Collections, qu. 938
Exemptions, qu. 491, qu. 708
Imports, 4411
International bridge, Niagara Falls, material, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Jobber and retailer, 4411
Magazines and periodicals, 4416
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 919
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Senate, elective, M. (Mr. Denis) 1369
Shale deposits, maritime provinces, 2513
Silk. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk; Customs Tariff items; French treaty
Industry in Canada, 2397
Prices, 2397-2400
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference, 3012
Soldier Settlement Board; estimates, 1910
Soldiers, vocational training, 686
Spain, trade with, 2397

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4409. *See also under this title,* Sales tax
Steamship services, 4701
Tariff commission evidence, 2296
Tariff weapon, 3477. *See also* French Treaty
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Receipt tax; Sales tax
Direct results, qu. 281
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3963
Tinplate, 2400
Toronto
Canadian National railways office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Customs house, 3278
Harbour improvements, 4610
Union station, 4325, 4450
Viaduct, 4306, 4325, 4445, 4450
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2293
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270, 2301
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Signing of, 4466
With France and Italy, 9. *See also under this title,* French; Italian
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Unemployment relief, 689
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Tariff and emigration, 1092
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3234
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4726
War claims, adjustment, 2495, 2497, 2501
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3761
West Ukrainian republic, 657
Wheat shipments, Quebec, qu. 3820
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Excise tax on, 3937
Woollen imports, 3469
Woollen industry, protection, 931
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4682
Hudson Bay railway, 1062

Dredges and Dredging. *See* Harbours and Rivers; Marine and Fisheries; Public Works

Drugs. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Opium
Importation of. *See* Narcotic Drugs
Metagen, analysis of, qu. 1867
Scopolamin, 4647

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 2973; tariff; marking of woollen goods; protection fundamentally wrong; congratulations to Finance Minister; budget, violation of election pledges, 2973; tariff issue from 1878 to 1896; appropriation of protective policy by Liberals; Mr. Euler's statement on political platforms; political honour in jeopardy; Prime Minister's pre-election promises conditions unchanged and grievances unredressed; Conservative party, violation of pledges; Mr. Meighen on agricultural implement duties, 2974; "ramparts of gold"; duty increased by increase of price; protection and home markets; agricultural implement industry; duty payment of $265.80 per employee, 2975; Canadian National railways hotel deficits; Progressive party a "menacing enemy"; reasons for agricultural organizations, 2976
Sales tax on Union Jack, 4514
Woollen industry, protection, M. 928, 2973

Drury Government, expenditure and debt, 2824

Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 384, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705

Dry Docks
Esquimalt, 2671, 2682
Kingston, 4563
Vancouver and Victoria, 1002

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt Bill
(Ninety per cent of subsidy payable when seventy-five per cent of work completed). Res 3583, 3979; 1r., 2r., com., 3979; 3r., 3981

Dual Citizenship. *See* Naturalization

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address, 108. The late Hon. Mr. Kennedy; necessity for economy, 108; amendments of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hoey; the public debt, expenditure at Halifax and St. John, 109; Quebec and Toronto ports, expenditure; Pacific coast ports; naval expenditure during war, 110; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; immigration and emigration; railway freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement, 111-112; maritime provinces suffering by reason of high freight rates; United States tariff; tariff on fish, 112; national expendi-

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
ture, necessity for reduction in militia estimate, 113; loan to Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 113-114; Purchasing Commission; international boat race, 114; votes for agriculture; Hudson Bay railway, 115; Mr. Meighen and the tariff, 116
Agriculture, expenditure on, 115, 117
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4158
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1542.
Salmon canner's licenses, 1547
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coasting regulations, 4235
Distressed seamen, 3970
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 111
Advances, 113, 3377, 3799
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3396
Operating deficit, 3843
Sale of vessels, 3813
West Indies, trade, 3387, 3808
Fish and fisheries
French treaty, canned fish, 452
Sardine fishery, 2518
Tariff on fish, 2518
Trout fishing season, 1686
Grondines wharf, 960
Halibut fishery treaty, signing of, 858
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 942
Hudson Bay railway, 115
M. (Mr. Knox) 1042
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4223-34, 4283, 4293
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3352
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Marine and Fisheries
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Deputy minister's salary, 3373
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Naval service, 905
Royal Canadian Volunteer reserve, 2897
Royal Canadian navy, 905
Nova Scotia
Harbours and rivers, 942
Miners' strike, use of troops, 897
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
Steamship services.
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that head under this title*
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3387

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Thornton, Sir Henry, director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3845
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trout-fishing season, 1686

Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations to, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Dun, R. G. & Co., cost of living, 1812

Duncan, Mr. M. R. (North Grey)
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283
Malone, Late Lieut-Col. W. P., qu. 206
P. C. 1053, qu. 516

Duncan, Mr. Walter, 1140

Dunning, Premier of Saskatchewan
Budget, 2872

Duties. *See* Customs

East, crisis in. *See* Near East Crisis

East Edmonton District
Res. on immigration, 81
United Farmers of Alberta, 107

East Templeton, Que., wharf, 955

Easter adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Galicia. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Eastern Lands Development Company, 626, 1635

Eastern Situation. *See* Near East Crisis

Eaton, T. Company
Comparison of prices with Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, 2739, 2742

Economic Conditions, 1238, 1250, 1393. *See also* Agriculture, Agricultural Conditions; Banks and Banking; speeches on Address, and Budget
Canadian affected by European, 3003
Cost of living and, 1684, 1811-14. *See also that title*
Cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Economic group organizations, 3002
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Immigration and, 1231. *See also that title*
Improvement, 3055
Effected by railways, 1566
Tariff, 3053
Wealth, production of, 1856
Western provinces, 1883. *See also that title*

Economic Conference. *See* Imperial Economic Conference

Economy. *See* Government; Immigration; Public Expenditure

Editorial Committee
Abolition, 1714
Cost, 1669
King's Printer, 1669
Members of, and staff, 1675
Publications, unnecessary duplication, 1714
Saving effected by, 1670
French publications, 1670
Translation and printing, 1489

Edmonton. *See also* East Edmonton
Board of Trade res. on coal duty, 1275
Grain elevator, 4716
Indian school, 2149, 2164-5
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Post Office, theft of $50,000 from, 1142
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506

Edmundston, N.B.
Bridge, 1014, 2342, 4589
Public building, 4613

Education. *See also* Schools; Universities
Capitalistic control of educational agencies, 2725
Cost of, 2732
Foreigners, opportunities, 1885
Indians. *See that title.*
International Scholarships, 878
Jurisdiction, 882, 1884-5
Opportunities, 2831
School lands. *See also* Dominion Lands
Schools closed on account of financial stringency, 1202
Technical Education Act, 1637

Eggs
Egg-grading plants. *See* Live Stock Acts
Freight rates, 1962
French treaty, export, 1978
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
From United States, 2708, 2821
Inspector, Yukon territory, qu. 2516
Prices, 1841, 1851, 1852

Egypt, British policy in, 4662

Eight Hour Day. *See* Labour

Elections. *See also* Dominion Elections; Proportional Representation
By-elections. *See also* House of Commons
Grenville, 4606
Handwriting on the wall, 2981

Elections—*Con.*
By-elections—*Con.*
Lanark, 157
Moose Jaw
Certificate of Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Oleomargarine, 3526
Reported statement, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 1686, 2774, 4683
North Essex, 2013, 2469, 4594, 4606
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2013, 2245
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr.
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2245
Visit to Belle River, 4594
Election of 1896, 3014
Election of 1921. *See also* Liberal Party
King, Right Hon. Mackenzie, speeches, 3047
Policy proclaimed but forgotten, 1426
Statements and prophecies, 1658
Violation of election pledges, 2973, 3189
Multi-member constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation
Ontario. *See also* Ontario
Issue in, 1420
Proportional representation. *See that title*
Revelstoke and Nelson, bribery, 2941

Elective Senate. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Electoral Reforms. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Lines, sale of. See Canadian National Railways

Electric Power. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Exportation to United States, 1266
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 658, withdrawn, 666
Export duty, 2828
Power development, St. Lawrence river. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal

Electricity
Electrical apparatus, import. *See* French Treaty
House heating by, 3425

Electrification. *See* Canadian National Railways; Railways

Elevators. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Elliott, Mr. Preston (Dundas)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3523

Elliott, Mr. William (Waterloo)
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Rural mail carriers, qu. 1259, 1783
Sales tax, 4422
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207

Elmira-Souris railway, 129

Embargo on Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Cattle

Emigration. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration
Doukhobors, 43
Emigration to the United States, 21, 67, 77, 628, 637, 1082, 1093, 1109, 1113, 1128, 1165, 1173, 1178, 1188, 1198, 1206, 1217, 1235, 1241, 1244, 1253, 1319, 1322, 1330, 1338, 1389, 1392, 1403, 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1439, 1845, 1888, 1892, 2400, 2650, 2715, 2743, 2822, 2929, 2970, 3191, 4064. *See also* Taxation
American publications, effect on, 831
Canadians returning, 2743
Causes, 2747, 3004
Climate, 2747
Cost of living, 2790. *See also that title*
Economic conditions, 2727
Taxation, 1319, 2709, 2747
Unemployment and, 1657
Figures, 1917-22, 1093
Halifax, exodus from, 2400
Information bureau to ascertain reason for, 2932
Labouring people, 2727. *See also* Labour
Lumber camps from, to New England States, 1125
Montreal, from, 2216, 2790
Returned soldiers, 691
Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1188
Skilled workmen, 2823
Montreal, from, 2790
Tariff and, 2737. *See also* speeches on Budget
University graduates, 2732
Windsor, Canadians crossing border, 1431
Winnipeg, from, 1975
Winnipeg Free Press, statement, 2790
Young men, 2816
Mennonites, 43, 1239, 1341, 1884
Mexico, to, 1229

Empire Day Ajournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

Empire Forestry Conference, 3410

Empire Settlement Scheme. *See* Immigration

Employers' Liability Compensation

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Alien Property. *See* Aliens

Enemy Aliens. *See this title under* Aliens

Engineering Standards. *See* Canadian Engineering

England. *See* Great Britain

English River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Equalization of Railway Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Eskimos, Trial of. *See* Justice

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt
Dry dock, 2671
Graving dock, 2682
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634

Essex By-Election. *See* Elections, North Essex

Estevan Board of Trade, Hudson Bay railway, 1079

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supply
For departments, *see their titles*
Appropriations for railway subsidies, 4521
"Appropriations not required" 1656
Arrangement of, 1468
Canadian National railway expenditure, 4304
Civil government, form of, 610, 668, 780
Discussion
En bloc, 4554, 4558, 4612, 4587
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614, 4615
Expenditure provided for, 4554
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations
Maturing, 1753
To be incurred, 1753
One-sixth vote for 1923-4, 1482, 1538
Preparation, 2756, 3242
Supplementary
For 1923-4, 1359, 1659, 4536
Further supplementary, 4392, 4536
Lack of information, 4576, 4577
Time of presentation, 4554, 4577, 4594, 4601, 4703, 4420, 4422
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report, 3284

Euclid Hall. *See* Military Hospitals

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 2852. Congratulations to Finance Minister; a unique record; criticism of budget; national viewpoint; Canada a hard country to govern; diversified interests make compromise necessary; Liberal tariff platform of 1919, 2852; little confidence in political platforms; artificial and natural silk industries; taxation of luxuries; speech of Mr. Forke; tariff stability; opinion of Mr. H. W. Wood, Alberta; dependence of industry upon agriculture, 2853; difficulties of manufacturers; free trade not possible; tariff for revenue and protection; effect upon consumer; amendment; free trade with England; British preference; reciprocity; charge that government has done nothing for the farmer; Crowsnest pass agreement 2854; claim of Progressives that they forced concession; the two old parties; "holier than thou" attitude of some members; allegation that parties take orders from big interests, 2855; no election contributions; leader of the Government; speech on budget, in 1921; moderate tariff; lack of markets; United States markets, competition of Canadian manufacturers in; United States tariff against Canadian goods, 2856; revenue; tariff reduction; taxation; Canadian farmer a free trader; United States farmer a protectionist; Wheat Board; free trade in raw materials; importance of tariff question magnified; income and luxury taxes, economy; Civil Service; taxation rescinded; system should be carefully worked out; stamp tax; receipt tax; irritating excise tax; cheque tax, 2858; difficulties of collection; public irritation and inconvenience; basic methods of taxation; tariff, income and turnover; sales tax; Canadian National railways; public ownership; revaluation, 2859
Budget speech, reference to, 3070
Buttons, importation, 2214
Canadian National railways
Fixed charges, qu. 708
Public ownership, 2859
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 373
Eastern Canada, conditions, 1222
Free trade, 2466, 2858

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Immigration
Policy, 1220
Attitude of labour towards, 1224
Labour Gazette, 1627
Liberal platform of 1919, 2852, 3019
Repudiation of, 2994, 3019
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2190, 2444-67
Denaturalization, 2465
Judges, 2466
Nationality, dual, 2444, 2464
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3521
Political platforms, 2853, 2974, 2991
Reference to, 2852, 2974
Sales tax, raw materials, 4421
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4421
Tariff and immigration, 1222
Western provinces, conditions in, 1221

Europe. *See also* Immigration
Agricultural products, inability to buy, 3004
Coal supplies, 1263
Conditions
Chaotic, 2748
Economic, 3003
Unsettled, 3052
Purchasing power, decrease, 1859
Southeastern, immigration from, 1195
Wheat prices, 3004

European War. *See* Pensions; War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address in reply, 144. Agriculture the basis of national prosperity; tariff system, 144; anti-combine legislation; customs, valuation for duty, 145; the Tariff Act; protection on flour, 146; dissatisfaction with economic situation in West; British Columbia apples, handling of, 147; class legislation; embargo on cattle, 148; automobiles in Saskatchewan; Crowsnest pass agreement and freight rates, 149
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4046, 4137
Bounties, principle of, 3242
British preference, direct importation, 3457
Budget, 3067. Trade issue; secession talk, 3067; abandonment of free trade by Liberal party; speech of Prime Minister; tariff stability; taxation, burden of; capital; theory and method; venerable protectionist arguments; prices of manufactured and agricultural products; British preference; Canadian ports; 3068; raisins and currants duty; artificial silk duty; copper

Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
bounty; sugar duty; permanent tariff commission; "scientific" tariff protection; class privilege; taxation, passing on; farm products and world conditions; United States farmers and Fordney tariff, 3069; Progressive party, criticism of; discrimination between city and rural dwellers; rural mail carriers remuneration; speech of Mr. Euler; concessions to manufacturers; old parties and big interests; Sir Richard Cartwright on protection; protection, money and moral cost of, 3070; political corruption; legalized robbery; Goldwin Smith; farming methods; paternalism; "Canada for the Canadians;" interest of common people in government, 3071; free trade England; tariff and deficit of Canadian Government Merchant Marine; exodus to other countries; British national debt decreasing, Canadian national debt increasing; bonussed industries; tariff inconsistencies; dumping clause; revenue; combines, 3072; taxation; co-operative purchasing and selling; cost of living; income tax; inheritance tax; luxuries, taxation of; economy; inopportune expenditures; Welland canal; "blind selfishness;" Hudson Bay railway, 3073; Canada hard country to govern; independence not vital; newspaper control; confidence destroyed; class privilege, 3074
Canada Grain Act, administration, 786
Canadian Pacific freight rates and dividends, 1134
Combines bill, 2533
Consumption of intoxicants, qu. 285
Copper bounty, 3069, 3242, 4371
Deportation of British soldier, 2254
Esquimalt navy yard, qu. 1634
Experimental farms, 4632
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4346
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Freight rates, increase, 1134
Geodetic survey, 3245
Grain dockages and screenings, 786
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 941
Hemp bounty bill, 4381, 4384
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Hudson Bay railway lands, qu, 2393
Immigration policy, 1133
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Income tax, 4501
Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Indians, 2145, 2147
Reserves, grain production, qu. 1139
Iron and steel bounties, 4381
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4293
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837, 841
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 295
Oleomargarine, import of materials, qu. 3505
Pulpwood, export of, 4346
Qu'Appelle-Battleford telegraph line, 1017
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 744
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3069, 3476
Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 3070, 3076
Shipping combines, 1134
Steamship service, Canada-West Indies, qu. 937
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2683
Topographical surveys, 3245
Woollen industry, 3461

Everett, Mr. Howard. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization

Evidence in Marriage and Divorce Proceedings. *See* Criminal Code Admt. bill

Ewart, Mr. J. S., K.C., Canada's relations with Empire, 314, 1529

Examinations of Masters and Mates. *See* Marine

Exchange. *See also* Great Britain; Finance
Medium of. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Rate, franc, value of, 2009
Unfavourable, 2912

Exchequer Court of Canada
Alien enemy property, 2499
Audette, Mr. Justice, 2502
Judgeship, 2499
War claims, competency to deal with. *See* War Claims

Excise Taxes. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Excursion Tickets, qu. 1485

Executions, public. *See* Capital Punishment

Exemptions. *See* Civil Service; Income Tax; Taxation

Exhibitions. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade
Agricultural fairs, horse-racing, 726, 750
Atlanta, 1465
Belgian, 496, 1467
British Empire, 463, 1454, 1873, 1910, 3949, 4704
Yukon mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Brussels, 1467
Canadian, travelling in France, 811, 1457, 4711
Chicago, 1454, 1466
Fat Stock Show, 1398
Collection of samples for exhibits, 1468
Commercial, 1467
Des Moines, 1466
Estimates, 1454, 1465
Expenditure in Great Britain and United States, 1465-68
Great Britain, 1467
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1454
Maple products, Beauceville, 1810
Royal Show, 1454
St. Petersburg, 1465
Seattle, 1467
Seed and field competitions, 599
Southern States in, 1465
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1467
Staff and salaries, 1455
Tampa, Florida, 1454, 1465
United States in, 1465

Exhibits. *See* Exhibitions

Exodus to United States. *See* Emigration

Expenditure. *See* Public Expenditure

Experimental Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explorations, Arctic, 3944. *See also* Arctic

Explosives. *See* Mines and Minerals

Export Duty. *See* Customs and Excise

Export Act Amdt. Bill (Pulpwood, prohibition, of export) Res. 4012, 4345; 1r., 4355; 2r., com., 4393; 3r., amdt. (Mr. Power), six months' hoist, 4397, neg. on div., 3r., 4397

Exporters' Association. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Exports. *See* Imports and Exports

Express Charges, 2876. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific

Express Companies. *See* Canadian National Railways

External Affairs, Department of
Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988
Employees and cost, 2970
Pope, Sir Joseph, salary, 3988, 4671
Salaries, 3987

Factory and Shop Acts of British Dominions, 1443

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Eggs, price of, 1852
Geodetic survey, expenditure, qu. 1634
L'Islet wharf, 969
Surveys in prairie provinces, qu. 1866
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865

Failures. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

False Creek Bridge, 3375, 4708

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Crude petroleum bounty, qu. 3262
Customs drawbacks, qu. 1484
Raw materials imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259, qu. 1864
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3358
Oil Springs postmaster, qu. 518

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Products. *See* Agriculture

Farmer, Mayor S. J., Winnipeg. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Farmers. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget; Immigration; Taxation
Advice to, 2953
Allegation that government has done nothing for, 2854
Bank shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Bankruptcy Act Amdt., farmers, 3211
Banks, treatment by, 2929. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Burdens of, 2731
Canadian farmer, free-trader, United States protectionist, 2857
City man and, 2869
Comparison with other countries, 2791
Conditions. *See* Agriculture; Immigration
Debts, 1407, 1412, 2768
Earnings, 2813, 3023
Extravagance, 1888
Farmers' Bloc in United States, 2791
Farmers' movement, 2884
World wide, 2791
Farmers' party. *See* Progressive party
Hard times, 1859
Help for needy, 1404

Farmers—*Con.*
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1419. *See also* Immigration
Improvident methods, 1423
Income tax and, qu. 1259, qu. 1486
Industries dependent on prosperity of, 2853
Labour. *See that title*
Manufacturers and, 2716
Market, lack of, 2856
National Farmers' Union of England, 2791
National Policy, 2917. *See also* speeches on Budget
Non-continuous employment, 1888
Organizations, 2815
Future of, 2792
Parliament, in, 2787
Profits, 2873
Pulpwood, export of, 4513. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Purchasing power, 1408, 1851
Reciprocity and, 2924. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2731, 2916, 3066. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxes, 4224. *See also* Taxation
United Farmers of Ontario, 4608
Work, 1852

Farms
Abandoned, 67. *See also* Address; Immigration; Lands; School.
Credits. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits

Favoured Nation. *See* Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Feathers and Ornaments. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* Jurisdiction; Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Federal Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1621

Federal Representation. *See* Redistribution

Federal Statutes, enforcement, 1142

Federation of Canadian Students. *See* Students

Feeding Stuffs. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill; Grain and Grain Trade
Adulteration, 600, 604
Conference of producers and handlers, 600-4
Control, 599
Milled, mixing with bran and shorts, 600
Screenings, 2039. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill
(Regulation of preparation and sale of milling by-products) Res., 4012, 4270, 4272; 1r., 2r., com., 4276; com., 4538; 3r., 4553

Fenian Raid. *See* Pensions

Fertilizers
Administration of Act, 601
Control, 599
Duty, 3486
Fish waste, manufacture into, 2946
Machinery for, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Nitrate of soda, 2307

Feudal System. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Fiats, Issuing of. *See* Petition of Right Act

Field Crops. *See* Agriculture

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Acknowledgment of congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Address in reply 89. Mr. Meighen on the tariff; valuation of goods for customs duties, 90; causes of increase in national debt, 91; railways, cost of taking over, 91-93; national ownership expensive; increase in obligations to United States, 93; loans and interest; money borrowed cheaper from United States, 94; late government's borrowings from United States; Mr. Meighen on sales tax, 94; amendments moved by Progressives; resolution of Liberals in 1921; downward revision of tariff, 96; French treaty, 97; wise expenditure true economy, 97-98; business of country cannot be carried on without increase in public debt, 98; amendments not acceptable to government, 99
Agricultural conditions, Great Britain, 1861
Annuities, old age, basis of computation, 1698
Artificial silk, duty. *See under this title* Customs Tariff Items
Auditor General
Office, salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Report, 434
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4513
Automobiles
Duty, 3075
Insurance 3147, 3977

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1157, 1310, 4013, 4017, 4075, 4078-4131, 4133-4162
Extension of charters for one year, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Government inspection, 1310
Mortgages or hypothecs, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4133
One vote for each share, 4085
Postponement, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Senate amendments, 4508
Bank Act revision
Inquiry, 255, 496, 644, 858
Res. of Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank draft tax, 3928
Bank mergers, 4134, 4139
Banking and Commerce Com. changes, 2926
Beet sugar excise duty, 2644, 3229, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597
Binder twine, duty and manufacture, 3231, 4388
Board of Audit Act, 4355, 4369, 4733
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference, 3454. *See also under this title,* Budget
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 3454, 3895
Goods via Hong Kong and Suez canal, 3455
Increase in, 3488
Liberal convention of 1919, 454
Woollen industry, 3459, 3472
Budget
Date of
Announcement, 2469
Inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Debate, precedence, 2694
Record established, 2852
Resolutions, changes, notice, 3046, 4163
Speech, 2640. Finances, income and expenditure over ordinary capital and special expenditure, 2640; advances to Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine; public debt, addition to; expenditure and taxation; additions to debt diminishing; increase since 1914, 2641; estimate of revenue and expenditure for 1923-24; loans, tax reductions, 2642; sales tax, complexity of; imposition of six per cent tax at source; exemptions from, additions to list of, 2643; receipt tax; cheque tax; French Treaty; Canadian wines, duty on; French brandy, 2643; income tax;

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
cigarette duty; beet root sugar; raisins and dried currants; petroleum, 2644; iron and steel scrap; boots or other appliances for deformities; casual donations; machinery; hemp seed; machinery for conversion or fish waste; oil-drilling machinery; stumping machinery; malt flour; printing machinery; artificial silk; British preferential tariff; direct importation through Canadian ports; sugar duties; 2645 sugar, increase in price; speculation; reduction in duty; dumping clause; copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646; bounty on hemp; linen thread bounty; manila hemp bounty, 2647; petroleum bounty; forest conservation; pulpwood; prohibition of export, royal commission; tariff stability; finality, 2648; relations with United States; Fordney-McCumber tariff; offer of reciprocity; reduction of duties by order in council, 2649; the outlook; trade revival in United States; labour, unemployment; prospects of a return of prosperity, 2650; tariff resolutions, 2650
Supplementary statement, 3074. Appreciation of personal references; speech of Sir Henry Drayton; estimates; revenue, estimate of; tariff weapon in trade negotiations with foreign countries, 3074; France and United States; "no truck nor trade with the Yankees"; automobiles; potatoes; artificial silk duty, 3075; economy; expenditures suggested by Opposition; militia; naval service; bounties; Toronto harbour; St. Lawrence waterway; rural mail carriers; Progressive members and expenditure; Hudson Bay railway; civil service; public works, 3076; protectionist budget; tariff reductions; amendment; speech of leader of Opposition; budget, form of; brevity, 3077; "jacking-up" tariff; financial difficulty due to war and railways; responsibility for; budget, balancing of; new taxation; sales tax; public debt, additions to; reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3078; possible United States view; reciprocity agreement of 1911; permanency, attitude of United States towards, 3079; position of Conservative party in 1911 and at present time; "no truck or

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
trade with the Yankees", authority for phase, 3080; letter of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Patterson to United States Secretary of State; clear-cut issue; Conservative party against trade with the United States; Liberal party stands for reciprocity; defeat of reciprocity agreement in 1911; sentiment towards question to-day, 3081; budget proposals; no new taxes; tariff reduction; British preference; sugar duty; Canadian ports; simplification of sales tax; reception of budget by country, 3082
Statements omitted, presented, 2926
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Adjournment, hour of, 3208
Budget resolutions, proceeding with, 4163
M. anticipating matter appointed for consideration 3327
M. to increase taxation, 3934, 3936
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Proceeding, 3127
Questions
Answers to, 343
Framing of, 1386
Passed as orders for returns, 939
Resolutions, unusual to call for explanation, 3583
Returns, inquiries for, 2208, 2254
Cattle embargo correspondence, 4295
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com., 857, 1300
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4076
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1300
Calling of, 2295
Business profits tax
Arrears, 4491
Collections, 1157
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4440, 4489
Canadian National railways
Advance, $13,099,493.34, 1752
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-37
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4337, 4398
Finance, 4329
Ocean ports, 1758
Paris offices, 3614
Securities bill, 4012, 4402, 4516, 4732
Expenditure to be voted by Parliament, amdt. (Mr. Meighen) 4527
Responsibility of government, 4696
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games 4707

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184, 4295
Cheque tax, 332, 2643, 3922, 3925, 3931, 4423
Cigarette duty, 2644, 3229, 4392
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Superannuation, 3402
Calder Act, 3266
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, 2926, 3146
Clair-Fort Kent bridge, 4590
Commercial union, 3909
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Concurrence, 4735
Interim supply, 1482
Confectionery and beverages, tax, 2644, 2656, 3046
Congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4742
Consumer, taxation and, 4415
Copper bounty, 2646
Bill, 4369, 4370, 4374, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4370
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister of Interior, salary, 4667
Credit and Industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 644
Amdt. ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 645
Criticisms of foreign budgets, 2804
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 2650, 3963, 4408
Customs Tariff items, 3895. *See also under this title,* Budget
Artificial silk, 2645, 3075, 3489
Drawback, 3502
Fabrics, 3492
Tops or waste 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493, 3495
Composition and plated metals, 3483
Coverings for goods and machinery, 3501
Crude petroleum, 2648, 2644, 3481
Date when changes effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Hatters sweats, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 3502
Dry red lead, etc. 3480
Fire-brick, 3481, 3896
Hemp seed, 2645, 3474
Liquorice paste, 3480
Machinery for manufacture of fish waste, 2645, 3486

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff—*Con.*
Printing and lithographing presses, **2645,** 3486
Raisins and dried currants, **2644, 3474**
Rolled iron and steel, 3484
Silk cloth woven in the gum, **3489**
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 2645, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Typewriters and parts, 3485
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dredging, government dredges, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates. *See also under this title,* Supply
Civil government, form of, 612
Further supplementary, **1923-4, 3492**
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations maturing, 1753
Preparation of, 3244
Supplementary, 1923-24
Tabled, **3492, 4536**
Time of presentation, 4554
Time of presentation, 4420, 4597, 4601
Experimental farms, 486
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4345, 4393. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Fertilizers, duty, 3486
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill 255, 4405
Finance dept., charges of management, **3987**
Forest protection and conservation, **2648.** *See also under this title,* Export Act; Pulpwood
M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
France
Exports to, 1997
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Trade with, 1990, 1995, 1999
French treaty, 331, 436, 456, 1977, 1990, **2815**
Brandy, 2302, 3478
Bronze powder 1998, 2016, 2270
Canned salmon and lobster, 453
Concessions to border states, 440, **2273**
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Direct importation, 2303
Favoured nation, 448, 2271, 2398
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Luxuries, 446
Machinery and parts, 441
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2260
Sales tax and, 2279, 2280, 2299

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Silks, 448, 2266, 2301, 2398
Tabled, 54
Unfair competition, 2300
United States
Preferential treatment 440, 442
Trade with France, 2277
Wines, 1997, 3937
French treaty bill, 2238, 2255-80, 2299-2304, 2347
M. for 2r., 1910, 1990-95
Grants for historical celebrations, 4705
Halibut fishery treaty, 734, 857
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Hemp bounty, 2647
Bill, 3911, 3963, 4376, 4388
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigrants complaints of, 3598
Income tax, **1157, 2644**
Agricultural forms, 4498
Exemption for children, 4503
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1384
Fines, qu. 2180
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4492
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, **4360**
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. **2655, 3229, 4392**
Cigarettes, 3229
Insurance Act Amdt. **3045, 3147, 3977, 4357**
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interim supply bills. *See under this title,* Supply
Italian treaty, 331
Signature, 2403
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2404
Concessions to border states 2395
Consideration postponed 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401
Favoured nation treatment, 2398
Lapointe Mr., visit to Washington, 734, 857
League of Nations
Canada's contribution 3990
Canadian delegation, expenses, 3989
Legislation. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Hasty, 1376
Indemnity, etc., 4674
Liberal platform of 1919, not bound by, 2994, 3020
Library, joint committee, 615
Linen yarn
Bounty, 2648
Duty 3897, 3899
Little Anse breakwater, **Morrison claim, 4575**
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4577

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Malt flour, duty, 2645, 3480
Manila fibre bill, 2657, 3231, 4369
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, cattle embargo, **3317**
Merchants' Bank. *See also under this title,* Bank Act Amdt.
Failure, 4155
Inquiry, expenses, 3990
Ministers and officials, travels, 343
National Gallery, 1019
Naturalization Act M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4372
North Essex election, 2013
Nova Scotia steel bounties, 4371
Oleomargarine
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials used, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3530, 3561
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of **order,** 3571
Orders in Council, repeal by statute, 3504
Parliamentary restaurant, com., **382**
Penny Bank of Toronto, 1739, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866, **4749**
Pensions
Old age, inquiry, 733
Pension Board, Colonel Thompson, **4749**
Senators, to, 1376
Petroleum Bounties bill, 2657, 3920, **3963,** 4392
Postage stamps used for revenue purposes, 3927, 3938
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, **4676**
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Promissory notes, 3924
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389
M. (Mr. Good) 413
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, new departmental, 1730
Public debt. *See also under this title,* Budget
Additions to, 2642, 3078
Maturing obligations, **3823**
Statement, 2926
Public expenditure, 2641, 4422, **4554**
Apportionment of, 4560
Public Service Retirement Act, 3323, 3402
Calder Act, **3977**
Public Works estimates, 4554

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Publicity agent in London, Mr. Cranfield, 2927
Pulpwood prohibition of export, 2648, 4012, 4345, 4393
Royal commission, 2648, 4709
Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4183, 4392
Railway subsidies, 4304
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 2644
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474
Receipt tax, 2644, 3935, 4423
Revision of, 4409
Reciprocity with United States
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3075, 3080
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 3454, 3474, 3901, 3903, 3907
Permanency, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 3079, 3905
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, 733
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal commission on lake grain rates, **2927**
Rules of the House. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Sales tax, 3078, 4181, 4409, 4419. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Articles used by hospitals, 4432
Complexity of, 2643
Exemptions, 2643, 4431
Imports, 4409
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 919
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Public libraries, 1871
Six per cent, imposition at source, 2643
Union Jack, 4515
Select standing committees, membership, 382, 615, 2252
Senate
Abolition of, 1376
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1375
Senators, pensions to, 1376
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184
Special War Revenue Act 1915 Amdt. bill 2657, 4363, 4409
Cheque tax, 3922
Sales tax, 4181. *See also under this title,* Sales Tax
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Wines, excise tax on, 3937
Sugar duties, 2645, 3082, 3479
Beet root sugar, 2644, 3229, 4393
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4320

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Supply. *See also under this title,* Business of the House; Estimates
Bills, 4735
Interim supply, one-sixth vote, 1482, 1538, 3705
Committee, notice, 179
Concurrence, 4732
Tariff. *See also under this item,* Budget speech; Customs Tariff items
Amendments of 1920 and 1921, 3020
Attitude on, 2838
Changes proposed, 2651, 3462, 3895
Commission, evidence, 2296
Resolutions, 2650, 3963
Stability and finality, 2648
Weapon, 3074, 3477
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement on immigration, 2795
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Trade, 437
Union bank, position of, 4298
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Trade with France, 1991, 1997. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3233
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183, 811
War claims, Vickers company contract, 1746-7
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Ways and Means committee, 2640
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Wheat board legislation, 2928
Wines. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Canadian, duty on, 2643
Tax on, 3937
Woollen industry, 447, 3459, 3472

Fiji Islands, trade with, 1848

Finance. *See also* Bank Act Amdt bill; Banks and Banking; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Credits; Loans; Public Debt; Public Expenditure
Amortization plan, 2930
Bonds
Guaranteeing. *See* Canadian National Railways
Interest rate and income tax, 4494
Tax-free, qu. 342, 2914

Finance—*Con.*
British debt to United States, 2878
Dollar reserve in Canada, 2879
Canadian National Railways, securities, approval, 4402. *See also that title*
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739
Complicated and confused, 2915
Credit control, 631. *See also* Credits
Department
Boville, Mr. T. C., service and retirement. qu. 3135
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4670
Estimates, 3987
Distress in West, 1890. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Dividends
Taxation of, 281
Watered stock, 2956
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Financial and class rule in politics, 2733
Financial conditions, analysis, 2984
Financial control of government, 2812
Industry and, 4053
Interest rate, 2812. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
New York loans, 154, 155, 2963
Saskatchewan debentures, sale of, 2770
Securities, on which advances made to banks, 4405
Shares, issue of. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
World conditions, 2823, 2878

Finance Act 1914 Amdt. Bill, 255
(Advances to banks, bank payments in notes instead of gold or Dominion notes; export of gold, etc.) Res. 4249, 4405, 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4408

Financial Post, statement as to labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125

Financial Situation, 2658. *See* speeches on Address; Bank Act Amdt bill; Budget; Immigration

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2883. Long speeches; a budget Conservatives cannot find fault with; Liberal principles, 2883; tariff proposals; amendment; tariff reduction; disappointed hopes; farmers' movement; return to flesh-pots; member for Muskoka; disappointment with budget; 2884; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of, 2885

Finger Prints, offenders against Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136

Finland, immigration from, 1085

Finn, Mr. Robert E. (Halifax)
Canadian National railways, terminals, 4716
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 4678
Halifax grain elevator, 4715
Introduced, 3
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4678

Fire Brick. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Fire Prevention. *See* Forests and Forestry
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget

Fiset, Sir Eugene. *See* National Defence

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Asiatics engaged in, 1453, 1540-1, 1555, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484-5
Naturalization, 2461
Atlantic fisheries, inquiry into, 2983, 3084, 3365
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Behring sea, 4485
Bounties, report, 911
British Columbia, 3372
Fisheries Commission, 1453
Fishing licenses, 1540
Japanese fishermen, naturalization certificates, 1899, 2443
Canadian ports use of by United States fishermen, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Canned lobster and salmon, French treaty, 452
Canned salmon shipped via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Cold storage, 2056
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 3364, 3365
Express rates, 3365
Fish
Cooking, 3366
Culture, 3367
Demand for, 3364
Inspection Act, enforcement, 3367
Preserved, 1984. *See also* French Treaty
Products, imports, 445, qu. 617
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Russel, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Fishery protection service, 3361
United States steamer captured by Malaspina, 2207

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Fishing industry, difficulties and handicaps, 2945, 2972, 3002
Fishing interests and reciprocity, 3082
Fishing schooner race, 114, 115, 906
Fishways
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Salmon River, N.B., 3362
White Mud river, 3362
Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent, 1548
Freight rates, 1953, 1964, 2946
French treaty, 1978, 2235
Halibut, 151
Close season, 4480
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries. *See that title*
Treaty, 857, 858, 4132, 4440, 4437, 4664, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Signing of, 734
Hudson Bay, 1064, 1073. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
International Fisheries Commission, 4480
Japanese fishermen, 1453, 1540-1, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484, 4485
Japanese fisheries association, 1453
Licenses, reduction of 40 per cent, 1540-1
Lobster season, extension of, 2983, 3084
Machinery for conversion of fish offal into fertilizer, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine and Fisheries Committee
Reports presented
First, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983
Markets, 2906
Miramichi smelt fishing, qu. 1974
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Moving pictures, 3365
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Orientals engaged in. *See under this title,* Asiatics; Japanese
Pacific coast, 2734
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Publicity, 3364
Reciprocity, 3906. *See also that title*
Rivers and streams, sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Russel, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868
Salmon canners' licenses, 1540. *See also* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill
Salmon fisheries, Fraser river, 4461
Sardine fishery, 2518
Smelt, regulations, qu. 1868, qu. 1974

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Steveston Fishermen's Benovolent Society, 1900
Tariff on fish, 112-113
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Trout-fishing season, 1686
United States
Fishing vessels, licenses, 911
Markets, 2906
Modus vivendi. *See under this title,* Modus Vivendi
Tariff, 2734, 2940
Schooner, capture of, 2207

Fisher, Prof. Irving, purchasing power, 4666

Fisher, the late Hon. Sydney, 2057
Copyright Act, 2140

Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. Bill (Salmon canners' licenses) 1r., 4009; 2r., com., 3r., 4207

Fisheries Commission. *See* British Columbia

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Fishing Schooner Race, 114, 115, 906

Flags, Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Flathead District highway, qu. 2085

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 157, 1612

Flax. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Linen

Fleming, Sir Sandford, port of Shippegan, 2938

Flexner, Dr., discovery of serum for spinal menengitis, 1287

Flour. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade,
Freight rates, 1914, 2127
French treaty, 1978
Malt flour, duty, 3480
Milling in bond, 2960
Ocean rates, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906 2761
Prices in Canada and Great Britain, 1906
Protection, 146-147
Reciprocity in, 2993
Shipments
Canadian and United States ports through, 1767
China, to, 1840
Transportation, earnings of railways, 2960

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Budget, 2814. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public debt; war scandals; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; progress and prosperity, 2814; Borden-Meighen administration; speculation and profiteering; origin of farmers and labour party; democratic policy of present administration; agriculture, condition and encouragement of; French and Italian treaties; Australia, trade agreement with; Turkey, threatened war with; Canada's participation, 2815; financial conditions; economy; European affairs; Canadian policy; immigration policy; emigration to the United States; protection of Canadian labour; Georgian Bay canal; Civil Service Commission, unconstitutionality of; patronage, 2816; dismissals and appointments after 1911; classification; the Griffenhagens; old age pensions; amendment, Mr. Forke; western provinces, contribution of the East to development of; tariff and revenue, 2817
Civil Service Commission, 2816
Old age pensions, 2817

Fontaine, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Food. *See* Agriculture; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices

Food and Drugs Act
Administration, 697
Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Henry, Automobile duty, 2908

Fordney-McCumber Tariff. *See* United States

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade; Treaties, French, Italian

Foreign Policy. *See* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis

Foreign Vessels, registration. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Germans in Peace river district, 1184
Naturalization of. *See that title*

Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See* Dominion Forests

Forests and Forestry. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Natural Resources; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1748
Alberta, 1778
British Columbia, 1776
Manitoba, 1778
Nova Scotia, 1778
Ontario and Quebec, 1776, 1778

Forests and Forestry—*Con.*
Aeroplanes used in protection work, 1776
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 821, 2948, 3412, 4348
Campbell, Mr. R. H., Superintendent of Forestry, retirement, 3410
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Conservation, 2648, 2947, 2950, 4349. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Development, 2744
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Forest fires, 816
Conscription of fire-fighters, 3409
Fires started to make employment, 3409
Relief, 4010
Forest products, exports of, 1776. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Forest protection, 1776, qu. 2205, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 816
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 817, qu. 2178, qu. 2697, 3416
Moose mountain reserve, 3453
Spruce bud worm, 596, 2179
White pine blister rust, 595
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Moose mountain forest reserve, 3453
Provincial ownership, jurisdiction and responsibility, 3416
Pulp, paper, forest products, export, 2750. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Reforestation, 3412, 4349
Reserves. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Roads and bridges, 1014
Shelter belts, 459
Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial patrol, 1776
Tree-planting
Associations, 3415
Prairies, on, 3412
Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 34. Thanks to previous speakers for references to himself; congratulations to mover and seconder; resignation of Mr. Crerar as leader of Progressives, 34-35; Canada's position in relation to other countries; trek from country to city, 35; trade treaties; trade expansion 36; co-ordination of National Railways; new board of directors, Sir Henry Thornton, 36; lake freights inquiry; Crowsnest pass agreement, 36-37; immigration; natural resources, 37; farm labourers; tariff and taxation; revision of Bank Act; committee to inquire into agricultural problems, 38; causes of present agricultural depression, 38-39; bill to safeguard interests of consumers and producers; cattle embargo; economy in expenditure, 39; civil service reform, 39-40; redistribution; our national status, recommendations to government, 41
Agriculture
Condition of, 1107, 1852
Co-operation, 1852
Expenditure, 3240
Alberta coal, 794
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Banff national park, power leases, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4044, 4097, 4100, 4107
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 858
Banking and Commerce Com., member of, 2639
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3213
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4438
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Belle River harbour, 4606
Bounties, agriculture, 3240
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3456
Woollen goods, 3460, 3470
Budget
Reported statement on, 2946
Speech on, comment, 2853
Speech, 2711. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; budget disappointing; financial position of country; railway and shipping deficits, 2711; debt; increase in; economy; taxation a billion dollars a year; Britain's example to Canada; limit to tax-paying powers increasing cost of government, 2712; machinery of distribution; parasites between producer and consumer; tariff and tax changes; buying and selling; British preference; trade with Great Britain, 2713; best market for agricultural products, 2714; ocean freight rates; tariff and combines; natural resources; "stability of tariff" Liberal tariff policy; Moose Jaw election, 2714; handwriting on the wall; budget a disappointment to the West; exodus; agricultural and manufactured products, prices; Canada a dear country to live in; high cost of living; manufacturing industries, 2715; production, cost of; taxation of commodities; relations between farmer and manu-

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
facturer; agriculture, position of, 2716; potential wealth of the prairies; immigration, taxation and railway troubles; commercial rivalry; amendment, 2717
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3798, 3833
Canadian National railways
Appointments, 2472
Branch lines construction bill, 4192, 4338, 4399
Management, responsibility and powers, 3640
Minister's annual statement, 1617
Paris offices, 3646, 3672
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., reference to, 3672, 3678
Toronto office building, 3641
Cattle boats, conditions, 2613
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3641
Vessel space, 1868
Cheque tax, amendment, 3934, 3935
Chilled meat, 463
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 361, 565
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3986
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4236, 4290
Combines bill, 2579, 2618-36
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Copper bounty bill, 3240, 4376
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2145, 2346
Cost of living, 1813
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4254
Deceased members, tribute to, 7
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Depression in England, 1854
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Distribution, cost of, 1852
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 3983
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2252
Economic conditions, wealth production, 1856
Eggs, price of, 1852
Emigration to the United States, 1109
Europe, reconstruction, 4654
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1820
Experimental farms, 463
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Fishways, 3363
Free trade, 3024
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1932
Concession forced by Progressives, explanation, 2971
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1933
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1932
French Treaty bill, 2012, 2261, 2267
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 332-3
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Grondines wharf, 968
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1693
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1047
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1407, 1479
Letter not read by Prime Minister, 1333
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1336
Personal explanation, 1105
Detailed estimates, 1464, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 1464
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3593
Policy, 1105-1110
Imperial Conference, 4654
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians
Condition of, 2147
Manitoba, 2125
Sioux, 2159, 2160
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 231
Lake Grain Rates, royal commission, 3507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-32, 4285
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4178
Liberal policy, reversal of, 3007
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lunenburg dredging, 4577
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds 4238
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 845
Merchants' bank, 4297
Moose Jaw by-election, 2714
Delay in return, 2295
Naturalization Acts Amdt. 2187, 2193, 2454
Winnipeg Free Press editorial, 2454
Near East Crisis, 40
Newspapers
Monopoly, 2580
Postage, 4534

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Newspapers—*Con.*
Size of, 4534
North Essex by-election, 4606
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill, 4483
Oleomargarine, inquiry as to legislation, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3524, 3526
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3572
Patents of Invention bill, 2066
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3884, 4534
Postal appointments, 1800
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 2181
Protection and world conditions, 2752
Public buildings, Manitoba, 4629
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Redistribution, intention of government, 4250
References to, 11, 17, 18, 27, 55
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1150
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1790
Sales tax, 4431
Barley flour, 4431
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 920
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 3445
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-42
Shipping combine, 4223
Soldier settlement, 2027
Supplementary estimates, time of bringing down, 4555
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3968
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291
Trade barriers, 2214
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
M. to adjourn House, 4296
Vimy Ridge monument, 182
War, Canada's participation in, 4655
War claims, 2496
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Woollen industry, protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Forrester, Mr. William (South Perth)
Linen yarn duty, 3897

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406

Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2573

Fort William
Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grain shipments, 1114
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Budget, 2831. War sacrifices; Liberal party heir to burdensome estate; public debt; Canadian National railways; deficits; economy; improved financial situations; borrowings and interests payments; taxation, reduction of; tariff; downward revision; reciprocity, 2831; resources; British preference; introduction and further increase of; French and Italian treaties; friendly relations between France and Canada; Rodin's statue of France; gift of site for Vimy memorial; Canadian National railways, management; President and board, 2832; western settlement made possible by railway construction; British Columbia; Quebec; Transcontinental railway; development of Abitibi region; contribution of railways to development of country; immigration, 2833; land awaiting settlement; provincial land grants; emigration to the United States; natural increase of population; immigrants, recruiting and selecting; choice of location, 2834; repatriation; the future, 2835
British preference, 2832
Woollen goods, 3458
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canadian National railways, branch lines, 4199
Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power) 548
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Immigration, 2833
Colonization in eastern provinces, 1134
Policy, 1134
Quebec into, 1104
Labelle country development, 4199
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 235
Montford railway, 4199
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3984
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3543
Patents of Invention bill, 2071, 2098
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Ruling as chairman, 4293
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1296

Fortin and Moffatt, Transcontinental railway claim, 3646

Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Foster Homes. *See* Immigration, Child

Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent of Fisheries, 1548

Fox-Breeding Industry, 588, 2763

France. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Agricultural products, 2247
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Canadian Commissioner General, 4001
Canadian travelling exhibition in, 811, 4711
Convention of commerce with. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Devastated areas, reconstruction, 2012, 2219
Exports and imports, 1977, 1997, 2004, 2015, 2210, 2213, 2222
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Franc, value of, 2009
Franco-German relations, 4652
Friendly relations with, 2216
German reparations, 440. *See also* Germany
Immigration from, 1085, 1173
Imports from. *See* Imports and Exports; Treaties, French Treaty
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Paris agency, 4001
Peace treaty and. *See* Germany, reparations
President of, letter from, Vimy Ridge memorial, 1538
Reciprocity treaty with Great Britain, 3050
Relations with, 2832
Rodin's statue, 2832
Ruhr, invasion of, 2748, 2822
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Surplus, 2823
Tariff against Canadian goods, 1999, 2015
Trade relations with, 1990, 1995, 2218
Trade treaties with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Termination of, 1999
Vimy Ridge, gift of memorial site, 1538, 2832. *See also* Vimy Ridge
War losses, 2215, 2256
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections
Amendment to Act, inquiry, 3223
Equality of citizenship between men and women, 3059
Hindu, 503, 4640. *See also that title*
Withholding of, 2456
Women, to, 408
Orientals to. See Immigration, Orientals; Naturalization

Fraser River
Fisheries. *See* British Columbia Fisheries
Improvements, 1003, 1006

Fraud, obtaining fiats by. *See* Petition of Right Bill

Fredericton experimental farm, 460, 471

Free Trade. *See also* Budget; Copper Bounty bill; Export Act Amdt. bill; Hemp Bounty bill
Advocacy of in western Canada, 2752
Agriculture, 1858
Binder twine, 4379
Difficulties in the way of, 3010
Effect of in different sections, 1246
Free list, goods on. *See* Budget; Customs; Reciprocity
Great Britain, 1858, 2721, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3012, 3050, 3059, 3847
Liberal party and, 3068
Necessities of life, 1230
No cure for Canada's ills, 2982
Not a practical question, 2745
Potatoes, 2820
Progressive party amd, 1196, 2818, 3030
Protection and, 2806, 2922
Pulpwood, prohibition of, 4349
Tariff stability, 2648
Tendency towards protection, 2822, 3009
Theory and practice, 3050
United States, 1113, 2737, 2746

Freight Cars. *See* Canadian National Railways

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canals; Grain and Grain Trade; Hudson Bay Railway; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterways; Transportation
Adverse. *See* Immigration; Vancouver Harbour bill
Agriculture and, 1416, 1424
Alberta, discrimination against, 1957, 1958
Apples and vegetables, Nova Scotia to Montreal and Toronto, 626
British Columbia
Discrimination against, 1914
Equalization, 1911, 1914
Building materials, 1961, 3036
Brick and cement, 3017
Butter, 1961
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. Sir Henry Thornton, 3845
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canned goods and fish, 1915
Cattle export trade, 2127, 2963, 3040

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Cheese, 1961
Chemicals, 1920
Coal, 84, 795, 1264, 1272, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Alberta, 1275, 1282, 3009
Excessive, 1345
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Maritime provinces, 1813
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators' Association, res. 1275
United States railways, 1266
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4290
Consumers and, 1958
Control of, 4226
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1620, 1912, 2741, 2836, 2852, 2854. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill and *under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Charge that Progressives had forced concession, 2854, 2875
Explanation by Mr. Forke, 2971
Discrimination in favour of Western Canada, 3239
Furniture manufacturers, 2855, 2875
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway receipts, decrease of, 3036
Restoration of rates, results, 1620
Saving absorbed by lake shipping companies, 2961
Discrimination, 130, 3195. *See under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization; *see also* Railway Act Amdt.
Downward revision, 3195
Eggs, 1962
Emigration and, 1440
Equalization. *See also* Railway Act Amdt. bill *and under this title,* Railway Rates
Fish, 1953, 1964, 2946
Flour, 1914, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906, 2761
Freight classification, 1618, 2876
Grain, 260, 1914, 1960, 1965, 2854, 3194, 3680
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343
High, 2812
Highways and, 1619
Hudson Bay railway 1035, 3779
Immigration and, 1133, 1181
Increase of, 1134, 3190
Iron and steel, 1964
Lake and river, 3776
Fixing, 4284
Lower, demand for, 3024
Lumber, 1961, 2875
Pulpwood, ties and, 3036

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Manitoba, 1932
Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Maritime provinces, 1963
Mountain scale, 1912
Operating costs and, 1761
Pacific standard tariff, 1914
Potatoes on, 137-138
Prairie scale, 1912, 1915
Railway and shipping, 1051, 1114, 1395, 4226. *See also under this title,* Shipping
Railway Commission
Appeal from, 1912
Hearing, 3190
Railway rates
Attorney General of British Columbia vs. C.P.R. 1916
Equalization of, 1400, 1437, 2868, 3191
British Columbia, terms of union, 1916
Canadian Northern and British Columbia, guarantee, 1917
Control of rates, 1917
Canadian Pacific railway construction of, 1916
Carvell, Hon. F. B., letter to Associated Boards of Trade, 1915
Construction, cost, 1918
Earnings, 1919
Grain, 1921
Long haul, 1920
M. (Mr. Clark) 1284, 1490, 1911, 1914
Ruling of Mr. Speaker, 1284, 1307
Oliver, Hon. John, 1915, 1952, 1955
Operation, cost, 1918
Railway Commission, judgment of June 30th, 1922, 1914
Traffic, density of, 1920
Railway transportation costs committee, evidence, 1919
Railways, qu. 625
Canadian National railways, 3621. *See also that title*
Saving by projected Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2899
Reduction of, 1101, 1400, 2800, 2868, 3194
Rice, 1915
Shipping, 144, 171, qu. 206, 310, 1395, 4077. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Agricultural conditions, Special Com. report, 2127
Armstrong bill, 4284, 4290
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 3848
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613, 3806
Vessels, qu. 3262

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Shipping—*Con.*
Canadian Liner Committee, 2127
Cattle, shipment to Great Britain, 2127, 2963, 3040
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 494, 2959, 4231
Combine, 2578, 2581, 2583, 2667, 2828, 2954, 2960, 4223, 4226, 4277
Control of by Railway Commission, qu. 2611
Discrimination, 4290
Canadian ports, against, 2960
Dominion Marine Association, 2613
Flour, 2127
Freight and passenger, 2174
Grain, 2517, 2828, 4290
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence, 14, 36, 48, 52, 68, 206, 247, 302, qu. 2611
Increase of, 2960
Lake and ocean, 3763
Lake grain rates. *See that title*
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 1395, qu. 2611, qu. 2612, 2710, 3960
Personnel, 4231, 4234
Report, 2885, 4277
Legislation, 3265, 3507
Printing, 2927, 3045
Salaries and expenses, 4710
Live stock, 2133, 2758
New York pool, 3806
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, 2760
Ocean, 2127
Flour, Canadian, discrimination, 2761
Livestock rates, 2758. *See also* Livestock
Return cargoes, 2714
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
"Shipping barons", 2960
Standard Shipping Company, 1704, 4278
Steamship combines, 2667
Subsidized steamships, 2714, 4003. *See also* Steamship Services
Weekly Liner Committee, 2127
Welland canal, 3762
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704
Wolvin, Messrs, 4285. *See also* Lake Grain Rates Bill
Textiles, 1964
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1915, 3848
Transfer charges, 2876
Transportation cost committee, 1944
United States, 2801
Waterways, 1619
Western Canada and, 1887

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Westward from prairie provinces, M. (Mr. Clark) 1158. *See also under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Wheat, discrimination in favour of, 2946

French-Canadians
Bravery and courage, 165, 2935
Deputy Ministers, 1805
Repatriation, 1462
Settlement in New Ontario, 1401

French Language
Difficulties, 1341
Editorial Committee, elimination of French publications, 1670
Immigration officials, Quebec, qu. 4752
Insurance bill, French version, 3147
Magazines and periodicals, 842
References to, 166
Translation and printing, 1489
Bills, 4435

French River improvement work, qu. 620, 2682

French Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Frenette, Mr. George, postmaster, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698

Fruit. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Treaties, French Treaty
Apples
Imports, qu. 617
New varieties, 2307
Banana trust, 2979
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Combines, 2616
Competition from United States, 2977, 2980
Dehydration of, 4674
Dumping clause, 2988
Estimates, 598
Fiji islands, from, 1848
Foreign
Competition, 2979
Importation, 2979
Taxation of, 2979
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Fruit-growing industry
Annapolis valley, 104, 2763
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Depression, 3002
Niagara district, 104, 2225, 2763, 2765
Fruit union of the Okanagan, 2526
Grading. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers
Grape-growing industry, 2742. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Grapes, export, 2270

Fruit—*Con.*
Grape-growing—*Con.*
Price in Niagara district, 2225
Wine manufacture, 1977
Imports of dried and prepared fruit, 445
Insects and pests, 596
Inspection. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit
Marketing, 463
Mediterranean, importation, 1636
Pears, new varieties, 2307
Plums, new varieties, 2307
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Pre-cooling plant, 464, 2056, 2765. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill
Prunes and dried plums, 3474
Raisins, imports of, qu. 2699
Duty, 2657, 2718, 3474. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff items
Sale and Inspection. *See that title*
Trees, new varieties, 2307

Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Fuel Oil. *See also* Oil
California and Oklahoma, 1245
Importation of, 1245

Fuel Supply, 84, qu. 203. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Oil; Railways
Adams, Dr. Frank D., coal situation, 1265
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4691
Anthracite coal, embargo on, 4394
Bermingham, Mr., President Delaware and Lackawana Railway, evidence, 1279
Camsell, Dr. Charles, Deputy Minister of Mines, 1265
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Central heating plants, 3199
Coal. *See also that title*
Alberta
Freight rate on, 3009
Mines, 3424
Areas in Canada, 1344
Cost, 1700, 3198. *See also* Cost of Living
Duty, 3493
Embargo on United States, 1279
Freight rates, 2828, 2875
Imports, qu. 516, 2828
Production and, qu. 490
Offset by exports of electric energy, 1266
Mines, 2785
Canadian, 1247, 1344
Prices, 3198
Substitutes for, 3199
Welsh, 3199
Coking. *See also* Coal, Coke

Fuel Supply—*Con.*
Coking—*Con.*
Coke-ovens, establishment of, 788
Municipal plants, 3200
Dominion Fuel Board
Salaries and expenses, 3197
Statement of work and suggestions, 3199
Exploitation, 1344
Federal Advisory Fuel Committee, 1274, 3198
Freight rates, 1919, 2855, 2875, 3199, 3200
Fuel testing, 789, 3197
House construction, 3203
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
Investigation, 3427
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509, 2512, 3206
Lignite Utilization Board, 387, 2515
Mines and Minerals Committee
Suggested reference to 1271
Report, 4436, 443
M. (Mr. Church) for a national fuel policy, 1262
Amdt. (Mr. Carroll) for reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Suggested amendment of, 1284
Oil shale deposits, 2513
Peat
Alfred peat plant, qu. 1487
Experiments, 790, 3199
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Public ownership and, 3200, 3205
Pulverized fuel 3199
Resources, 1264
Shortage, deaths of children from, 751, 1657
Sifton, Sir Clifford, on, 1265
Smith, Mr. George Otis, export of coal from United States 1265
Special committee, appointment of, qu. 617. *See also under this title,* Mines and Minerals
Steam, 789
Thornton, Sir Henry, evidence, 1919
Waters powers, 3203

Fundy. *See* Bay of Fundy

Fungus and Insect Diseases. *See* Insect Pests

Furness Withy Company, ocean rates, 2127

Furniture
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855, 2875
French Treaty, 1982, 1989
House of Commons, qu. 1138

Furs
French treaty, 1981
Sales tax, 2742

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Gallipoli Peninsula. *See* Near East Crisis

Gambling. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Gambling
Futures, in, 3058
Staples of life, in, 3058
Stock exchange, 3058

Game. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423

Gaols. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries;
Capital punishment at. *See that title*

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Agricultural conditions, 1903
Agricultural exports, 1904
Audibility of debate, 4580
Bacon, Canadian prices, 1905
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4095, 4096
Bank officials, as insurance agents, 4095
Belle River harbour, 4601
Business of the House
Bills, distribution, 4276
Bills not printed, 4185
M. that Committee rise, 4185
Business profits tax, arrears, 4491
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Canada Highways bill, 2342
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4321
Coal leases, 3424
Copper bounty bill 3436
Cost of living, reduction, 1907
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1806
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms 470-486
Exports and imports, 1841
Farm credits, 1907
Farm mortgages 1841
Farmers, competition with world, 3236
Flour, price in Canada and Britain, 1906
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of Canadian grain at United States ports, 3650
Grain commissioners, board of, 787
Grain samples for exhibitions, 1454, 1455
Grazing
Lands, southern Alberta, 3424

Gardiner, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Grazing—*Con.*
Leases, 3426
Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line, 4321
Highways, Alberta, 2342
Hogs, grading, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Expenditure, 1908
Policy, 1903
Indemnity of members, 4237
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4205, 4276
Land valuation, 1878
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192-3
Lunenburg harbour, 4580
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3409
Manitoba, agricultural conditions, 1906
Medicine Hat customs employees, qu. 3505
National parks
Banff, electric light plant, 3435
Water power leases, 3939
Natural resources of western provinces, 3424
Oil
Leases, 3423
Monitor district, 2514
Speculation in claims, 3423
Postal appointments, 1801, 1806
Postmasters, 1809
Railway mail service, 1801
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways, 1791
Saskatoon-Edmonton, 1790
Rural depopulation, 1906
Rural mail delivery, 1801
Seed inspection, weed seeds, 197
Seed Purchasing Commission, 601
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt bill, 4185, 4237-4246
Amdt. six months' hoist, neg. 4246
Settlers
Relief, 3448
Transportation facilities for, 2172
Soldier settlement, 2024
Land valuation, 1878
Salvage cases in Quebec, 2029
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Inspection of, 2178
Stockyards, discrimination, 192
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff, agricultural conditions and, 1907
Tree-planting association, 3415
Water power leases, 3422
Western provinces, conditions in, 1903

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Advisory Fuel Committee, 4691
Agricultural conditions, 1201

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Alberta
Coal resources, 801, 1275, 4692
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Arctic expedition, new ship, 4702
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4069, 4078-4126
Business and powers of banks, amdt., agency, 4093, withdrawn, 4094
Interest rate, 4125
Bank mergers, 4237
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3211
Banks and banking
Pressure on farmers, 1202
Profits, 1209
Buffalo, slaughter of, 4702
Business of the House, private members' day, 1158
Cahill, Mr., speech on immigration, 1209
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, war claims, qu. 3142
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3809
Amdt. to reduce, 3395, neg. 3398
Trade agreement, 3392
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3414
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advance, 3824, 3838
Canadian National railways
Advance of $1,550,000, 4694
Branch lines bill, 4308-22, 4694
Hanna-Warden-Loverna railway, qu. 4436
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1203
Net earnings, 1130
Canned salmon, shipment via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Coal. *See also under this title,* Alberta
Alberta, shipment to Ontario, 1163
Bituminous, duty on, 1275
Combines bill, 2616
Commodity prices, increase in, 1084
Copper bounty bill, 3238, 3241
Credits, function, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 647
Customs duty on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3275
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4253
Dominion Lands and Parks, salaries, 3251
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1011
Emigration to the United States, 1206
Employment service, director of, 1676
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farm buildings, 4630
Exports, agricultural machinery and farm products, 814
Farmers and bankruptcy, 3211
Farming equipment, 1088
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt bill, 4540

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Fish culture, 3371
Fishing schooner race, 115
Fuel and power resources, 801, 3427
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1275
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 327
Government publications, distribution, 1715
Grain, Canadian, adulteration at United States ports, 3649, 3962
Hamilton public building, 4628
Hanna-Warden and Loverna-Warden branch lines, 4308, 4322, 4436
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hector celebration, grant, 4705
M. to reduce, 4706
Historical celebrations, grants for, 4706
Homestead inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenburg leases, cancellation, 3146
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1208
Agreement, signing of, 1976
Empire settlement scheme, 1204, 1205
Immigration, population, natural increase, 1871-1921, 1207
Literature, misrepresentations, 1203
National railways and, 1121
Policy, 1200
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement, 1204
Steamship companies and, 1201
"The Unseen Hand," 1201
Total expenditure on, 1208
Indemnity of members, 4242
Indians
Blackfeet reserve, 2148
British Columbia, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Greater production, 2150
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Interest, 4107, 4125
International boundary, survey and demarcation, 3248
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Land leasing, 1101
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3352
Marine biological board, 3371
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, salary, 3352
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3985
Northwest territories, new ship, 4702
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, monument, 4704
Penitentiaries, 770
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3870
Pickled fish, inspection of, 3367
Plamondon, Alberta, dredging, 1013
Political patronage, 3347

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4678
Printing bureau, 1710
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 4614
Saskatchewan, 4629
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Renovated butter, 4253
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 776
Royal Mail Packet Company's boats, 3390
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3341
Sackville public buildings, 4613
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184, 4242
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Steamship services, 4702
Canada-West Indies, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Subsidies, grants and bonuses, 3414
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Water powers, development of, 3422
Welland canal, lumber imports for, qu, 1867
Western wheat crop and taxes, 1220
West Indies
Steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Trade with, 3395

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Caraquet railway, purchase price, qu. 1258
Coal imports and production, qu. 490
Daylight saving, Ottawa, qu. 2612
Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085
Soldier settlement, farms in Carleton county, qu. 1031

Gasoline. *See also* Oil
Price of, 2547
Short measure, 810

Gaspé Peninsula
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Natural resources, 1242
Railway facilities, 4186, 4197, 4307
Steamship services, 2176

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Wednesday evening sittings, 1163, 1995, 2518
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial pensioners, passes, qu. 2418
Superannuation, qu. 2418
Civil service superannuation, qu. 940, 3266
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Labrador gold rush 1995, qu. 2696
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3351

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Printing, Joint Committee on, Reports
First, 1156
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4009, 4436
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238

Gélinas, Mr. J. N., postmaster, St. Barnabé Nord, 1830

Gendron, Mr R. M. (Wright)
Public Works paymaster, qu. 1257

General Election. *See* Elections, Election of 1921

Geneva, International Labour Conference, 1441, 1539. *See also* Labour

Genoa Conference
Tariffs
Economic warfare, 3053
Stability, 3053

Geodetic Survey
Expenditure, qu. 1634, 3073. *See also* Mines; Surveys
Investigation, etc., 3245

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines; Surveys
British Columbia, 2504
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Expenditure by provinces, 2508
New Brunswick, explorations in, 2504
Overlapping, 2508
Revenue, 2510

George, Little, deportation of, qu. 1704

George, Right Hon. David Lloyd. *See* Lloyd George

Georgetown wharf, 4587

Georgian Bay
Canal. *See* Canals
Ports, grain handling, qu. 620

Georgetown-Montague railway, 128

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt bill (Seasonal or temporary employment) 666
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 435
French treaty, wines, 452, 2225
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184
Redistribution, Welland county, 667
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
Water powers, 3784
Sales tax, 4414, 4427, 4431
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Welland canal construction, 3762, 3784

Germany. *See also* France
Canadian Pacific railway shares, 2496
Franco-German relations, 4652
Franco-Prussian War indemnity, 3070
Immigration from, 1094
Nickle, shipments to during war, 4371
Reichsrat, constitution of, 1372
Reparations, 2498, 4653, 440, 4053
Investigation by Hon. William Pugsley, qu. 4753. *See also* Pugsley
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for withdrawal of of Canada's claims, 280, 311, 330, 332
Rhineland, cost of occupation, qu. 2696
Ruhr valley, occupation by France, 2748, 2822
War claims. *See also that title*
Investigation, qu. 1486, 2946
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Personal explanation, 4249

Gibeau, Mrs., postmistress, Morinville, 1028

Girl Guides, grant, 114, 3954

Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., British tariff reduction 3050

Glanders. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Gold. *See also* Mines and Minerals; Labrador
Export of prohibited 4249, 4405
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Golf Course, Jasper park, 3435

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Acland, Mr. F. A., 1675
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314, 4034, 4063, 4066, 4078-4103, 4141-59
Amdt., bank charters extended for one year, 4141, neg. on div. 4147
Charters, terms of, 1314
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4142
Point of order, 4055
Shareholders' audit, 4088
"Sincerity and integrity" 4067
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4142
Banting, Dr. F. G. annuity, 4676
Bees, suppression of foul brood in, 4675

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Board of Audit bill, 4369
British preference
Canadian ports direct importation, 3456
Manufacturing industries, and, 3472
Business of the House
Bills not distributed, 4104
Private members' day, 1160
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Cadet services, 883
Canadian National Railways bills
Branch lines construction, 4401
Securities, 4526
Capitalistic system and labour organizations, 2895
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 568
Civil Service patronage, 368
Class antagonism, prevention of, 1233
Combines bill, registrar, inquiry, 2624
Commercial union, 3906, 3911
Conversion loan, qu. 386
Co-operation, industrial relations, 2895
Copper bounty bill, 4374
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4252, 4263, 4270
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4673
Estimates, method of discussion, 4614-6
Experimental farms
Buildings, 4630
Overlapping, 4633
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4396
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Fertilizers, duty, 3487
Foreign relations, 4659
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 341
Health of animals, 4676
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4390
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4660
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1118
Hindu, 1120
Policy, 1116-1120
Imperial Conference 4640-4666
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 4660
Confidential matters, 4660
Preferential tariff, 4661
Imperial Economic Conference, 4659, 4666
Agenda, 4250
Interest rate, 4131
International questions, opportunity for discussion, 3998
Joint industrial councils, 1655

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Labour
Cheap, 1118
Estimates, reduction in, 1643
Gazette, editor, 1671, 1675
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 220, 222
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4227
Land, vacant, taxation of, 1104, 1118
League of Nations, 3998
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Liquor exports and imports, 3704
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Manila fibre bounties, 4369
Merchants' bank, investigation, 4068, 4156
Money, purchasing power of, 4666
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll)
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that legislation be submitted before end of session, 3567
Point of order, 3571
Petroleum bounty, 3916, 3918
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Privilege, question of veracity, 2181
Proportional representation, 427
Lord Bryce, 391
M. for alternative vote in single-member constituencies, 388
Multi-member constituencies, M., 389
Protection and industries, 3472
Public debt, maturing obligations, 3822
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4396
Race-track betting, M., 494, 709, 764
Railways and canals dept., salaries, 3195
Raney, Hon. W. E., letter from, 2181
Reciprocity with United States, 3905
Offer to negotiate, 3908
Renovated butter, 4252, 4263, 4270
Rideau Hall expenditure, 4627
Rural mail carriers, names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Stationery, embossed, 1716
Tariff stability, 3054
Toronto
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621, 4622
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unearned increment, appropriation by state, 1119
United States tariff, 1119
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Woollen goods, prices, 3463

Good roads. *See* Highways

Goods, Marking of. *See* Imports and Exports

Goodspeed, Mr. F. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Gordon, Mr. George N. *See* Deputy Speaker

Gordon, Sir Charles, director Bank of Montreal, 4022

Gosse-Millerd Canning Company, Vancouver, shipments, 2519, 2615

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 1080, 2051, 2204, 3318
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2052
Bankruptcy Act
Administration, 780
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1523
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 2252, 3085-3127, 3209-21
Farmer and, 3211
Senate amendments, 4201
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2423
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-16, 2419-23
Capital punishment, 769
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 1483, 2281
Opium joints, etc., 2281
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971, 2053
Directorships, 4024
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2355
Good, Mr., statement with regard to Hon. W. E. Raney, 2182
Guessing competitions, 733
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 3128
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3264, 3452, 3604
Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Department, estimates, 705
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Lake of the Woods Regulation Act repeal bill, 2885, 4163, 4179, 4185
Liquor, government control, 2406
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 180, 270
Senate amendments, 2050
Pecuniary claims convention, 779
Penitentiaries, 706
Estimates, 770

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer—*Con.*
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 2639, 3127
Fiats, 3224
Race-track betting. *See also under this title,* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
M. (Mr. Good) 738, 743
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Legal adviser, 778
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment, 1147
Naturalization, 778
Pensions, 776
Reorganization, 776
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-48
Tariff stability, ref. to, 2819
Washington, visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Accredited herd system, 587
Agricultural conditions in West, 1357
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Annual drill, 4636
Artificial silk duty, 3452
Australia, land settlement, 1389
Automobile accidents, 3958
Belle river harbour, 4610
Bienfait briquetting plant, 3206
British and foreign news service, 4713
Budget, 2951; congratulations to Finance Minister; last two budgets disappointing; Liberal promises and performances; tariff planks of 1896 and 1919; broken pledges, 2951; reciprocity; Liberal platform of 1919, duties upon implements of production; appeal to the West; speeches of the Minister of Agriculture; curtain lectures to Progressives, 2952; agricultural conditions; municipal taxation, non-payment; advice to farmers; more work and mixed farming; Canada a great exporting country; charge of extravagance unfounded; utterances of Mr. Motherwell, 2953; combines; lake freights; terminal elevators; Price, Waterhouse & Company report; elevator profits; income tax; unearned income, 2954; harbour facilities; free sites to elevator companies, Fort William; land speculators; stumping machines; tariff on implements of production and necessaries of life; amendment; special committee on the

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tariff; tariff revision; permanent tariff commission to investigate industries, 2955; the "say-so" of tariff beneficiaries; watered stock, dividends; debt; direct taxation; government ownership, 2956; bounties; flax industry; hemp industry; special privileges; oleomargarine; protected industries; Progressive party and power, 2957
Business profits tax, 4489
Canada Grain Act, administration, 4710
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3408
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4198, 4325
Paris offices, 3679
Public ownership, 3679
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3958
Cheque tax, 3932
Chief Electoral Officer, salaries, 4001
Combines bill, 2627
Copper bounty bill, 3235, 3241, 4375
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Deputy ministers
Perquisites, 4669
Salaries, increase, 4669, 4673
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Dredging, Fort William and Port Arthur, 3341
Emigration to the United States, 1389
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farms, 468, 4632
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4273
Free trade, Progressive party and, 1196
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 1762
French treaty, 442
Fuel supply, 799
Grain and grain trade
Grain commissioners, salaries, 4710
Grain unsold, 273
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 296
Mixing of grain, 1388
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Wheat in farmers' hands, Saskatchewan, 1975
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of animals, 577, 587
Hector celebration, 4636
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1357, 1878
Child, 1470

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Policy, 1356, 1387
Publicity, special writers, 1874
Income tax, agricultural forms, 4498
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4498
Indians, agricultural production, 2162
Interest rates on land payments, 1088
Labour Gazette correspondents, 1627
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4235
Liberal platform of 1919, 2853
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201, 2203
Maritime provinces, public expenditure, 4586
Military hospitals, 673
Moose mountain
Forest reserve, insect pests, 3453
Indian reserve, qu. 706
Pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Parliament buildings
Estimated and actual cost, 1725
Tower, 1722
Passports, issuing of, 4707
Peebles-Lampman branch railway, 4325
Petroleum bounty, 3920
Prices of binders and labour, 1886
Printing bureau, new building, 1738
Protection
Applications for, 3235
Granted without investigation, 3489
Public expenditure, apportionment of, 4559, 4560
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2503
Pugsley, and Meighen, Messrs., exchange of compliments, 2503
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 3951
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3475
Reciprocity
Agreement of 1911, 2854
Agricultural implements, 3499
Boots and shoes, 3499
Coal, 3499
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4491
St. John, N. B., visit to by members of parliament, 2503
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3788
School lands
Balance due on purchase price, 1389
Unpaid taxes, 4205
Seed inspection, 197-8
Shipping combine, 4235
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salaries, 669
Steamship subsidies, 4004
Topographical survey, towers, 2512
Trade commissioners, 1840

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Tuberculosis in cattle, 587
Welland canal construction, 3788
Western provinces, conditons in, 1357, 1388

Government. *See also* Legislation
Appointment of supporters, 2710
Burdensome and costly, 2719
Business principles applied to, 2806
Canada a difficult country to govern, 2796, 2852, 3002, 3023, 3074
Capitalistic hold upon, 2726
Civil government, retrenchment, 2964
Commission, by, 428, 4037, 4039
Committees, by, 2979
Cost of, 1153, 2785, 2805, 2968, 3027
Increasing, 2712, 2756
"Cuckoo" 3451, 3510
Decentralization of, 66
Departments, increase in cost of, 2970
Difficulties of, 2796
Duplication and overlapping of services, 2805
Economy, 2816, 2823, 2825, 2831, 2842, 2921, 2950, 2959, 2963, 2969, 3043, 3073, 3076, 4236
Indemnity of members, 4236
New methods of, 2914
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Taxation unaccompanied by, 2997
Financial control of, 2812
Group government, 1427
Senate and, 1378
Supply, amdts. to, 1299
Inconsistency, 2990
Invisible, 2812
Irresponsible, 2979
Offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Officials, travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Order in Council, by, 4354, 4487. *See also* Orders in Council
Policies, review of, 407,409
Resignation of. See Lack of Confidence Vote
Responsibility of, 2805
Retrenchment, 2805
Too much from Ottawa, 3434

Government Ownership. *See* Public Ownership

Government Printing. *See* Printing

Government Publications. *See also* Editorial Committee; Printing
Agricultural, 598, 1428
Distribution of, 1712, 3266
Fisheries, 3364
Interior department, 3443

Government Publications—*Con.*
Mines and Geological Survey, 3197
Printing, 811
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste in, 1734
Waste paper sold, 1713
Judge Snider's report, 1714
Governor General
Address, acknowledgement of, 1256
Expenditure, 4627
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Royal assent, 4755. *See also that title*
Speech on opening of Parliament, 2; travels in western Canada and Yukon; improvement in economic conditions; trade conventions with France and Italy; Canadian National Railways consolidation; Great Lakes shipping; anti-combines and trusts legislation; cattle embargo; abundant harvest; immigration publicity campaign; Bank Act revision; redistribution; Postal Conference; Vimy Ridge site, 2-3
Speech on prorogation, 4756
Vimy Ridge memorial, 2, 1631
Governor in Council, judicial or administrative power, 1912
Grading of Seeds. *See* Seed Inspection
Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of National Defence; Minister of Railways and Canals from April 28, 1923.)
Address in reply, 54; The late Minister of Railways, 54; new members; Mr. Forke, 54-55; the railway problem, mileage of Canadian National railways; value of property; employees, 55; history of acquisition and amalgamation, 55-63; Canadian Northern, acquisition, 55-57; Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59; Grand Trunk acquisition, 59-60; amalgamation under one board of directors, 60; formal transfer of Grand Trunk, 60-61; amalgamation of Canadian National and Grand Trunk, 61; purchase of rolling stock, 61; establishment of headquarters, 62-63
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4692
Agriculture estimates, form of, 610
Alaskan, wreck of, 3173
Ammunition, 884, 1740, 1741
Appointment as Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Atherley bridge, 3648
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4197
Belle river harbour, 4599, 4606
Bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
British mails, delay in, 2694
Brockville rifle range, 889
Bruederheim branch line railway, 4316
Business of the House
Motions, anticipatory, 3327
Privilege, Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Involving lengthy answers, 622
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 4303
Placed on order paper without members' knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Supply, calling of, 2296
Cadet services, 877
Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill, 2253, 2338, 2469, 2470. *See also under this title,* Highways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983, 3208, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3377, 3798, 3824, 3841
Deficits, 3816
Earnings and expenditure, 3399
Lease of freighters, 3848
Negotiation for sale of ships, 1976
Canadian National Railways, 55-63
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650
$13,099,493.34, 1764, 3376
$1,550,000, 4692
Statements of appropriation, 1922-23, 1923-24, 3789
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Colonel, reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 3646, 4188, 4197, 4303-4344, 4397, 4694
Expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4400
Finance, 4319, 4330
Rejection by Senate, 4695
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Bituminous, duty, 1278
Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027.
Correspondence, inquiry for, 244
Dominion Express Company, contract, termination, 2473
Employees' pension, 288
Estimates, 1619
Opportunity to discuss, 3703
Expenditure, 4304
Express business and sale of electric lines bill, 2392, 2470, 2479
Radial railways, sale of, 2479, qu. 2612
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Express and electric lines—*Con.*
Freight rates, 1620. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Coal, on, 1278, 1280
Grand Trunk, 58-60
Gratuities to directors and officials, royal commission, 1665, 1976
Ocean ports, 1760
Providence, 1762
United States, 1762
Hanna, Mr. D. B., retirement of, 1666
Hudson Bay railway and, 1067
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 1635, 2048, 2105
Insurance, rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 1760
Pensions, 3196
Management
Non-interference with, 2472, 3670
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3654
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 55, 3197
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646
Ocean ports, 1760
Operating deficits, 3701
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3626, 3650, 3681, 3682, 4514
M. (Mr. Stevens) 3670
Pre-audit, 3701
Public ownership, 2475, 3670, 4198
Railway Commission and, 666
Regions, boundaries of, 1754
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1484
Robb, Mr., 2471
St. John station, 3646
St. John terminals, 2481, 4311
Securities bill, 4515
Thomas, Mr. A. J., appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3670, 3675
Appointment
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4198
Office building, 1664, 3629
Viaduct and union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Toronto Suburban railways, sale of, qu. 2612
Transcontinental
Conditions and prospects, 3681
Fortin & Moffatt, claim, 3646
Quebec port and, 3681

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Transcontinental—*Con.*
Unification, 1666, 3196
Chinese immigration bill, 2332
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 550
Civil Service
Postmasters, appointments, 1823, 1827
Returned soldiers, 1773
Copper bounty bill, 4373
Credits, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Demers, Mr. Amedee, contract, 1977
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1807
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Desiauriers) 665
Estimates, civil government, form of, 610, 668
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Fiset, Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Forest preservation, 3416
Freight rates
Coal, 1278, 1280
Comparison, 1620
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1930
Equalization, 3192
Railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1925
Fuel supply, 793
Advisory fuel committee, 1278, 4692
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4197
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 280
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Grants to military and rifle associations, 889
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Highways. *See also under this title,* Canada Highways Act
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Canada Highways Commissioner, staff, 2489, 3173
Federal grant, 519
Hamilton-Brantford, 2492
Ontario, 2490
Statements
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Tabulated, 3174
Hudson Bay railway,
Canadian Air force, 1749
Construction vote, 4681
Dominion lands, sale of, 1068
Feasibility of route, 1068
M. (Mr. Knox) 1066

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Co., refund, 4687, 4690
Port Nelson Terminal, 3647
Repair of second 118 miles, 1070, 4198
Turning first sod, 1069
Welland canal and, 1068, 3779
Work this year, 4310
Hydro electric power, radial railways, 2475
Immigration, Canadian National railways and Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island employees, pensions, 3196
Inverness railway, 4198
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Kent Northern railway, 4197
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 236
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 1740, 2053, 2086
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4197
National Defence
Ammunition, 884
England from, value and quantities, 1740
Quantity on hand, 1741
Annual training, 859
Cadet service, 877
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749, 1775
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, 1778
Forestry protection work, 1776
Mail carrying, 1775
Operation, maintenance, repairs, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Department, salaries and contingencies, 901
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740-4
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Expenditure, 1744
Estimates, 859, 1740
Grants to rifle associations, 889
Military districts, reduction of, 868
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia expenditures, statement of, 1747
Officers retired, 890
Permanent force, 892
Schools of instruction, 900
Staff
Pay, 891
Reduction, 1773
Naval service, 902
Department of National Defence and, 3342
War claims, adustment of, Llandovery Castle, 1745
North Essex by-election, 4606

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Nova Scotia miner's strike, use of troops, 868, 893
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3571
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1833
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1816, 1826
Post Office
Department
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1805, 1807, 1826
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Excise taxes, payment in postage stamps, 1815
Printing, 1818, 1820
Revenue not attribuable to postal service, 1815, 1818, 1820
Salaries, 1780, 1794
Staff, reductions 1824
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1687
Letter carriers, bonus, 1784
Mail contractors, 3144
Mail service, 1778
Postal rates
Reduction of, 1780
Special delivery, 1873
Postmasters
Appointments held in suspension, 1832
Clementsport, 1797
Woodbridge, 1823
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786, 1801, 1805
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. C., 1823
Carriers, 1784, 3264
Compensation for loss, 1833
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144
Routes, spur lines, 1826
Statistics of, 1801
Western provinces, 1802
Extension, 1790
Saskatoon, accommodation, 1785
Toronto
New building, 1780
Revenue, 1780
Prince Edward Island railway
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Pensions, 3196
Railway employees, death of, 3196
Public buildings
Ontario, 4615
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public ownership of railways, 3670, 4198
Radial railways, 2475
Toronto street railway, 2475

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Public Works, expenditure, apportionment, 4578
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment and salary, 3043
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3417
Royal commission, 4709
Railway Commission, 3188
Annual report, 1659
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3188
Constitution and work of, 3192
Railways and Canals
Bell, Major Graham A., 3195
Estimates, 1764, 3173, 3376, 3760
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648
Returned soldiers, Civil Service, 1773
Rideau canal, 4691
Royal Canadian navy, 903. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403, 3145
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Agreement with United States, 3772
Provincial undertakings, 3782
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3647
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Thornton, Sir Henry. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845
Reported statement on immigration, 2795
Toronto
Harbour improvements, 4578
Street railway, 2475
Union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Viaduct, 4325, 4336, 4452
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 893
Unrest, alleged in Western Canada, 4514
War claims adjustment, 900
War medals, 1744
Warlike stores, 900
Water powers, jurisdiction, 665
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3771, 3778
Hudson Bay railway and, 1068, 3779
Request for, 3073, 3772

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Freight Rates; Lake Grain Rates
Additional outlets for, 53
Alberta production, 1435
Bankers and, 4048
Bank liens upon seed grain and crop, 4102
Barley flour, sales tax, 4431
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 2035, 4709

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Canada Grain Act—*Con.*
Appeal, 781
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Licenses, 2299
Litigation, 2045
Canadian National Railways, 3680. *See also that title*
Cargoes, loading of. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Cheque tax charged back to farmers, 3039
Comparative rates on, 78
Crop of 1922, 20
Dockages. *See under this title,* Elevators
Drought, effect on grain production, 3429
Elevators. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Commission, qu. 1867
Co-operative, 2043
Dockages, 782, qu. 1661, 2039, qu. 3141, qu. 3505, qu. 4300
Earnings, 2042
Edmonton, 4716
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Fort William and Port Arthur, qu. 4132
Georgian Bay, qu. 620
Government, 2036, 3264
Grain Growers', 2675
Halifax, 4713, qu. 4751
Lethbridge, 4716
Montreal, qu. 385, qu. 1663, 1768, 1974, 3767
Short weight, complaint of, 2037
Multiplication of, 1400
Ontario, 2038, 4716, 4719
Overages, 494, 782, 2039
Port Arthur, qu. 4132. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Screenings, purchase of, qu. 2612, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Port Colborne, qu. 1029, 4690
Public ownership, 2956
Quebec, 2903, 3768, 4233
St. Croix, 2903
Saskatchewan co-operative, 2779
Screenings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1633, qu 1661, qu. 1739, 2042, qu. 2613, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Seed supplied by. *See* Seed Inspection
Terminal, 3821
Abuses. *See under this title,* Marketing
Fort William and Port Arthur
Dockages, screenings and scalpings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1739, 2254, 2867
Sale of, qu. 1633
Free sites, 2955
Maintenance, 810

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Elevators—*Con.*
Terminal—*Con.*
Montreal, 1768
Price, Waterhouse, report, 2954
Profits, 2954
Vancouver, 1057, qu. 1487. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Dockages, 782
Improvement, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Exports, 2748
Flax, weed seeds and, 4378
France, pre-war production, 2247
Freight cars, shortage of, 4697
Freight rates on, 1914, 3194. *See also* Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland canal
Shipping. *See* Lake Grain Rates bill, *and under this title,* Shipment
French treaty, 455, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Gage case, 2592
Gambling in futures, 3058
Grain
Adulteration of Canadian at United States ports, 3649, 3764, 3961
Combine, 4048
Commission. *See under this title* Marketing
Loading at Canadian ports, 3974. *See also under this title,* Shipment
Mixing, 1388, 3764
New varieties, introduction, 483
Samples for exhibitions, 1454
Surveys, qu. 4131
Unsold, 273, 1975, 2748, 2773
Grain Act. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Grain Commissioners, board of, 53, 2036
Commissioners, residence of, 787
Dockage and screenings, 782
Elevator screenings, inquiry into, 2254
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Lake grain rates, 4218
Names, occupations, etc., qu. 2206
Personnel, 4221
Salaries, 4709
Grain Growers' Guide, Mr. Shaw, 987
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1763, 4710
Lawyers, employment of, 4710
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Handling of. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Hudson Bay railway 1032
India, wheat production, 1840

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Indian reserves, grain production, 1139, 2156
Injustice to western farmers, 1114
Inquiry into trade, etc. 48, 301. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 2774
Inspection. *See under this title,* Marketing
Lake Grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates Bill
Royal commission on, report, 2885
Liverpool Corn Trade Association, shortages, 1764
London Corn Exchange, adulteration, 3649, 3961
Mandscheuri barley, introduction of, 483
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Marketing, 53. *See also* Hudson Bay Railway; Markets
Costs, 68
M. (Mr. Millar) for commission of inquiry, 288 agreed to as amended, 311
Shipment and, 494
Markets, 1410
Grain unsold, 1975, 2748, 2773
Milling and baking tests, 463
Millfeeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act
Montreal
Grain shipments, qu. 1973, 1974
Shortages, 1764
Oats
Acreage and production, 2934
Price, 1388
Ocean freights. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
Overages, 494, 782, 2039. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Overhead, 1400
Pooling, 1400
Prices. *See also* Immigration; Prices
Comparison with United States. *See under this title,* Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar)
Royal commission recommended, 1209
Sample market at Winnipeg, qu. 345, qu. 494
Screenings. *See under this title,* Elevators, *and also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Seed. *See* Seed Inspection
Seed grain advances, 3444, 3447
Amount outstanding, 3444
Municipal indebtedness for, 3446
Seed purchasing commission, qu. 279
Shipment, 1032, 2854, 4193, 4714. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill *and under this title,* Wheat
Canadian and United States ports, 1756, 1767, 1768, 3764
Adulteration, 3649, 3764, 3961
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3263, 3812

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Canals, utilization of, 2808, 3763
Congestion, 3767
Quebec, 3768
Cost of, 2808, 2044
Discrimination against Canadian ports, 2960
Diversion to United States railways, 2898
Elevators. *See under this title,* Elevators
Facilities for, 730
Improvement of, 2745
Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Hudson Bay railway, 4681. *See also that title*
Lake, 2959. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Montreal, to, qu. 385
Pacific coast, 3769
Panama canal, 1921
Portland, St. John and Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Prince Rupert, 151-2
Royal commission on lake rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3342, 3763
Shipping rates, 2517, 2613. *See also* Freight Rates
Vancouver, by, 257, 1057
Volume of, 2757
Welland canal, 3763
Wheat, Quebec, qu. 3820
Shortages
Complaints by British importers, 1764, 2037
Transportation, 19, 69, 77, 4222. *See also under this title,* Shipment
United Grain Growers, Calgary, 1408
Warehousing. *See under this title* Elevators
Western grain route, 69, 1924. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Wheat
Bounty on, 1196
Bushels required to purchase agricultural implements, 1912, and 1922, 1408
Canada greatest wheat export country, 2780
Canada third in acreage and production, 2934
Central European competition, 2396
Exports, 2750, 2774, 2780, 2843, 3062. *See also* Imports and Exports
French treaty, 1978
Hard, 2873
Markets, 3068
Marquis III, introduction of, 483
Pool, 2526

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Wheat—*Con.*
Prices, 628, 1101, 1886, 3004. *See also that title*
Production, 68, 265, 1405, 4224
Reciprocity in, 2993
Rust, 595
Saskatchewan, in farmers' hands, 1975
Screenings as feed for lambs, 2867
United States tariff against, 2823. *See also* United States, Fordney-McCumber tariff
Wheat-growing as permanent operation, 1423
Wheat stem saw-fly, 2774
World competition, 2781
Wheat board, 409, 2548, 2592, 2836, 2857, 3235
Correspondence, 626
Legislation, extension of, 2696, 2740, 2927
Order in council, 2696, 3045
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Profits, 3239
Progressive party and, 3030
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345, qu. 494

Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board

Grain Commission. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Grain Growers' Guide reference to, Mr. Shaw, 987

Grain Inquiry Commission. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Grand Jury System
Abolition of, 2695, 3272
Combines, 2585

Grand Manan, island of
Breakwaters, 945
Population, 2172
Steamship service, 2172

Grand River, Que. wharf, 958

Grand Trunk. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Pacific. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grant, Dr. W. L., Civil Service, 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Letter to Dr. Roche, 355

Granville, Earl, Canadian Pacific Railway, 1916

Granville Island, taxation, qu. 1485

Grape-Growers. *See* Fruit; Treaties, French Treaty; Wines

Grapes. *See* Fruit

Grasshoppers. *See* Insect Pests

Gratuities. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Grazing Leases. *See* Dominion lands; Interior

Great Britain. *See also* British Preference
Agricultural conditions, 1861, 2755
Agricultural labourer's strike, 2822
Agricultural products, markets for, 2869
Agricultural representative in, 3291, 4675
Agriculture and free trade, 1858
Ammunition received from, 1740
Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824
"British policy" 4652
British preference. *See that title*
Budgets of Chancellor of the Exchequer, 2984, 3001
Canada's relations with. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties
Capital levy, 2722
Cattle
Embargo, 2871
Markets for, 208, 2871
Shipments to. *See* Live stock
Coal exports, 1263
Conditions in, 2748
Copyright legislation, 2140
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 3007
Anti-Corn law league, 1859
Bright, Mr. John, 3013
Peel, Sir Robert, 3050
Prosperity, return of, 3020
Dairy representative in, 3297
"Dangerous agitators from," 3033
Debt
Per capita, 2956
Reduction, 3072
United States to, 2879, 2918
War, 24, 2986
Deportation of Irish men and women, 3158
Depression in, 1854
Dumping ground, 2822
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Exchange, refund, 2641, 2658
Exhibitions, 1454, 1467. *See also that title*
Federation of British industries, 2726
Foreign policy, 165. *See also* Near East
Free trade, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3072, 3012. *See also under this title,* Corn Laws
Progress of movement, 3050
Rents, and, 1862
Grey, Earl, 1418
Halibut Fisheries Treaty and, 1308, 4457
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374
Immigration from, 1084, 1218. *See also* Immigration

Great Britain—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Prepaid passages, 2611
Imports and exports, 2928
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Industrial revolution, 2723
Liberty of the subject, 3158
National Farmers' union, 2791
National Labour party, policy, 2721
Naturalization. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Near East crisis. *See that title*
Necessities of life, taxation, 2789
Parliament, history of. *See* Lack of Confidence
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Precedent, 2788
Protection, 2752
Proportional representation, 392
Railways, 1618
Reciprocity treaties with France, 3050
Rural depopulation in, 1854
Shipbuilding, 3072
Surplus, 2823
Taxation, 2796
Expenditure and reduction, 2749
Income tax, 2881, 2986
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Luxuries, 3069
Necessaries, 2754
Reduction of, 2712, 4493
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2294
Trade with, 3072. *See also* British Preference
Unemployment in, 1205, 2754, 2822
War debt, 24, 2986. *See also under this title,* Debt
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Great Lakes
Disarmament
Correspondence with United States, M. (Mr. Meighen), 244, 247, 494
Tabled, 1307
Diversion of waters, qu. 3821
Shipping rates on. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates
Subsidized Steamship services, suggested extension, 2175

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Transportation Company, lease of freighters to, 3848

Great War Veterans Association
MacNeil case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Great War Veterans Association—*Con.*
Oleomargarine, 3547
Pensions. *See that title*
Petition, 4535

Greece
Grecian loan, qu. 623, 2010

Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Grenville by-election, 4606

Grey, Earl, Canada and the Empire, 1418

Griffenhagen and Associates. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Budget, 2898. British preference, increase of; Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, 2898; railways and transportation; ports, development of; United States, railways, ports and commerce; Passamaquoddy bay, "greatest natural harbour on Atlantic coast; Canadian National Railways, ocean terminals; "Canadian export trade routed by United States ports; Senate committee's report; diversion of grain traffic; Winnipeg-St. Croix direct route; saving in transportation costs; Admiral Sir W. F. W. Owen, report, 2899; Commander Compbell, report; Captain Henry Mowat, report; Hon. Robert Rogers; examination of St. Croix harbour; Mr. E. C. Swan, report; Mr. F. C. Goodspeed, report; 2900; Messrs. Fillies, Kenney and Elliot, master mariners, reports; St. Stephen, industrial centre; advantages of St. Croix from railway point of view; Mr. D. F. Maxwell, statement of mileage, 2901; St. Croix as winter port; small cost of development; construction of railway across state of Maine, 2902; gradients; St. John Journal editorial, 2903
Canadian National Railways, 2898
Talbot, Mr. O., director, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 945

Grisdale, Dr. J. H. *See also* Agriculture department
Cattle shipment, 3040
Salary, 610

Groceries. *See* Prices

Grondines wharf, 959

Grosse Isle. *See* Health, Quarantine

Grosses Roches, Que., wharf, 968

Group Government. *See* Government

Group Representation. *See* Proportional Representation

Guarantee. *See* Railways

Guessing Contests, qu. 733. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Ammunition, 884
Annuities branch, advertising, 1641
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3217
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1500
Canadian National Institute for Blind, 693
Canadian National railways, Paris offices, 3633, 3693
Cold Storage Act Amdt bill, 2057
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2139, 2288
History of legislation, 2140
Le Droit D'Auteur, 2141
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, 2060
Dominion Fuel Board, 3198
Dredging
Expenditure, 4590
Maritime provinces, 1009
Estimates, time of presentation, 4577
Field crop competitions, 603
French treaty, 2227
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238
Border states
Agreements with, 2231
Concessions to, 2402
Favoured nation treatment, 2232, 2234
Manufacturers and, 2236
Pianos and organs, 2237
Revenue loss through, 2235
Rubber, manufacturers of, 2237
Sewing machines, 2237
Summary of, 2232
Trade results, 2230
Treaty of 1907, 2229
Fruit industry, 598
Fuel supply, 797, 3198
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Grondines wharf, 959
M. to reduce item, 963
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 949
Nova Scotia, 944, 4576
Ontario, 981

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 2061
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2139
Italian treaty bill, 2402
Labour
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 2061
Strikes, 1628
Troops, employment of, 893, 1627
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, correspondents, 1626
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Linen yarns, 3897, 3898
Lunenburg harbour dredging, 4576, 4591
Amdt. to reduce amount, 4577, neg. 4580
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3314
Political partisanship, 3315
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Murray Bay wharf, 973
National Defence
Annual training, 859
Arsenal, Quebec, bonus to employees, 1751
Estimates, 859
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 893, 1627
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and contingencies, 901
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2111, 2182
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2074, 2078, 2080, 2130
Public Works
Dominon Archives, building, 1730
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Quebec riots, 893
Society of Chemical Industries, 2069
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, amalgamation, 3893
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3892
Soldier Settlement Board, Moss Mr. H. H. compensation, 2030
Supplementary estimates, lack of information, 4576, 4577
Trade and Commerce
Estimates, increase, 2033
Staff, 2031
War claims, adjustment of, 1745
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1746
Vickers Company contract, cancellation, 1746
War medals, 1743
Yarmouth harbour, dredging, 1011

Gypsum Lands. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Hackland, Capt. J., Hudson Bay route, 1064

Haggard, Sir Rider, immigration, 1206

Hail Insurance. *See* Insurance

Haileybury, armoury and post office, 4615

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Agricultural publications, 598
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855
Eight-hour day, 1650
Farming, investment to start, 1415
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4275, 4538
Hog grading, 591
Immigration
Farm labourers, 1416
Policy, 1415
Tariff and, 1416
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3554
"Plutocrats and profiteers" 1417
Senate, elective or nominative, 1378
Toronto, expenditure on public buildings, 4621

Half Breed Claims. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill; Mackenzie

Halibut Fishery Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut

Halifax
Camp Hill hospital, qu. 3506
Duties on goods shipped from Vancouver via Panama canal, 2519, 2615
Exodus from, 2400
Grain
Elevator, 4713, qu. 4751
Shipments from, qu. 1484
Immigration building, 4612
Importation through port of. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Naval college, 1744
Naval stores at, 110
Ocean terminals, qu. 4510, qu. 4713, 4751
Port, development of, 109
Quarantine station, 4612
Rockhead hospital, 4613

Halifax-Cape Breton steamship service, 2173

Halifax-Newfoundland steamship service, 2173

Halton County customs officials. *See* Customs and Excise

Hamilton
Harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Public building, 4628

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Automobile accidents, 3959
Bracebridge harbour, 4612
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4546
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
Redistribution committee, 1660
Reference to, 2884

Haney, Mr. M. J., purchase of steamer Murray Stewart, 3354

Hanging. *See* Capital Punishment

Hanna, Mr. D. B. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Director, Canada Steamship Lines, 3208
Dismissal of, 157
Insurance companies, interest in, 2050

Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Ammunition, 887
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt bill, 2048
Annual drill, 859, 863
Arichat wharf, qu. 2180
Atlantic Fisheries Commission, inquiry, 3365
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-95
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, dismissal, qu. 4511
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613
Bridges, New Brunswick, 2342
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4489
Campbellton wharf, 945
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, Moncton, transfer, 574
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4189, 4309-22
Coal purchases, qu. 4303, qu. 4511, qu. 4752
Directors, board of, 60
Dominion Express Company, contract, 2473
Express and Electric lines bill, 2471
Fredericton bridge, 3645
Grand Trunk ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 2048
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Paris offices, 3638, 3683
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Capital punishment, 768
Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway, qu. 204
Carleton county, execution in, 778
Cheque tax, 3931
Chinese immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Dismissals, 856
In 1922, 3324
Civil Service Act, violation of, 1794
Coal. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Cost of, 1813
Railway rates on, 1272, 1813
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C.
Administration of Yukon territory, 2299
Appointment as commissioner, qu. 3131
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Descheneaux, Mr. P., lightkeeper, qu. 4512
Digby harbour, dredging, 4568
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 2375, 2379
Dominion arsenals, 887
East Sandy Cove, 4571
Eastern Harbour, dredging, 4569
Edmundston public buildings, site, 4613
Fishways, 3362
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1271
Geological survey, exploration, 2504
Gorman, Mr. L. F., salary, 3360
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 4562
Hayes, Mr., Canadian National Railways, 2471
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment, 2498
Highway bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Hudson Bay railway, 4310
Construction vote, 4683
Icebreaker Mikula, qu. 1384
Immigration
Child, 1471
Policy in New Brunswick, 1086
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4494, 4502
Indians, 2154
Agent at Perth, N. B., 2154
Intercolonial inclusion in Canadian National, 13
International bridges, 2342, 3647
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Joggins breakwater, 943
Kent Northern railway, 4189

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Labour
Employment bureaus, private, 1630
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4232
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouse and lightkeepers
Descheneau, Mr. P., qu. 4512
Maintenance and repairs, 3353, 3354
New lights, 3357
Salaries and allowances, 3352
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, 4573
Magdalen islands wharves, 974
Mail contracts
Sporting mountain, qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, Quebec, 4302
Margaree river salmon fisheries, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Maritime provinces coal, freight rates, 1813
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 2615
Meteorological service, 3360
Miramichi smelt fisheries, 1974
Moncton and Buctouche railway, qu. 203, 3646
Morrison, Mr. D. W., 1489
Murray Bay wharf, 973
Murray Stewart, purchase, qu. 203, 3354, 3359
National monument, Connaught place, 1020
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2186
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Nova Scotia, harbours and rivers, 941
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Parliament buildings, 1727
Patents of Invention bill, 2072, 2087
Permanent force, 892
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Port Greville breakwater, 944
Postmasters
Appointments and dismisals, 4534
Angouleme, qu. 3139
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, N. S., qu. 1363, 1795, 1797, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698
Herbertville, Que., qu. 3139
Labarre, Que., qu. 3138
Larouche, Que., qu. 3137
Pierreville, Que., qu. 4511
St. Bruno, Que., qu. 3140
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
St. Peter's, N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D. W., qu. 1488, 1489
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, qu. 3139
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4534
Post Office department, administration, 1817
Printing bureau, 1710
Public buildings
New Brunswick, 4613
Ontario, 4615
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1486, 2498, 2504
Rimouski wharf, 977
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1802
Russell, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebes railway, 4309
Sale and Inspection of Fruit bill 2105
Sales tax, exemption of hospital supplies, 4432
Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1369
Smelt-fishing regulations, qu. 1868, 1974
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldiers Settlement Board, staff, 2020
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Telegraph lines
Chicoutimi county, qu. 3138
St. Charles-Peribonka, qu. 3262
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment to Bench, 1868
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal qu. 3140
War claims, 2498
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Harbours. *See* Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual harbours, *See* Harbours and Rivers
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Vancouver, Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers, 993, 4554. *See also* Public Works, Dredging
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 2671
Canoe wharf, 1005
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Fraser river improvements, 1003-07
Generally, 1002
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Port Renfrew, 1008
Salmon arm, 1006
Vancouver. *See also that title*
Stanley Park, 1008
Victoria. *See that title*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Day labour, 950, 956
Expenditure, 83, 947
Generally, 1009
Manitoba, 993, 4589
Red River, 1000
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Selkirk, 1000
Wanipigow (Hole river), 1000
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
Campbellton, 945
Cummings Cove, 945
Generally, 946
Grand Manan, 945
Head Harbour, 2900
Passamaquoddy bay, 2899
Portage river, 950
St. Andrew's, 2899
St. Croix, 2899
St. John. *See that title*
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Wharves transferred to Dominion government, 946
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Abbott's harbour, 4563
Advocate, 4560
Annapolis Royal, 941
Arichat, qu. 2180
Bass River, 4563
Battery Point, 4563
Black Point, 941
Broad Cove marsh, 4564
Burlington Centre, 4564
Canada Creek, 4564
Canso, 941
Cape St. Mary, 941
Cariboo Island, 4564, 4567
Chapel Cove, 941
Cheverie wharf, 4567
Chimney Corner, 941
Culloden, 4567
Dartmouth, 4568
D'Escousse, 4568
Digby, 942
Dredging, 4568
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Eastern Harbour, 4569
Ecum Secum, 4571
Five Islands, 4571
Fruid's Point, 4571
Generally, 942
Gillis Point, 4571
Grand Narrows, 4572
Half Island Cove, 4572
Halifax. *See that title*
Hampton, 4572
Haulover, 943
Inverness, 4572

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Joggins, 943
Judique, 943
Leitche's Creek, 943
Little Anse, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4722, 4572
Little Harbour, 4575
Livingstone's Cove, 4576
Lockeport, 943
Lunenburg, 4576
Dredging, amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580
Malagash, dredging, 4580
Margaree, 4581
Margaretville, 4581
Meteghan, 4581
North Ingonish, 4582
North Sydney, 4582
Nyanza wharf, 4582
Ostrea Lake, 943
Parrsboro, 4583
Pembroke, 4584
Pictou, 4584
Beach light, 4583
Piper's Cove, 4583
Point Aconi, 4583
Port Beckerton, 4583
Port Greville, 944, 4583
Port Lorne, 4584
Portugese Cove 4584
Riverport, 4584
Round Hill, 4584
Sandford, 4584
Scotch Cove, 4584
Scott's Bay, 4584
Shaw Bay, 4585
Shelburne, 4585
Sheet Harbour West, 4585
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Ship Harbour, 4586
Smith's Cove, 4585
Sonora wharf, 4585
South Lake, 4585
Summerville, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Yarmouth, 944
Ontario, 2690, 4588, 4594
Bayfield, 981
Belle River, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Big Bay Point, 981
Blind River, 981
Bracebridge, 4612
Chatham, 982

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Cloud Bay, 982
Cobourg, 981
Fort William, 2675, 4610
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Generally, 982
Grassmere, 4612
Jackson's Point, 4589
Kincardine, 982
Little Current, 982
Meaford, 983
Midland, 983
Owen Sound, 2690
Port Arthur, 2675, 4610
Port Burwell, 983
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Port Maitland, 4589
Rondeau, 983
Southampton, 984
Toronto, 2678. *See also that title*
Prince Edward Island, 945
Beach Point, 4586
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Quebec
Bryant's Landing, 950
Cap de la Madeleine, 950
Chicoutimi, 950
Contrecoeur, 950, 1008
Cross Point, 955
Descente des Femmes, 955
East Templeton, 955
Generally, 968
Grand River, 958
Grondines wharf, 959
M. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 963
Grosses Roches, 968
La Malbaie, 968
Lanoraie, 969
Lavaltrie, 969
L'Islet, 969
Matane, 970
Montreal. *See that title.*
New Carlisle, 973
Peribonka, 973
Piche Point, 973
Pointe a Elie, Magdalen islands, 974
Point au Pic, Murray Bay, 973
Pointe aux Trembles, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) 977
Quebec harbour. *See that title*
Repentigny, 977
Rimouski, 977
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Riviere du Lievre, 978
Roberval, 978
St. Alexis, 980

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Ste. Anne des Monts, 979
St. Charles, 980
St. Jean d'Orleans, 980
St. Michel de Bellechasse, 980
St. Omer, 980
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Three Rivers, 3399, 3963. *See also that title*
Ville Marie, 981
Saskatchewan, 1001, 4589
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winter ports, 2902

Harington, Sir Charles. *See* Near East Crisis

Harness, duty on, 3048

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582-3
Budget, 2804. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Bank Act revision; tariff; former criticism of minister; irritating taxation; sales tax; increase passed on to consumer; application to foreign and domestic goods, 2804; encouraging the middlemen; dilemma of the Minister of the Interior; free trade and protection; cost of civil government; balanced budget; Civil Service salaries; duplication and overlapping of services; retrenchment; ship of state drifting; Liberal party near rocks of destruction; immigration policy, 2805; government on business principles; tariff stability, protection and free trade; indigenous industries; wood production; reciprocity with United States; a begging request; parliamentary speeches; brevity, 2806; shipment of cattle to British markets; Transcontinental railway; Winnipeg-Quebec route; shipping facilities; Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats for cattle trade; St. Lawrence river waterway, parliamentary discussion of, 2807; talk of secession in western provinces; breezes blowing in the mulberry trees; national and imperial unity, 2808
Canadian National Railways
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Directors, inspection trip, qu. 489
Special train, qu. 489
Experimental farms, 467, 472

Harris, Mr. Joseph H.—*Con.*
Feed inspection, 602
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4589
Health of animals, 582
Hog cholera, 582
Jackson's Point wharf, 4589
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, Stornoway, 2181
Montreal harbour commissioners, advances, qu. 812
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 4753
Retired farmers, income, 1118
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Toronto viaduct, qu. 517
Trade commissioners, 1840

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 958

Hatters Bands, etc. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Haulover, N.S., wharf, 943

Hawkesbury, government revenue and salaries, qu. 2205

Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal from Calgary post office, 1687, 1868

Hazelton telegraph line, 150

Hazen, Sir Douglas
Appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Health. *See also* Housing; Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Advancement of, 2827
Children, mortality of, 1179
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Death rate, 1197
Department of
Estimates, 697, 2170
Food and Drugs Act, administration, 697
Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Institutions for sailors, 2167
Legal adviser, 777
Maple products, 1810
Marine hospitals, 2167
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Grosse Isle, number of vessels calling, 2168
Halifax building, 4612
St. John, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Health—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Sick mariners' dues, 2167-8
Dominion Council of Health, women members, 3649
Medical research, standardizing and testing laboratories, 703
Immigration, medical inspection, 702
Oleomargarine and, 3558
Pharmaceutical preparations, country of origin, qu. 3261
Venereal diseases, 705

Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live stock

Healy, Mr. A. F. (North Essex)
Belle River harbour, 4594, 4608
Canadian Press Limited, 2555, 2630, qu. 3703
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Combines bill, 2555, 2621, 2630
Registrar, appointment of, 2630
Introduction, 1135
Newspaper combines, 2630
North Essex election, visit of Mr. Meighen to Belle River, 4594

Hearst Publications. *See* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)

Hebert River coal district. *See* Coal

Hebridean Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Hector Celebration, grant to Scottish Pioneer Association, 4636, 4705

Helium, discoveries
Macallum, Dr., 4439
McLennan, Professor by, 703

Hemp
Belfast, 3032
Bounty, 2647, 2659, 2704, 2709, 2778, 2823, 2827, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3018, 3031, 3911, 3963
Binder twine, 2780
Extension of time, 3911
Duty, 3017
Industry, establishment of, 3031
Seed, for agricultural purposes, 3474
Free entry of, 2645, 2651

Hemp Bounty Bill
Res. 3911, 3914, 3963; lr., 3963; 2r., com., 4376; 3r., 4391
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4376, neg. 4391

Henderson, Right Hon. Arthur, class rule in politics, 2733

Herbertville, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3139

Herschell Island, Eskimos, trial. *See* North West Territories Act Amdt.

Hides, imports, qu. 617

High Commissioner in London
Empire settlement board, agreement, **1476**
Grain shortage, complaint of British importers, 1764
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Office building, 4629
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., representative on Pacific Cable board, 1832
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456

Highland Battalions. *See* Hector Celebration

Highways. *See also* Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill
Alberta, 2342
Appropriations under act of 1919, 2338
Banff-Windermere, 3437, 3584
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
British Columbia, 2941, 3186
Unemployment, 3032
British Columbia-Washington state, 2941
Buckhorn lock roadway, 4691
Canada Highways Commission, 2489
Campbell, Mr. A. W., C.E., 3173
Staff, 3173
Canboro-Dunville-Welland-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Cariboo road, 3032
Cost per mile, 2491, 3176
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Dundas street, qu. 708
Effect on railway traffic, 1619
Estimates, 2489, 3173
Federal contribution to, 2489
Grants
Federal inquiry, 519, qu. 623
Ontario, to, qu. 620
Hamilton-Brantford, qu. 624, 2492
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 813
Hope-Princeton, 2342
Indian reserves, passing through, 2153
International, 2941
Bridges, 2342
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Jasper Park, 3435
Lachute-Arundel, 4313
Manitoba, 3184
Meaford-Clarksburg, 4565
Millbrook reserve, 2124
Montreal-Hull, 2341
Montreal-Mont Laurier, 2341, 4313
New Brunswick, 3182

Highways—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 3183
Ontario, 3177
Grant, qu. 620
Projected, 624
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 2085
Pacific highway, 2341
Prince Edward Island, 3184
Quebec, 3180
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Saskatchewan, 3185
Statements
Cost per mile, 3176
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Types of roads, 3174
Toronto-London, qu. 708
Waterton lakes, qu. 2085
Yukon, 3943

Hindus. *See also* Immigration, Oriental
Immigrants, franchise, 503, 4077, 4640-53

Hirtle, Carrie L., schooner, qu. 3323

Historic Sites. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Canadian National Parks and Reservations bill; Monuments and Memorials

Hoboes, products of unemployment, 1194

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Annuities, old age, 1697
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Belle River harbour, 4597
British mail, delay in, 2639, 2695
Business, difficulties of, 1419
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4190
Paris offices, 3279
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Combines bill, 2522
Co-operative associations, 1419
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4558
Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 335
Hamilton harbour commissioners qu. 912
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hemp bounty, 3911
Hudson Bay railway, 4192
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3590
Policy, 1418
International Joint Commission, 3427
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour, hours, 1842

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
Canadian, encouragement of, M., 826, 855
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Midland post office, qu. 623
Montreal harbour commission, qu. 1137
National Monument, Connaught place, 1021
Navigation, aids to, 3333
Newspaper combines, 2522
Paper, prices in Canada and United States, 829
Peat experiments, 794
"Plutocrats and profiteers," 1418
Post Office department
Appointments and retirements, 1826
Ross, Mr. George, retirement, 1825
Progressive party and tariff, 1421
Proportional representation, 388
Public ownership of railways, 4190
Public Works department, patronage, 946
Quebec harbour commissioners, qu. 1136
Radio direction finding, qu. 3820
St. John harbour commissioners, qu. 911
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2780
Sales tax, 4414
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Tariff
Immigration and, 1418
Reduction of, 1421
Toronto
Customs house, 3279
Harbour improvements, 2679
Seed branch building, 4624
Union station, 4444
Viaduct, 4444
Vancouver harbour bill, 264
Vancouver harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Welland canal construction, 3780

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 186
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs., trip to South America, qu. 1031
House of Commons furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Address in reply, 63. No reference in speech to tariff revision, 63; rapid deflation in price of foodstuffs; market for surplus farm products; Canadian agriculturist to-day feeding Europe, 64; Canadian representation in the United States; foreign policy bound up in that of United States; conference of provincial representatives on revenue; amendment, 65

Hoey, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 999
Authors' Association of Canada, copyright, 3155
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4038
Bank robberies, 776
Binder twine, prices, 4377
Brandon, damage by floods, 999
Cadet services, 877
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3961
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 565
Civil Service, exempted positions, 367
Copper bounty bill, 3235
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155
Dominion Elections Act amdt. 1027
Experimental farms, 462
Farm homes, 1215
Grand jury system, abolition of, 3271
Hemp bounty, 3912, 4377
Hopkins, Mr., and reciprocity, 3010
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1215
Policy, 1213
Story of an immigrant's struggle and success, 1216
Inheritance tax, 2803
Institutionalism, over, 1214
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225, 4227
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4175
League of Nations, 142
Manitoba
Agricultural economic conditions, 1213
Institutions and services in excess of present need, 1214
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Proportional representation, 406, 418, 424
Reciprocity with the United States, 2854, 3905
Rural credits, 4039
Settlement schemes, 1089
Shipping combine, prosecution of, 4077, 4227
Taxation commission, 4039
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Western provinces, conditions, 1213

Hogs. *See* Livestock

Holland
Butter, competition, 2863
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration, from, 1085, 1095, 3591
Imports and exports, 1977

Home Building. *See* Building; Housing

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act

Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697, 1810

Hong Kong, goods imported via Suez canal and, 3454

Honorary Advisory Council. *See* Research

Honours. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Hooper, Mr. Ronald, Labour Gazette, 1625-6

Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supply, 1263

Hopkins, Mr. E. N. (Moose Jaw)
Budget, 2980. First speech in House of Commons; limited vision of new members; Canada's destiny; Moose Jaw district; selection of wheat by millers; high tariff bears unduly on the West, 2980; interests of the East and West; recapitalization and adjustment of debts; sharing of war burdens, 2981
Introduction, 2417
Moose Jaw income tax office, qu. 2699
Reciprocity, attitude towards, 3010

Hoppe and Isenberg Leases. *See also* Dominion Lands Act (Coal Leases); Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill
Cancellation of, 3146, 3222
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Investigation into, 3128

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse-Racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Information. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bills

Horses. *See* Live stock

Horticulture. *See also* Fruit; Insect Pests
Canadian Council of, 2307
Garden and grass seeds, purity of, 601
Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423
Nursery stock, 1990
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Seed testing. *See* that title

Hospitals. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Health
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Marine, 701, 2167
Military, 669
Closed, 669
Brant House, Burlington, 4075
Euclid House, Toronto, 4075

Hospitals—*Con.*
Military—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
Repairs and improvements, 4629
Staffs, 675
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Transients, treatment of, 673
Sales tax, 4432
Soldiers, maintenance cost, qu. 812
Standardization, 2934
X-Ray plates, coverings, duty, 3501

Hotel Scribe, purchase of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hotels. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hours. *See* Civil Service; Labour

House of Commons. *See also.* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1721, 2446. *See also under this title,* Audibility of debates
Members, speaking, to occupy central position, 1721
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven o'clock, 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3208, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
To await action of Senate on bill, 4754
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
British Columbia fishing licenses, M., (Mr. Clark), 1540
Hebridean immigrants, M. (Mr. Speakman) 3584
Powell River Paper Company, M. (Mr. Neill) 2886
Union Bank, M. (Mr. Forke) 4296
Twelve, midnight, 4672
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Audibility of debates, 645, 976, 2446, 3327, 4572, 4580, 4593
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Bills
Alterations in, 3325, 3451
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3974, 3976, 4185
Preparation and form of, 4007
Principle discussed on second reading, 3091
Private, suspension of rules, posting, 4248
Third reading by consent, 4141
Business of the House, 179, 250

House of Commons—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Amdt. to amdt.
Mr. Crerar, session of 1922, 1300
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1299-1307
Budget debate, precedence, 2694
For to-morrow, 3750
Government orders to have precedence Monday and Wednesday, 1158
Legislation
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
Pending, qu. 2517, 2795, 3265
Announcement, 3452
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Post Office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' days, 1158
Progress of, 2469
Supply. *See also under this title,* Supply
Calling on Mondays and Tuesdays, 2295
Relevancy, 4720
By-elections, 99. *See also* Elections and, *under this title,* Vacancies
Grenville, 4606
Moose Jaw, return, delay, 2295
North Essex, 4594
Chamber
Acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics;
Conversation, 4528, 4572
Lighting, 1728
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Canadian Government Merchant Marine vote, 4598
Committees, For proceedings and reports, *See titles* of the several committees
Expenses of, 2691
Reports
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Right to consider questions not referred to, 3266
Select Standing, 3, 199
Changes in membership, 382, 486, 435, 615, 811, 857
Special, cost of, 2979
Contingencies, 2691
Debate
Audibility of. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility
Speeches
Brevity, 2806
Length of, 2883
Debates, Official Report of
Abolition, 1734
Committee, 202

House of Commons—*Con.*
Debates, Official Report of—*Con.*
Distribution, 1715
Estimates, 2691
Insertion of documents not read, 1830, 3174
Pages missing from bound copy, 887, 1081
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Revised edition, inquiry, 122
Undiscussed items in supply, 1638, 3284, 3292
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Divisions
Address in reply
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) neg. 178
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Shaw) neg. 177
Bank Act Amdt. bill
Bank charters, extension, amdt. (Mr. Good) 4141, neg. 4147
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Officers, right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Budget
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means agreed to, 3084
Canadian National Railways bill (Branch lines) amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to 3r., neg. 4401
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) for repeal; amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for Special Com. agreed to, 571
Combines bill, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for 2r., agreed to, 2609
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Robb) for concurrence in amdt. agreed to, 2292
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to supply neg. 2391
Export Act Amdt. bill (Pulpwood) amdt. (Mr. Power) six months hoist, neg. 4397
French Treaty bill, M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., agreed to, 2250-51
Lack of Confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) neg. 243
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill M. (Sir Lomer Gouin) for 2r., agreed to, 4180
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) to permit manufacture, importation and sale
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) to remove suspension of prohibition, agreed to, 3581

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that government submit legislation before prorogation, neg. 3580
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 434
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment of, neg. 1152
Titles, Honours and Decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) neg. 1299
Documents, distribution of, 1712
Estimates, 2691. *See also that title;* Supply
Discussion
En bloc 4554, 4558, 4587, 4612
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614-15
Furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons Act Amdt. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Indemnity of members, 4674. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Proposed reduction 2915, 2967, 3043
M. (Mr. Leader) 1153
Senate and House of Commons Act, proposed changes, 4007, 4008. *See also that title*
Internal Economy Commission, 3
Joint Committee of both Houses on matters of common interest, 4007. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611
Report, 3887
Language, unparliamentary. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Letters
Quotation from by private member, 4599
Signature withheld, 4599
Library of Parliament, salaries, 2691
Members
Alleged reflection on, 4237
Attendance, 4007, 4008, 4236. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Coaching each other, 405
Deceased, 10, 102, 166
Blackadder, Dr. Edward, 4-8, 102

House of Commons—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Deceased—*Con.*
Kennedy, Hon. W. C., 4-8, 10, 102, 166, 281
Lafortune, Mr. D. A., 4-8, 281
Stewart, Hon. J. A., 4-8, 435
Indemnity of. *See under this title,* Indemnity
Labour, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033
New, election and introduction of
Benoit, Mr. A. J., 3
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., 2837
Finn, Mr. R. E., 3
Healy, Mr. A. F., 1135
Hopkins, Mr. E. N., 2417
Preston, Mr. R. F., 3
Rheaume, Mr. J. F., 3
Roberge, Mr. Eusebe, 3
Robichaud Mr. J. G., 3
Party funds, and, 4237
Relationship with constituents, 3021
Sessional attendance. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Stenographers, qu. 518
Votes, 4237
Motions. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Amendment to amendment
Proposed change in rules, 856, 1299
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Precedence, 3451
To keep place on order paper pending Speaker's ruling, 1285
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the day. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Parliamentary counsel, Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Privilege
Bancroft, Mr.—Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner), 1308
Béland, Hon. Mr.—Reported statement of Mr. Meighen in North Essex election, 708
Carroll, Mr.—Com. on Agriculture and Colonization, 3266
Clark, Mr.—Equalization of railway rates, 1910
Coote, Mr.—Correction of newspaper report, 2519
Good, Mr.—Question of veracity, 2181
Irvine, Mr.—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Martell, Mr.—Civil Service Committee report, 4363
Shaw, Mr.—Grain Growers' Guide, 987

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr.—Redistribution Committee, 1660
Questions
Answers and, 1385
Inquiry as to, 940
Lengthy, 939
Passed as orders for returns, 938, 940, 1139, 1385, 4303
Placed on order paper without member's knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Representation. *See* Redistribution
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Alleged incomplete, 1307
Inquiry for, 1212, 1636, 2208, 2254, 2394, 2640, 3324, 3508, 3962, 4184, 4295, 4513
Tabled, 3399
Rules
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Special committee to consider, M. (Mr. Johnston) 856, 1299
Suspension of, private bills, 4248
Wednesday, hour of meeting, Rule 2, 1
17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Senate and, Joint Committee. *See* Senate
Sergeant-at-Arms, estimates, 2691
Session
Economy in length of, 132, 133
Waste of time in, 143, 144
Sittings. *See also under this title,* Adjournments
All night, 4672
Late, 4599
Midnight, 4579, 4672
Mornings, 4132, 4249
Saturday, 2694, 3452, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Change in hour of meeting, 1
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Speaker's rulings. *See also* Speaker
Discussion of, 4013, 4076
Speeches. *See under this title,* Debate
Staff
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Organization, 4592
Salaries, 2691
Translators, Arsenault, Mr. H. P., 2691
Supply
M. to postpone proposed resolution, 3667
Voting in, 4610, 4611
Vacancies. *See also under this title,* By-elections
Cape Breton North and Victoria, 1763, 2469
Moose Jaw, 615
Nicolet, 2178

House of Commons—*Con.*
Votes and proceedings, questions passed as orders for returns, 939

House of Lords, constitution of, 1378

Housing. *See also* Building; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Assistance for, 2987
Building trades and, 1812
Farm homes, 1178, 1215
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1215, 1240, 1406
Harvesters, 2822
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 2517, 2518
Loans to provinces, 4558, 4603, 4704

Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2393, 2347, 2419, 2469, 3155

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4082
Budget, 3060. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity with United States; sugar duties, reduction in; tariff stability; review of fiscal system; national policy and its results; comparison of imports 1879 and 1923, 3060; new inventions, standards and wants; imports increasing in spite of high tariff; United States, Fordney tariff; iron ore and smelting industry; Canada not a self-contained country; imports must be paid for by exports; products of farm, sea and forest; manufactured products, export of, 3061; United States market; free admission of boots and shoes and farm implements; Canadian manufacturers, after 40 years protection not able to compete; folly to encourage new industries by artificial means; new duties and bounties; sectionalism; solidarity of the West; tariff and unjust tax; wheat production; producers get no benefit from tariff; Liberal platform of 1919; no hope of tariff planks being carried out; vote against government tariff proposals, 3062
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, grain trade, 1211
Rules, 1301. M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com. on
Tariff proposals, vote against, 3062, 3084

Hudson Bay
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Resources. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Company
Claim to Rocky Mountain park, qu. 2418
Navigation of Hudson bay and strait. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Railway. *See also* Canadian National Railways, branch lines; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland Canal
Agricultural resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Appropriation of land for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Canadian air force, 1748
Climatic conditions, 1072
Coal, transportation of, 1055, 1073, 1283
Cochrane, Hon. Frank, statement by, 1071
Commercial feasibility. *See under this title,* Feasibility
Commission to inquire and investigate, 3005
Comparative distances, 1034, 1070
Competition with Canadian National Railways, 1041, 1050, 1056, 1058, 1067, 1973-4
Construction, 4680
Correspondence, 208
Discontinuance of, 1062, 2747
Deficit, operating, 1560
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1062, 1761, 4682
Expenditure, 1033, 3073, 3076, 4192, 4198. *See also* Welland canal construction
Public and, 3005
Experiments, 461
Feasibility, 1033-70, 1749, 2878, 2939, 3005
Anderson, Captain, 1038, 1042, 1044, 1057, 1064
Bartlett, Capt, 1047
Bell, Dr., report, 1052
Bernier, Capt., testimony, 1072
Chisby, Capt., report, 1052
Crean, Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1072
Gordon report, 1038
Hackland, Capt. J., statement, 1064
Investigation by Canadian air service, 1749-50
Kennedy, Capt. William, report, 1052
Low, Mr. A. P., report, 1072
MeKenna, Mr. J. A. J. report, 1063
Manitoba legislature, com., report, 1052
Pritchard, Capt. William, report, 1052
Reid, Capt John, 1046
Test of, 1069
Tyrrell, Mr. J. W. report, 1072
Wakeham report, 1038
Finance, 1053
Dominion lands, appropriation for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Lash, late Mr. Z. A., 1053
Oliver, Hon. Frank, statement, 1053
Fishery resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Fort Churchill terminal. *See under this title,* Terminals

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1061, 1072
Freight rates, 3779. *See also that title*
Graham, Hon. George P., statement in 1916, 1071
Grain, transportation and marketing, 1032-80, 4681. *See also that title*
Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, 1061
Hazen, Sir Douglas, 1061
History and condition of, 1040, 1076
Hydro-electric power, 1065
James Bay railway, 1036, 1049
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4170
Land sold for qu. 283. *See also under this title,* Finance
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid
Announcement of project at Niagara Falls, 1047
Statement, 1066, 1071
London Times 1059
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co. claim, 4686
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
Military aspect of, 1057
Monthly Trade Review, London, editorial, 1036
M. (Mr. Knox) for consideration of Senate report, 1032; agreed to "on division," 1080
Motherwell Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686, 2774, 4683
Obstacles to success of, 2939
Policy, 2878
Port Nelson. *See under this title,* Terminals
Postponement of, 2951
Press statement as to cost—correction, 2296
Priority of undertaking, 1073, 1079
Progressive party and, 3030
Rail removals qu. 203
Reclamation of land in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Repair, 1070, 3647, 4198, 4680
Resources Hudson bay and region, 1039, 1064, 1072
Agricultural, 1065
Crean Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Fishery, 1064, 1073
Lower, Mr. A. R. M. report, 1065
Melville, Mr. C. D. report, 1064
Sifton, Sir Clifford announcement of project at Brandon, 1047
Surveys and gradings, 4310
Terminals, 1071
Bartlett, Captain, 1063
Fort Churchill, 1039, 1043, 1063
Hazen Sir Douglas, statement, 1063

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Terminals—*Con.*
Port Nelson, 1032, 1037, 1039, 1043, 1063, 1069, 3647
Dredging, 1012
Reid, Hon. J. D. statement, 1063
Thornton, Sir Henry, 4683
Turgeon, Hon. Senator, 1071
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Utility of, 1076
Waterpowers, 1065
Welland canal and, 1054, 1068, 3779. *See also that title.*
West, interest in scheme, 1035
Work this year, 4310

Hudson Bay Route, feasibility of. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply 123. Financial question; social and industrial unrest, 123; transportation and the railway problem, 126; contrast between government railways and Canadian Pacific, 127; Prince Edward Island railway, 128; decrease in population of Prince Edward Island, 129; representation of Prince Edward Island on government commissions, 130; discrimination in freight rates, potato-growing; immigration; the eight-hour day, 131; hours of railway station agents, 132
Budget, 2919; Multiplicity of counsel; mild criticism of budget from opposition benches, 2919; taxation and debt; responsibility for; increase of expenditure by Conservative administration; civil service dismissals and appointments; war prices; 50 per cent of war expenditure wasted or stolen, 2920; Liberals associated with late government; purchase of medical supplies through middleman; Conservatives preach economy but propose no specific reduction, 2921; reciprocity with United States; offer by Sir John Macdonald; election campaign of 1891; statement of Mr. Blaine; protection and free trade; balance of trade; imports and exports, 2922; international trade, profit and loss; artificial trade barriers; trade commissioners and subsidized steamship services; war blockade; selling without buying 2923; defeat of reciprocity in 1911; world-wide free trade not attainable; high tariff unprofitable; revenue necessities; farmers and reciprocity, 2924; legislation in advance of public sentiment; Liberal platform of 1919; progressive opposition, amendment, 2925
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 531
Amdt. to refer to special committee, 534
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Morning and Saturday sittings, 4132
Powell River Paper Company, 2893
Proportional representation, 419, 423

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Budget, 2940. Congratulations to Finance Minister; western provinces, lack of knowledge of; British Columbia, resources, 2940; Asiatic immigration; highways; electors of Revelstoke and Nelson; Mr. McQuarrie's charge of bribery, 2941; Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; immigration; fruit-growing industry; returned soldiers, treatment of; discontent; Canadian Legion, Victoria, B.C. resolution; administration of Pension Act, 2942; Board of Pension Commissioners; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, withdrawal from Nelson; telegram of Nelson Board of Trade; professional agitators; copper bounty, 2943; Trail smelter; opening of copper rod mill; optimistic feeling in British Columbia; tariff; amendment, 2944
Canadian National Railways, legislation, qu. 4300
Canadian National Safety League, 3958
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-37
Copper bounty bill, 3241, 4373
Freight rates, equalization of railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1970
Hindu franchise, 4658
Housing
Administration of act, 2171
Loans to provinces, 4704
Imperial Conference, 4658
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour, right to organize, 2895
Ore-testing, Ottawa plant, 2505, 2511
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3282, 4748
Pensions, 2942
Appeal boards, 697

Humphrey, Mr. L. W.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Royal commission
Interim report, 2167
Recommendations, 2394
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 4734

Hungary, immigration from, 1094

Hunter, Mr. J. B. *See* Public Works Department

Husband's Brother, Marriage with. *See* Deceased, Marriage

Huskisson, William, tariff reduction in Great Britain, 3050

Hydro Electric Power. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Beck, Sir Adam, Morrisburg dam, 1270
Development in Ontario, 1270
Electric railways, 2475
Municipalities, 2475
Pointe Fortune, qu. 1974
Power exported to the United States, 1266
Quebec and New England Hydro Company, qu. 1974
Whitney, Sir James, 1266

Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 3782
Public ownership, 3056
Radial railways, 2476
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324

Hydrographic Survey. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Ice and Icebreakers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries; Vessels
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Cabot strait, obstruction in, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3354

Iceland, immigration from, 1096

Illicit Liquor Traffic. *See* Liquor

Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Immigration, 2784, 3060, 3066. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Labour, Unemployment; Naturalization
Advertising, 43, 81, 1084, 1085, 1103, 1180, 1218, 1318, 1873

Immigration—*Con.*
Agents
Appointment of, 1188
Biden, Miss, 1099
Bowder, Mr. W. R., representation of New Brunswick in Great Britain, 1086, 1198
European, 1876
Gardiner, Mr., 1099
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085, 1135, 1243
May, Mr., 2663
Murphy, Mr. representative in Scotland, 1095, 1879
Pattullo, Mr., 1096
Railways acting as, 1191
Agriculturists of, 37-38, 1881. *See also under this title,* Farmers
Alien enemies, restriction of, 1128, 2428, 2667
Alleged campaign against, 332
Appointments, 3252. *See also under this title,* Agents
Army officers, 1432
Artisans, shopkeepers, town dwellers, 1204
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental
Assimilation, 1346
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Assisted passages, 1096, 1132
Great Britain, from, 1100
Immigrants family or friends, advance, 1100
Loans for passages, 1475-8
Banks and, 4042. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Barnado Boys' home, 1099, 1470
Beatty, Mr. E. W. and, 1337-8
Belgium from, 1096, 1173
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister, visit to England, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Boundary inspection, 1875
Bracken, Premier, statement, 1123
British, 20, 43, 1084, 1105, 1218, 1339, 1346, 2929
Preference for Australia and New Zealand, 2932
British Columbia into, 1096, 1112, 2942
Co-operation with, 1097
Oriental, 1217. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Buildings
Halifax, 4612
St. John, 1457, 1464
"Canada an immigration sieve," 628, 647
Canada Colonization Association, 51, 71, 1089, 1118, 1133, 1175, 1178, 1180, 1191, 1208, 1215, 1237, 1240, 1315, 1352, 1357, 1396, 1391, 1399, 1425, 1428, 1437, 1439, 1479, 3637

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Advances, qu. 517, 1479
Advertising, 1318
Agreement, 1879, 3036
Signing of, 1976
Terms, 1102
Amery, Colonel, 1328
Brown, Mr. M. A., 1102-3, 1172, 1328
Letters from Messrs. Meighen and Forke, 1333
Budget expenses, 1877
Calder, Hon. Senator, voluntary colonizing agency, 1333
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, contribution, 1164
Canadian National Railways, 3324
Canadian Pacific Railway, and, 3324
Commission, 1877
Community clubs, 1183
Crawford and Kurdydyk, Messrs., letters, 1396
Creelman, Mr. George, manager, eastern Canada, 1172
Dennis, Col. J. S., statement of, 1324
Everett, Mr. Edward, manager, 1092, 1103, 1172
Forke, Mr. Robert, director, 1407
Letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Statement by, 1105
Grant, 1877
Hebridean immigrants, 3585
History of organization, 1102
Imperial government, financial support, 1429
Land, sales of, 1316, 1431, 1877
Commission of ten per cent, 1102
Interest rate, 1877
Selection and purchase, 1091
Luse Land Company, 1103
McRae, General, 1324
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Minister's statement, 1320
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Officers and directors, 1327
Proposals, memo of, 1877
Published statement of objects, 1180
Railway contributions, 3400, 3633
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Salvation army, 1093
Soldier Settlement supervisors, services of, 1090, 1877
Speculation in unimproved land, 1118
Subscriptions, 1877
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1172, 1182, 1323, 1328, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Willison, Sir John—*Con.*
Letter to directors, 1431
Retirement from presidency, 1164, 1332, 1431
Telegram, 1325, 1331
Withdrawal of financial support, 1208
Canadian born, 3032
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876
Central, southern and eastern European, 1346, 1883
Child, 1099, 1227, 1243, 1342, 1469, 1472, 1475
Agencies, grants to, 1469, 1470
Barnardo, Dr., 1099, 1470
Bilbrough-Wallace, Mrs., 1470
Cardinal Manning, 1470
Catholic Emigration Association, 1470
Cossar, Dr. George C., 1471
Inspection, 1874
Marchmont Homes, 1470
Middlemore, Sir J. T., 1470
National Children's home and orphanage, 1470
Oriental, 1445. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Quarrier, Mr. William, 1470
Rye, Miss 1470
Salvation army, 1470
Smart, Mr. Bogue, 1469
Statistics as to 1470
Chinese. *See under this title,* Oriental
Colonization, 1178, 1333
Eastern provinces, 1134
Societies, 1876
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Competition and, 1418, 1426
Conference with railway and shipping companies, 1193
Conservative administration under, 1335-6
Co-ordination of activities, 2800
Co-operation, 1255
Cost of, 1439
Crerar, Hon. T. A., statement, 1123
"Dangerous agitators from British Isles", 3033
Denmark, from, 1096
Department. *See* Immigration and Colonization
Deportation, 1875
British soldier, alleged inhuman treatment, 2254
Deserters from ships, 2435
Discrimination between native-born and immigrant, 2732
Distribution of, 1198

Immigration—*Con.*
Domestic servants, 1099, 1115, 1166, 1189, 1200, 1243, 1474, 1475-6, 1477, 1876
Doukhobors, 1176
Settlement and migration, 1340
Drift to cities, 1165-1171, 1342
Economic conditions and, 1231
Emigration, *See that title*
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 1096, 1111, 1120, 1127, 1132, 1175, 1205, 1237, 1328, 1480
Canada's non-co-operation, 1096
Canada's participation, 667
Grant
Agreement, 1461, 1464, 1469
Division of, 1475
European, 1085, 1094, 1170, 1340, 1346, 2748
Agencies, 1876
Assimilation of, 2749
Northern European, 1227, 1249
Southeastern European, 1195
Exhibitions, 1454
Expenditure, 1908, 2969
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Total, 1208
Farm labourers, 1100, 1115, 1166, 1174, 1187, 1188, 1190, 1200, 1358, 1416, 1475
Farmers, of, 1115, 1188, 1189, 1421
Farmers' Advocate, 1186
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Follow-up policy, 1181
Foster homes for children. *See under this title,* Child
Fowler, Senator, statement by, 3032
France, 1173
German and Hungarian immigrants, 1094
Growth of West due to, 1881-2
Hebridean, 2950, 3037, 3252, 3584, 4706
Canada Colonization Association, 3585
Macdonnell, Rev. Father, 3585
Settlement in valley of Red Deer, 3252
Treatment of, M. (Mr. Speakman) to discuss etc., 3584, withdrawn, 3603
"Hidden Hand," the, 1167, 1193, 1201
Hindu, 498, 1120-8. *See also that title*
Franchise, 503, 4077, 4640, 4655
Iceland, from, 1096
Immigrant's struggle and success, 1216, 1399
Immigrants, rejected, qu. 706, qu. 1992
Imperial government, and, 1328
Increase of, 3055
Indian army officers, 1096
Intending immigrants to make application. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
International Labour Conference, 1631
Isle of Man, address by Mr. F. W. Kerr, 2949
Jacobs, Mr., speech at Winnipeg, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental
King, Mackenzie, Mr., speech at Stouffville, 1430
Labour. *See also that title*
Attitude of, 1167, 1176, 1186, 1193, 1196, 1241, 1337, 1892-3
Competition with, 2816
Employers and, 1193, 1194
Howat and Meyerscough, detention. *See* Howat; Labour
Restriction of, 1104
Land, 1091, 1102. *See also* Dominion Lands
Adjoining railways, 1893
For American immigrants, 1093, 1101
Sales, appraisal, 1316, 1431, 1877
Settlement, 2834
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156. *See also* Howat
Literature, 1097-8, 1226, 1239, 1389, 1414, 1428, 1433. *See also under this title* Advertising; Propaganda; Publicity
Misreprensentations, 1203
Lloyd, Bishop, reported statement, 1117, 2844
Loans for passages. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Overseas settlement board, 1469, 1481
Location of immigrants, 2834
London Times
Advertisement, South Africa, 1180
Statement of, 1124
Lougheed, Sir James, statement by, 3032
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 1204
Maritime provinces to, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236
Ignoring of, 2950
Mechanics from the Clyde, 1204
Medical inspection, 702, 1875
Mennonites, 1176, 1229, 1341, 1884
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1170
National Trust Company, statement of president, 1122
Naturalization, 2196. *See also that title*
Netherlands, 1095, 3591
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Nomination system, 1360, 1475-8
Non-English speaking immigrants, 1216
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Officers in Great Britain, 1879. *See also under this title* Agents
Ontario, into, 1096-98, 1428, 1475
Child immigration and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Northern, into, 1097, 1320
Oriental, 1117, 1247, 1307, 1346, 1443, 1900, 2941, 3037. *See also* Imperial Conference
Bill respecting, 4441

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Bishop of New Westminster, on, 504
Chinese, 499, 1443, 1448, 4641. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission, statistics, 1921-22, 1445
Assimilation, 2321
Children, 1445, 1452, 2484
Education of, 1896
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Estimates, 1443
Exclusion, 2313
Fingerprints, 502
Head tax, 1445
Evasion of, 2309
Indentured labour, 2330
Japanese and, 1117
Liberal platform of 1919, 1652
Merchants, 2309
Definition of, 2329
Students and, 1445, 2308, 2310
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2319
Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike, 2319
Registration, 502, 1445, 1447, 1452
Regulations, 1445
Religious organizations, representations from, 2310
Roosevelt, the late Theodore, statement, 2320
Sailors, 2333
Schools, 2326
Silverton, B.C., public meeting, res. 2338
Tong wars, 2337
Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1896
United States, 2313
Victoria retail merchants, 2316
Wives, 2484
Women, 2310, 2318
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1161
Estimates, 1441, 1443
Exclusion of, 2869
United States, from, 1194
Hindu, 498, 1120, 1128. *See also* Hindus, Franchise
Franchise, 503, 4077
Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa
Letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Visit to Canada, 4641
Japanese, 1450, 1894, 4641. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Birth rate, 1898
British Columbia, menace to, 1900
Canadian Japanese Association, pamphlet, 1894
Citizenship, 2442

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Japanese—*Con.*
Consul General at Ottawa, pamphlet, 1894
Correspondence with Mr. McQuarrie, 1894
Direct, 1448
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
"Gentlemen's agreement" 512. *See also under this title,* Lemieux agreement
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 859, 1448, 1451, 1454
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Lemieux agreement, 1894
Modification, 1447
Limitation of, 1449
Merchants, 1452
Nationality, 2443
Naturalization, 2442
Negotiations with Japanese government, 2328, 4441
North American Commission of American Legion, pamphlet, 1898
Petition of W. J. Bartlett and others, 2837, 4075
Irregular, Speaker's ruling, 2885
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Race equality, 1896
Restriction of emigration by Japanese government, 2328
Rights as British Subjects, 1899
Root-Takahjira "gentleman's agreement" 512
Supposed special privilege to land holders, 1450
Merchants, definition of, 1452. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Naturalization, 1453
Ormsby-Gore, Mr. W. G. on Canadian policy, 1111
Overcharging, Quebec, 3324
Overseas Settlement Board, 1099, 1469
Agreement, 1476. *See also under this title,* Empire Settlement Scheme
Passage. *See* Assisted Passages
Paternalism, 1133
Permission to intending immigrants. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Poland, 1204
Policy, 19, 29, 42, 1095, 1120-30, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1461, 2774, 2805, 2816, 2833, 2844, 2869, 2874, 2911, 2949, 3036
British dominions, 1882
Comment of London Times on, 1111
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 1177

Immigration—*Con.*
Population. *See also that title.*
Loss of, 3018
Not increased by, 1195
Prepaid passages, agreement with Imperial government, 2611. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1407. *See also* Prices
Printing, 1873
Private enterprise, 1414
Progressive members, attitude of, 2774
Propaganda, 1192, 1389. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Publicity
Embracing all Canada, 1098
Oriental, 1894-6-8
Prosperity and depression, 1177
Provinces
Co-operation of, 1085
Other than western, discrimination against, 1097
Provincial governments and, 1327
Publicity, 1873. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Propaganda
Advertisements, cost of, qu. 518
Committee, 1871
Special writers, 1874
"Public charge" 3155
Qualifications of immigrant, 1882
Quebec, into, 1104, 1198
Railways acting as agents, 1191
Recruiting, 2834
Repatriation, 1085, 1188, 1198, 1876, 2834
French Canadians in United States, 1462
Restriction of, 1169, 1174, 1186, 1233. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Orders in council, 1128
Russia, 1340, 2845
St. John immigration building, 1464, 1908
Agreement with C.P.R., 1458
Salvation army, 1093, 1430, 1876
Saskatchewan
Domestic servants, 1099
Mennonites, 1229
Scandinavia, 1216
Scotland from, 1095, 1876
Scottish Aid Society, 1876
Selection, 1098, 1108, 1219, 1254
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Settlements far removed from railways, 3431
Shaw, Lord, statement in Winnipeg, 2833
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Sifton, Sir Clifford
Importation fo British workmen, 1186
Policy, 1204, 1881-83

Immigration—*Con.*
Smart, Mr. Bogue, child immigration, 1469
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1255. *See also under this title,* Canada Colonization Association
Extension of system to immigrants, 1128
Supervisory agents, 1179
Speeches
Adverse effect of, 1423
"Blue ruin," 3037
Standards of living, 1127
Statistics, 3036, 3055
1881-1922, 1094
1914-1921, 1111
1920-22, 1105
Steamship companies, bonuses to, 1109, 1462
Stornoway immigrants, 3037. *See also under this title* Hebridean
Supplies, Quebec, 496
Alleged overcharging, 3324
Sweden and Holland, from, 1095, 3591
Switzerland, 3591
Tariff and, 1133. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation and, 1121, 1319, 2791. *See also* speeches on Budget
Thirty-two year payment plan, 1317
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1167 2795, 2844
Trade
Effect upon, 1122
Relations with oriental countries, 507
Ukrainians, 1341, 1396, 1883
Unemployment relief, 1679, 2730
Union Nationale Francais, 1877
United Farmers of Alberta, res. 81
United Farmers of Ontario, res. 1191
United States. *See also that title*
Agencies, 1875
From, 43, 1105, 1113, 1243
Unskilled labourers, 2822
Vancouver immigration sheds, 1896
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981. *See also* Japanese
Walker, Sir Edmund, 1343
War years, during, 20
Western Canada, 1086, 1347
Attitude of, 107, 1086-92, 1129
Western Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Canada Colonization
Women's immigration division, 1876

Immigration Act Amendment Bills. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
1. Permission to intending immigrants (Mr. Neill) 1r., 74; order for 2r. stands, 497, 857

Immigration Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
2. Alien enemies; fines, shipmasters reporting desertions (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1r., 2204; 2r., com., 2428; com., 2668; 3r., 2671; Senate amdts., 3981
Sections and subjects discussed
British subject, 2429
Canadian citizen, definition, 2429
Canadian domicile, 2429
Deportation, 2429, 3981
Conspirators, 2428
Without trial, 2433
Deposit as security for return of deserters, 2435
Discharging crew without examination, 2435
Enemy aliens, 2428, 2667
Repeal of 1919 legislation, 2428
Undesirable classes, 2428, 2668
Aliens, 2428, 2667
Assassination, 2669
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981

Immigration and Colonization department
Chief Controller, 2308
Chinese immigration, salaries, 1443
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Statement of expenditure, 1480
George, Little, deportation, qu. 3704
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Little, Mr. W. R., employment, qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Minister
Reported statement, Sir Henry Thornton, as to, 2795, 2844
Statement of, 1082
Outside service, salaries, 1082, 1106, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386
Quebec employees, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Transfers, qu. 3141
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) to reduce, 1441, neg. 1441
Staff transfers, qu. 2517
Travelling expenses of inspectors, 1874

Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638
Opportunity for, 3059, 3223, 3453, 4250

Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Agenda—*Con.*
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled, 1991
British North America Act, right to amend, 4660
Canada's status, 4664
Canadian autonomy, 4651
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4664
Commitments, 3059, 3223
Conferences of 1917 and 1921
Cattle embargo, 26
Smuts, General, 72
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4660, 4661
Discussion, forecast of, 3453. *See also under this title,* Agenda
Egyptian policy, 4662
Embargo on breeding cattle, 3291
Expenses of delegation, 4638
Foreign relations, 4659
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 508, 4077, 4640
Imperial Federation, 4661
Imperialism, 4655, 4656
Militarism, 4652
Naval Service, 4654
Policy, 3453
Preferential tariff, 4661. *See also* British Preference
Publicity, 4665
Purchasing power of money, 4666
Reparations, 4653
Report inadequate, 4662
Representation of Canada, 1686
Resolution of Mr. Mackenzie King in 1921, 1535
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, 3822
Treaty of Versailles, modification of, 4653
War, Canada's participation, 4655

Imperial Economic Conference, 4666
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638, 4666
Opportunity for, 3453, 4250
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled 1991
Expenses of delegation, 4638, 4666
Representation of Canada, 1686

Imperial Federation, British labour party and, 4651

Imperial Oil Company. *See also* Oil; Petroleum bounties
Gasoline, price of, 2547

Imperial Relations. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties

Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Imperial Veterans of Canada, petition, 4536

Imperialism. *See* Imperial Conference

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Importation of Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Customs and Excise

Imports and Exports, 2401. *See also* Agriculture; British Preference; Budget; Customs and Excise; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French, Italian
- Agricultural products, 445, 1390
- Balance of trade, 2922
- Beans, 2981
- Binder twine, 2965
- Coal, 1226. *See also* Coal
- Comparison of 1897 and 1923, 3060
- Direct. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty
- Exports
  - Agricultural machinery, qu. 814
  - Agricultural products, qu. 814
  - Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Canada's best customer, 1838
  - Cattle to United States, 1410, 2910
  - Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Electric power, 658. *See also that title*
  - Export trade, 1838
  - France to, 1977, 2213. *See also under* Treaties, French Treaty
  - Gold, 4249
  - Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
  - Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper
  - Potatoes, qu. 621. *See also that title*
  - Products of farm, sea and forest, 3061
  - Pulpwood. *See* Export Act Amdt.; Pulp and Paper
  - Settlers' effects, 20-21
  - Wheat 2774, 3062. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
    - Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
- Fishery products, 445
- France, 2210, 2230. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
- Grain, 2748. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
- Great Britain, 2928. *See also* British Preference
- Home markets, 2869
- Imports
  - Agricultural products, qu. 617, 1246, 2917, 2958
    - United States, from, 2708

Imports and Exports—*Con.*
- Imports—*Con.*
  - Animals and animal products, 445
  - Butter, 2821
  - Canned vegetables, 445
  - Coal, qu. 490, qu. 516, 2828. *See also that title*
  - Direct, 2898
  - Duty collected, 2838. *See also* Customs and Excise
  - Eggs from United States, 2708, 2821
  - Farm produce, 1426
  - France, from, 1977
  - Fresh and dried fruits, 445
  - Marking, 931
  - Panama canal, via, 1921
  - Potatoes, 2820
  - Raisins, qu. 2699
  - Sales tax on, 4409
  - Silks, 445
    - France, from, 2397. *See also* Treaties, French
  - Tobacco, qu. 1258
  - United States from, 2820. *See also that title*
- Increased, 2936, 3055
- United States, 2929. *See also that title*

Income Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. Bill (Chief occupation; interest on borrowed capital; deductions for expenses; incomes of consuls and consuls-general; penalty against employer; appeals; taxes; prior lien; indebtedness to taxpayer; distress in default of payment; pension exemptions). Res. 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4508
- Sections and subjects discussed:
  - Act to come into force, 4508
  - Certificate of default to be registered as judgment, 4506
  - Collection of tax from third party, 4506
  - Decision of minister, notice of dissatisfaction with, 4505
  - Income from chief occupation, 4504
  - Taxes to be a lien, 4505

Indebtedness. *See* Bank Act Amdt.; Budget; Finance; Loan; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons; Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Independent Commissions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

India
Automobiles, export to, 508
Canadian trade commissioner in, 1840
Grain production, 1840
Hindu franchise, 4077. *See also* Imperial Conference; Hindus
Immigration of army officers from, 1096

Indian Affairs department. *See this title under* Indians

Indians
Agents
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, 2151
Local, 2146
Perth, New Brunswick, 2154
Wootten, Mr., 2154
British Columbia, 2152, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2125, 2145
Education, 2164
Brandon, 2147
Edmonton school, 2149, 2164, 2165
Elkhorn school, 2147
Kamloops, 2146, 2152
Morley reserve, 2150
Oblate Fathers, 2145
Red Deer school, 2164
Residential schools, 2164
St. Albert school, 2149
Sarcee reserve boarding school, 2145
White Bear reserve, 2162
Farming, 2156
Fishing, grazing and wood permits, qu. 706
General, 2163
Great Slave lake and Mackenzie districts, 2145
Hospitals, medical attendance, 2145, 2160
Hunting grounds, 2146
Indian Affairs, department
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Live stock, 2162
Manitoba, 2145-7
Medical service, doctors, 2145, 2160
New Brunswick, 2124, 2153
North West territories, 2145-7
Nova Scotia, 2124, 4702
Ontario and Quebec, 2124 2146
Peguis, Saulteaux chief, monument, 4704
Potlatching, gaol sentence for, 2163
Preservation of, 2151-52
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Rations, 2148
Relief, 2125
Reserves, 2124
Blackfeet, 2148
Prices charged, qu. 3142

Indians—*Con.*
Reserves—*Con.*
Blood, 2159
Carleton, 2162
Caughnawaga, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
File Hills, 2145
Grain production on, 1139, 2156
Greater production, 2150, 2155, 2156, 2162
Highways passing through, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Moose Mountain, qu. 706
Muscowequan, 2156
Nipissing, 1307
Perth, N. B., 2154
St. Peter's, 2153
St. Pie, fencing, 2154
St. Regis, 2163
Sarcee, 2125, 2145
Six Nations, 1307, 2148
Tobique, timber cutting, 2154, 2155
Turtle Mountain, 3413
White Bear, 2162
Saskatchewan, 2145-7
Sioux, 2160
Round Plain band, 2162
Starving, 2125
Statement by minister, 2145
Titles, extinguishment of, 3398. *See* Dominion Lands Act bill
Tuberculosis, 2152
Western Canada, 2145

Indictable Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Indirect Taxation. *See* Taxation

Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Research

Industrial Councils, Joint. *See* Labour

Industrial Designs. *See* Trade Mark and Designs Act

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Application for boards; pending proceedings) 1r., 1361; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2063; Senate amdts., 4357, 4592
Sections and subjects discussed:
Industrial towns, 2889
Judges on conciliation boards, 4358

Industrial Problems, credit and. *See* Credits

Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Labour; Textiles; Trade
Agricultural prosperity and, 2962
Annual production, statement, 2720
Basic
Adequate protection 2822
Assistance to, 3238. *See also* Bounties
Wool-combing, qu. 1973. *See also* Wool
Bonused, 3072
Capital diverted from by income tax, 2914
Conservation of, 2820
Control of bank directors, 4022, 4023
Democracy in, 2727
Encouragement of, 2958
By artificial means, 3062
Farmers and, 2853
French treaty, effect on, *See* French Treaty
Indigenous, 2779, 2806
Industrial centralization, 2850
Industrial conditions, 636, 3002. *See also* speeches on Address, Budget
Industrial revolution, 2723
Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891
Closed town system, 2888
Industry and finance, 4053
Investigation of by tariff commission, 2955
Joint control of, 1654
Key, 2752
Labour costs, 2876
Lack of in western provinces, 4047
Manufactured products
Exports, 3061
Value of, 2934
Manufacturing
Costs, 1409, 2720
Labour organizations and, 1857
Overhead, 2928
Production and distribution, 3029
Establishment in West, 1405
New, assistance to, 2780
Prices of agricultural and industrial products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Primary, relief, 2718
Protected, 2798, 2957
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
St. Stephen, N.B., 2901
Salaries, average, 2720
Small industries, disappearance of, 2850
Tariff and, 3024
Wages, average, 2720
Watered stock, dividends on, 2956
Western Canada, 1889
Wood-working, 2806

Inflation and Deflation. *See* Finance; Money; Prices

Ingram, Mr., appointment. *See* Immigration

Inheritance Tax. *See* Taxation

Inland Revenue. *See also* Customs and Excise
Illicit stills, remission of fines, 2299
Postage stamps, used for, 3938. *See also* Post Office

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bills
1. Excise duties changed; cigarette duties
Res. 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4392; 3r., 4393
2. Certificate of analyst; deodorizing or clarifying denatured alcohol; home-grown tobacco
Res. 3749; 1r., 4131; 2r., com., 4207; 3r., 4208; Senate amendments, 4528
3. Certificate of analyst, etc., order discharged, 3969

Insect Pests, 595. *See also* Agriculture; Forests and Forestry
Alfalfa weevil, 596
Apple sucker, 596
Browntail moth, 596
Cereal rust, 595
Codling moth, 597
Cornborer, 595
Cut worms, 4632
Grasshoppers, 595, 3447
Gypsy moth, 596
Nursery stock, 596
Potato diseases, 595
Satin moth, 596
Spruce bud worm, 596
White pine blister, 595

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Insolvent Cases. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Inspection of Seeds. *See* Seeds

Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Institutionalism, excess of, 1214, 1400, 1890. *See also* Hoey; Immigration; Speakman

Insulin Treatment, discovery. *See* Banting, Dr.

Insurance. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Returned Soldiers
Agents, bank officials acting as, 4093, 4094
Bank loans, security, 4094
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Combinations, 2591
Fire, soldier settlers, 496
Grain cargoes, 3764, 4219, 4223
Hail, 2769, 4095, 4509
Hail Insurance Commission of Saskatchewan 2770

Insurance—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 2050
Insurance branch
Annuities, old age, 1697
Salaries and contingencies, 3987
Live Stock condemnation, qu. 1972, 2699. *See also* Live Stock
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., director, 2050
Mutual companies, 4095-7
Roof coverings, 4703
Soldier Settlement Board, Edmonton, 3506
Soldiers. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance bill

Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. Bill
(Duplication of returns; automobile insurance; correction of French version)
1r., 3045; 2r., com., 3147; com., 3977, 4357; 3r., 4357
Sections and subsections discussed:
Accidents to persons or property, 3978
Application, 3148
Automobile insurance:
Conditions of license for, 3147, 3977
No liability:
If driver under age limit or intoxicated, 3978
Unless stated in policy, 3978
Exceptions to insurability, 3148
French version amended, 3147
Misrepresentation, 3147
Returns of British or foreign unlicensed insurance, 3147

Intercolonial Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Intercontinental Transports Limited, ocean freight rates, 2127

Interest. *See* Banks; Credits; Finance; speeches on Budget

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Concurrence, 1482, 1538

Interim Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Interior, Department of. *See also* Geological Survey
Astrophysics
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, Victoria, 3242
Expenditure, 3243
Campbell, Mr. R. H., retirement, 3410
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, salary, 4667
Dominion observatories, 3242

Interior—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, 3406
Canadian National Parks and historic sites, 3938
Contingencies, 3408
Engraving maps, printing reports, 3443
Estimates, 1908, 3242, 3406, 4702
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3252
Grazing leases, Alberta, revenue, qu. 2515
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Mines branch, 2970
Officials, 1108
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Reclamation
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 3949
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, 3447
Topographical surveys, 3244
Water powers, surveys, investigations, 3420

Interlocking Directorates. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundaries
Survey and demarcation, 3246

International Court of Justice, 3994

International Fisheries Commission. *See* Fish and Fisheries

International Harvester Company, 4376

International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Wheat production, 2780

International Joint Commission. *See also* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Lake of the Woods water powers, 3425
Pollution of boundary waters, 700, 3362
St. Lawrence river waterway, aerial survey, 1776, 3762, 3427
Welland canal, 3762

International Labour Conference. *See* Labour

International Law, violation of. *See* Germany, Reparations

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, United States lines

International Postal Conference, 4529

International Questions, opportunity for discussion, 3993, 3998

International Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations; Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Interprovincial Trade. *See* Trade

Interstate Commerce Commission. *See* United States

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Liquor

Inventions. *See* Patents of Invention

Inverness pier, 4572

Investigations. *See* Combines Bill

Ireland
Proportional representation, 395
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Iron and Steel. *See also* Customs Tariff Items; Mines and Minerals
Bounties, 4371, 4381
British industrial development, 3847
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994
Freight rates, 1964
French treaty, 1985, 1988
Iron and steel scrap duty, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Iron ore and smelting industry, 3061
Ore-production and smelting, 3061
Rolled iron and steel
Hoops, bars, etc., duty, 3484
Milling cutters, for, 2653, 3484
Steel-workers strike, 287. *See also* Labour, Strikes
United States, production, 2751

Iron Ores. *See* Mines and Minerals

Irrigation. *See also* Dominion Lands, Reclamation
Alberta, 1436
Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
British Columbia, 457
Central Alberta irrigation scheme, 3428
Drought effect on grain production, 3429
Expenditure, 2969
Lethbridge irrigation district, 3429
Macleod irrigation district, 3429
Northern Saskatchewan, 3430
Surveys and inspections, 3428
United irrigation projects, Cardston, 3429
William Pearce irrigation project, 3430

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Mining rights of lease holders)
1r., 1992; 2r., com., 2138; 3r., 2204

Irvine, Mr. William (Calgary East)
Audibility of debate, 645
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4037, 4049, 4082, 4118
M. that chairman leave chair, 4125
Shareholders' audit, 4089
Bank mergers, 4137
Banking system, 634
Cadet services, 880
Calgary
Post office building, 1024
Unemployment relief, 1682
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3387, 3397
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3650, 3662
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Capital punishment bill, 180, 487
Opportunity for consideration, 1810
Children, mortality of, 1179
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction, 914
Examinations, 366
Credit and industry, M. 626, 645, 650
Criminal Code Amdt., capital punishment bill, 180, 487, 1810
Customs and excise seizures, qu. 620
Dredging, 1012
Duff, Mr., amendment to Address, 117
Economic conditions, cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Emigration to the United States, 1178
Employers' liablity compensation, 692
Farm homes, building loans, 1178
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 333
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1176, 1177
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3600
Policy, 1176-80
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706-7
Senate amendments, 4362
Interest rate, 4107, 4116
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Labour department
Capitalistic, 1674
Staff, reduction, 1672

Irvine, Mr. William—*Con.*
Labour
Representation in House, 3556
Right to organize, 2888
Lack of confidence vote, M., 208, 239-243
Land, taxation of, 1178
Lignite Utilization board, 387
Mail contractors, names, 3144
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment and qualifications, 3311, 3295
Redistribution, 3313
Two Ministers of Agriculture, 3313
Money, origin and function, 633
National gallery, 1020
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2688
Nova Scotia strike, troops employed, 495
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3555
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854, 4750
Postal appointments, 1801
Powell River Paper Company, 2888
Privilege—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 414
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1022
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679
Scientific and industrial research, qu. 731
Secession—reported statement of Hon. W. F. Roberts, 3145
Single tax, 1178
Soldier Settlement board, 1179
Steamship services, 3378, 3387, 3397
Unemployment, 628
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Relief, 690, 1679
Vetcraft shops, 695
Western conditions, cause of, 1890

Isenberg Leases. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Italian Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Italy
Senate, constitution of, 1372
Tariff. *See also* Treaties, Italian Treaty
Trade, 2395
Treaty with. *See* Treaties
Wool-combing, 2866

Ivel, Mr. W. M. *See* Redistribution

Jackson, Professor, price chart, 1403

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
American fishing schooner Siloam, capture, 2207

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Arsenals, Quebec and Lindsay, 2165
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4050, 4052, 4056
Point of order, 4055
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1515
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3086-3108 3211-21
Belle River harbour, 4596
Binder twine, duty, removal of, 4387
Board of Audit bill, 4357
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1160
Saturday sittings, 3452
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408 2413
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3832
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 4335
Paris offices, 4514
Canadian representative in United States, 3085
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr. Duncan Marshall, 2614
Civil Service Act. M. (Mr. Power) 547
Combines bill, 2628
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Registration of ownership) 615
Deputy minister of Immigration, 668
English and French-speaking people, 1341
Halibut fishery treaty, 1309
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 514, 4077, 4640
Immigration
Alleged campaign against, 332
Assimilation, 1117
Canada Colonization Association, 1164
President, 1092
Exodus to United States, 1165
Farm labour and domestic servants, 1165
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Labour, attitude towards, 1167
Medical inspection, 702
Policy, 1163-71
Restriction of, 1169
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 514, 2428-35
Legislation of 1919, 243-32
Ships' crews, 2435, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4640-4661
Indians
Caughnawaga reserves, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
Edmonton school, 2165

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4359, 4361
King George and race-track betting, 728
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement in North Essex, 670
Money, purchasing power of, 1167
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2189 2195, 2438, 2461
British system, 2438
Judical and executive authority, 2462
Limited naturalization, 2461
Nationality, dual, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2461
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 700
Printing, outside Bureau, cost of, qu. 3131
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 957
Railway Act Amdt. bill (return tickets) 615
Receipt tax, 4425
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
Sales tax
Book or account, 4434
Licensed manufacturer, 4421
Speech at Winnipeg, 1429
Standard of living, 1168
Thetford Mines strike, 2207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Unemployment, 1168

James Bay Railway, 1036, 1049, 1402
Coal, transportation of, 1073

Japan
Bean-growing industry, 2982
British-Japanese relations, 2470
Canadian naturalization, 2442, 2461, 2467
Competition from, 2861
Expatriation from, 2443
French treaty, 3035
Immigration. *See also that title*
Restriction by Japanese government, 2328
Imports and exports, 1978, 2255
Japanese consul general
Immigration, 1447, 1894
Pamphlet, 2443
Japanese fishermen, 4484. *See also* British Columbia
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Military service, 2443
Mizusawa, Mr. Kosaku, alleged intervview, 1899
Nationality, 2442
Negotiations with, 4441
Rights of foreigners in, 1895
Silks, 2397
Trade concessions to. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Japan—*Con.*
Trade with, 2214, 2234. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Trade treaty with, 1449, 2399
Wool-combing, 2866

Japanese. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration

Japanese Fisheries Association, 1453

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Accredited herds, 586
Agricultural credit system, 1438
Alberta
Grain production, 1435
Irrigation, 1436
Live stock, 1435
Southern, conditions in, 1435
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4113
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3438
Cost of living, burdensome to farmers, 1437
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Freight rates, equalization of, 1437
Grain dockage and screenings, 786
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1437
Policy, 1435
Interest rate, 4113
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3429
Lethbridge elevator, 4716
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Oil prospecting and development, 780
Petroleum bounties, 780
Public buildings, rents, 1025
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 927
Timber wolves, 597
Tourist traffic, Southern Alberta, 3438

Jobbers
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Joggins, N. S., breakwater, 943

Johansen, Mr. F., assistant zoologist, 3360

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moose Jaw)
Certificate of registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Sales tax collections, qu. 285
Status of, inquiry, 202

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Agriculture, weed menace, 1887
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4097
British preference
Increase in, 2243
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2777

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred—*Con.*
Business of the House
Amdt. right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Private members' day, 1159
Rules, amendment of, M. for special com. 856, 1299, 1300, 1306-7
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4307
Grand Trunk, gratuities to directors and officials, 1666
Civil Service Act, special committee, names, 2417
Crowsnest pass agreement, statement that Progressives had forced concession, 2855
Dunblane-Aylesbury branch line, 4308
French treaty bill, 2242
Income tax, revenue, 3027
McMaster, Mr., statement of position, 3030
Nova Scotia secession resolution, 2243
Reciprocity with United States, 2243
Redistribution, 4740
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee report, 4740
Royal commission on lake rates, report, printing, 2927
Rules, M. for committee, 856, 1299, 1306-7
Seed grain advances, 3447
War claims, 2495
Waterous-Swift Current branch line, 4308
Wheat Board
Legislation, request to extend, 2927
Proceeding under Act of 1922, 1636
Yorkton-Willowbrook branch line, 4308

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Joint Peat Committee. *See* Fuel

Jolly Roger, the, 2787

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
St. John river wharves, qu. 1488
St. Margaret's bay road, qu. 3135
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Joynson-Hicks, Sir William, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill; Judges Act Amdt. bill; Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Admiralty. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.
Appointments, 3349
County court, naturalization certificates. *See* Naturalization
Industrial disputes conciliation boards, 4358
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Naturalization. *See that title*

Judges—*Con.*
Ontario and Quebec courts. *See* Judges Act
Pensions, qu. 492, 1154
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029, 1154
Political commissions, 3604
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Salaries
Pensions and, 1154. *See also* Judges Act
Total payments, qu. 491
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868
York county, 3607

Judges Act Amdt. Bill
(Salaries; Circuit Court judges)
Res. 3264, 3452, 3603; 1r., 3608; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610
Sections and subjects discussed:
Additional $1,000 to judge of Circuit Court, 3610
Arbitrators or assessors under Railway or public act, 3609
Judges, Supreme Court of Ontario, 3609

Judique, N.S. wharf, 943

Jugo-Slavia, Italian treaty and, 2396

Jurisdiction. *See also* British North America Act; Labour, Unemployment; Lake of the Woods; Provincial Rights
Bankruptcy Act, 3095
Combines. *See that title*
Disallowance of provincial statutes
British Columbia, Chinese immigration, 1161, 1261, 1453
Nova Scotia, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Drainage, 3256
Education, 882, 1884
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1646
Labour, 1442, 1646, 1650, 1618, 2894
Lake freight rates, 4227-31
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Unemployment, 1657, 1678
Water powers, 3421

Jurors, not British subjects. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Jury. *See* Grand Jury

Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Capital punishment, 768. *See also* Criminal Code
Department
Correspondence—Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2299
Employees, number and cost, 2970

Justice—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Deputy minister
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' case, 2521
Salary, 4671
Estimates, 705, 768, 4667
International Labour Conference, 1442
Salaries and contingencies, 780, 4667
Solicitor General, retirement of, 1763, 1764, 1810, 2710
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Executive clemency, correspondence, 1975
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Minister of, absence, 4514
Parole, release on, 1975
Pecuniary claims convention, 780
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Dorchester, qu. 494, 770
Earnings of inmates, 772
Nationality of inmates, 772
Prince Albert, Brenner, Meyer, release, 1975
Stony Mountain, 771
Trial of Eskimos charged with murder, Herschel Island, 4674

Kahn, Mr. Otto H., Elements of Success, 1399

Kamloops
Indian school, 2146
Public building, 1006

Kay, Mr. W. F. (Missisquoi)
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
Carroll, Mr., and, 3268
Oleomargarine, 3268
Reports
First, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock bill, 1441
Baker Memorial Com. report, 1256, 1991
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 4669
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4669
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4541
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3519
Amdt. 3520
Privilege—Mr. Carroll, 3268

Kay, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome, 4012

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Address in reply, 106. Condition of country; inauguration of industrial epoch, 106; farmers in the West and immigration policy, 107; duty of government to see fair play, 108
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027, 4099-4103, 4133, 4139
Mortgages and hypothecs amdt. 4099 withdrawn, 4133
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
British preference and Canadian ports, 2678
Budget, 2809; commendation of Minister of Finance; tariff stability; interpretation of term; speech of Minister of Agriculture; allegation of bad farming; amendment; British preference; comparative statement of rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809; speech of Minister of the Interior; Progressive party, assumption of power by; capitalistic interests and political parties; inheritance tax; reciprocity with the United States, 2810; agriculture, conditions of; budget; business and financial depression; "calamity howlers"; unsatisfactory conditions in West, 2811; disappointing record of Liberal party; no difference between Liberal and Conservative parties; invisible government; financial control; selfishness of those controlling destinies; prices and the tariff; interest rate; freight rates; charges of professional men; purchasing power, reduction of; conditions in the West; allegation of bad farming and extravagance, 2812; professional men, charges and standards of living, earnings of farmers; ridicule and intimidation of the West, 2813; government out of sympathy with people; Progressive party, predicament of; attention to demands of West, 2814
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National railways, wage reductions, qu. 1363
Copper bounties, 3239
Crude petroleum duty, 3481
Dental instruments, raw materials, 3484
Deputy ministers, retirement, qu. 3135
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4364, 4368

Kellner, Mr. Donald F.—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3252
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Dredging, Plamondon, Alberta, 1013
Farming at a profit, 81
Field supervisors, soldier settlement, 1090
Free trade and protection, 2923
Grand Trunk arbitration, commissioners, qu. 624
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3595
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1352
Personnel, 1092
Policy, 1348
Wealth and, 1122
Inland revenue officers, salaries, qu. 3892
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Live stock, tuberculin test, qu. 1972
Merchants bank inquiry, 3990
Solder settlement, 2024, 2027
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Western provinces, conditions in, 1349

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Bacon imports and exports, 938
Business of the House, 1386
Canadian air force, forest patrol, 1778
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship service, 2172
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, construction of, 1185
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Lifting of steel, 1664
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (scrip frauds) 730
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3430
Grain Act, litigation, 2045
Grain shipments, facilities for, 730
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Health department, salaries, 2170
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1180
Statement of objects, 1180
Supervision, 1092
Community clubs, 1183
Immigrants, standard of living, 1127
National land settlement plan, 1181
Policy, 1180, 1401
Indians, 2148
Labour Gazette, 1624
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Mackenzie river district, half breed claims, 3444
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speeches in Great Britain, 3595
Peace river district
Railway surveys, 4701

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M.—*Con.*
Settlement in, 1184
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Purchasing Commission, 1385
Railway Act Amdt. bill, (Equalization of rates) 730
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833, 1834
Scrip frauds, 730
Soldier settlement, 2028
Steamship services, 2172
Northern Alberta, 2176
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Water powers, investigation, 3426

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Agricultural conditions, 1843
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 376
Dairy Industry Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, renovated butter, 4510
Dairying industry, 1843
Exhibitions, 1454
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4620
Health department, salaries, 2170
Indian Affairs department, salaries, 2166
Labour department, employment officers. 1674
Military hospitals, 677
Pensioners, medical examination, 677
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3288
St. Lawrence river islands, St. Regis reserve, 2163
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Kennedy, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C.
Belle River harbour, 4597
References to, 4, 6, 8, 10, 54, 108
Letter of thanks for sympathy from Mrs. Kennedy, 281

Keynes, Mr. John M., on war, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations
Economic Consequences of the Peace, 2724

Kincardine, Ont., pier, 982

King, His Majesty the, race-track betting, 728

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Armouries, fittings, etc., 1024, 2413
Bamfield public building, 1024
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1556

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Calgary post office, 1024
Calumet-Bryson bridge, 1014
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 536
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Dominion roads and bridges, 1014
Dredging
Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1012
Expenditure, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009
Nanaimo harbour, 1014
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Shuswap lake, 1014
Victoria harbour, 1014
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583, 3979
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
Fraser river improvements, 1006
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Graving docks, 2682
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers, 2671
British Columbia, 1002
Stanley park foreshore, 1008
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Manitoba, 993
New Brunswick, 945
Grand Manan, 945
Wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675
Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012
Quebec, 950
Grondines wharf, 959
Matane, 970
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hydro Electric commission, St. Lawrence development, 2682
Lake Manitoba flooding, 1000
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Laurier monument, 1017
Law, the late Bowan B., tablet to memory, 1020
L'Islet wharf, 970
Matapedia birdge, 1014
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
Moose Jaw public building, 1023
National Gallery, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Okanagan lake wharves, repairs, 1008

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Parliament buildings, 1716
Acoustics, 1721
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723
Stone carving, 1720
Tower, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Port Burwell harbour dredging, 983, 1012
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Member for, 2681
Sewerage outlet, 994, 998
Printing bureau
Improvements, 1022
New building, 1732, 1738
Public Works
Engineering branch, 1017
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 2571
Patronage, 945
Public buildings, 2690
Dominion archives building, 1730
Economy, renting or building, 1735
Local improvement taxes, 1023
Maritime provinces, 1022
New departmental, 1729
Ottawa, Daly building, 1023
Ottawa Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also under this title,* Parliament buildings
Power, 1025
Printing bureau new building, 1730
Rents, 1025
Salaries, 2684
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 950, 955
Quebec, Champlain dock, 2675
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1954
St. John harbour improvements, 2676
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., appreciation of, 1006
Selkirk, repair slip, 1000
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Swift Current public building, 1023
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682
Toronto harbour improvements, 985, 1011, 2678
Toronto island protection breakwter, 984
Vancouver harbour bill, 267
Vancouver island telegraph lines, 1017
Victoria and Nanaimo harbours, dredging, 1014

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Victoria
Dry dock, 1002
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Wharves
Revenue, 975, 977
Transfer to Dominion government, 946

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2908. Felicitations to Finance Minister; tariff; automobiles; Henry Ford greatest customs collector in Canada; tariff "purely and simply protective"; Liberal platform of 1896; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on tariff reduction and Senate reform; Liberal party repeating tactics following election of 1896; influences preventing government from carrying out pledges; Progressive party, withdrawals from; capital levy; reciprocity; new sources of revenue; luxuries; inheritance tax, 2909; reciprocity with United States; advantages of enlarged trade; diversity of products; treaty of 1854; abrogation of and its results; reciprocity in natural and manufactured products; manufacturing opportunities in Ontario and Quebec, 2910; President, Massey-Harris Company "ready for free trade"; duties under reciprocity agreement of 1911; members elected to support reciprocity; President Harding and world peace; Washington disarmament conference; trade rivalry cause of war; population greatest need of Canada; five million Canadians in United States; immigration; Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply, 27. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 27; criticisms of Speech from Throne by Mr. Meighen; co-ordination of National railways, 28; government's immigration policy, 29; national resources of western provinces, 29; Near East Crisis, explanation of circumstances, 29-33; communications from British government, 30; delay in receiving despatches, 31-32

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions Com. report, 2181
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annuities branch, transfer, 1641
Australia, trade treaty, 245
Banff national park, power privileges, 3750
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4437, 4676
Bell, Major Graham A., salary, 4557
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M. P., 4
Board of Audit Act, 4249
Bolton speech, 2974
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Empire exhibition, 3950
British mails, delay in, 2639
Budget, 3046. Speech of leader of Opposition; attack on Liberal party; fidelity to pledges and principles; Liberal platform of 1919; presentation of "chart"; statement to convention after adoption of platform; resolution presented by opposition in 1921; appeal to the country; campaign speeches, 3047; position on tariff put plainly before people; Liberal platform carried out; the budget, charge that it is protectionist; tariff reductions; British preference; preference of 50 per cent and over, 3048; reciprocity, sugar duties, reduction; no increase in taxation; substantial tariff revision downwards; commercial treaties with France and Italy; Combines Act, 3049; free trade; speech of Mr. McMaster; theoretical study and concrete application; capital, attraction of; tariff walls going higher and higher; world conditions; free trade in Great Britain; slow progress of movement after its inception; industrial revolution; gradual elimination of tariff duties; reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and France, 3050; attitude of Progressive party and Mr. McMaster; leaders in British free trade movement; problems and difficulties in connection with the tariff; amendment, 3051; stability does not mean finality; United States tariff; European situation; British preference, increase of, 3052; cattle embargo, removal of; development of Canadian railways and ports; trade to Pacific ports by Panama canal; trade relations with the United States; Canada seeking new markets; tariff and economic warfare; declara-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tion of Genoa Conference; endorsement by Assembly of the League of Nations, 3054; economic conditions; statistics indicating revival; building operations; imports and exports; bank clearings; savings deposits; immigration; employment, 3055
Speech on, reference to, 3056, 3068
Statements omitted from, 2898
Business of the House, 179, 199, 250
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Early, 74
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven p.m., 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
Twelve midnight, 4672
Capital punishment bill, proceeding, 487, 1810
Economy of time, 382
Estimates, presentation, 4556, 4598, 4603
Facilitating of, 1836, 4736
Legislation pending, 2518, 3265
Announcement, 3452
M. that Com. rise to report progress, 1836
M. (Mr. Carroll) on oleomargarine, special order, 3270
Private members' day, 1158, 1160-62
Progress of, 2469
Prorogation, 4736
Facilitation of, 4732
Questions as orders for returns, 1385
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com., 1305
Select standing committee, personnel, 3, 202, 435, 486, 811, 1483, 2047
Sittings
Morning, 4132, 4249
Not later than midnight, 4579
Saturday, 2694, 3453, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1305
Concurrence, 4735
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. 4440
Campaign of 1921, speeches, 3047
Canada, constitutional development, 4474
Canada Temperance Act, correspondence, 1308
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, 3705

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Amalgamation, 34
Order in council tabled, 53
Branch lines construction bill, 4400
Rejection by Senate, 4754
Directors, board of
Additional director from Quebec, 34
Labour representation, 1652
Grand Trunk
Gratuities, royal commission, Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2347
Shareholders' representations, 3960
Grand Trunk Pacific debenture holders, 3507
Management, responsibility and powers, 3673, 3677
Paris offices, 3673
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3954, 3959
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4727
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4001
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Capital punishment bill, 487, 1810
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Cattle embargo removal, correspondence, 4133
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
China, trade relations with, 2313
Chinese immigration bill, 2312-33
Evasions, 2315
Exclusion, 2313
Head tax, 2312
International relations, 2312
Labour competition, 2312
Restriction of immigration, 2312
Students, 2313
Christie, Mr. Loring resignation, 3988
Civil Service
Bonus 1811
Commission, appointments, 371
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Political partisanship, 286
Superannuation, 4593
Work outside regular duties 1675
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 349, 358, 362, 374, 377, 522, 536, 545, 552, 559, 568
Special committee, 936
Appointment, 986
Change in membership, 2417
Coal, cost of, 1813
Combines bill, 254, 496, 938, 987, 2519, 2602, 2615-38, 2659-68, 2701

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Combines bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed, 2520
Civil Service Act, appointments, 2661
Commissioners, appointment and remuneration, 2627
Definition "combine" 2615, 2666
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar
Appointment, 2628
Inquiry, 2618
Senate amendments, 3505
Statement of provisions, 987, 2520
Technicalities, 2665
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605
Cost of living, reference to, 1812-13
Crowsnest pass agreement, extension, 2741. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs duties on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
M. (Mr. Motherwell) for discharge of order, 3449
Daylight saving, 2612
Debates, official report of
Pages said to be missing, 888, 889, 1082
Revised edition, enquiry, 122
Deceased members, tribute to, 4
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4557
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2384, 2386
Disarmament, Great Lakes, correspondence, 244, 494, 1307
Dominion Elections Act, amdt. 1027
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Election of 1921, speeches, 3047
Estimates, time of presentation, 4556, 4598,
Comparison with previous government, 4603
External Affairs, department, salaries, 3987
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Finance Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 4249
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1962
Suspension of, 1949
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark), 1285, 1490, 1962
Legislation to be introduced, 3265
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1284

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 336
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Grain shipping rates, information, 2517. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Royal commission to inquire into, 1211
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695, 3272
Grant, Dr., civil service, 560
Halibut fishery treaty, 4437, 4474, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Correspondence tabled, 1256
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Ratification by His Majesty, 1309
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1694
Hector celebration, 4706
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Hindu franchise, 4077, 4665
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 4442
House of Commons staff, organization, 4592
Housing, legislation, 2518
Hudson Bay railway, Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement, 1686
Immigration. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1330
Attitude of Conservative and Progressive parties, 1333
Forke, Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Reorganization, inquiry, 3324
Willison, Sir John, telegram, 1331
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Bill respecting (Mr. Neill) 4441
Exclusion, possible results, 1453
Japanese
Japanese stowaways on freighter, 1448
Lemieux agreement, 1447
Negotiations with Japanese govt. 2328, 4441
M. for return, 1261
Policy, 1330
Immigration Act Amdt. bills
Undesirable classes, 2669, 4441
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 3453, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4661
Forecast of discussion, 3453
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4665
Preferential tariff, 4661

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4440
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 2063, 4361
Illicit liquor traffic, 2208
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3978
Internal Economy commission, 3
International Labour Conference
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1647
Italian Treaty bill, 2437, 2701
Japan
Immigration from. *See under this title,* Immigration
Secret agreement, 1448
Trade with, 1449, 2313
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 5
King's birthday, observance of, 3323
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1669
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour
Estimates, 1643
Right to organize, 2895
Strikes correspondence, 816
Lack of confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 213 216, 226
Lafortune the late Mr. D. A. M.P., 4
Lake freight rates, commission, 247
Legislation arising out of report, 3507
Lake of the Woods
Control, 247
Control board expenses, 4001
Levels 247
Lausanne conference, 54
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Legislation, Senate salaries, 3949
Liberal convention of 1919, 2994, 3047
Labour resolution, 1652
Liberal platform, speech of June 1, 1920, 2994
Library of Parliament, 202
Joint committee, 516
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture by Chinese bandits, 2695
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
McDougall, Mrs. William, pension, 3949
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.,
Appointment to Bench, 1810
Retirement, 2392

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Militia and Defence disbursements, 344
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways and Canals
Appointment, 519, 1081
Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
Mines and minerals com. report, 4743
Montreal harbour commission bill, 3463
Moose Jaw by-election, 2295
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Near East crisis, 29-33
Correspondence, 45
Newspaper combines, 2524
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 1309, 2519
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3326, 3524
Precedence, 3451
Special order, 3270
Orders in council, government by, 1652, 1655
Orient, trade relations with, 2313
Pan-American union, 496
Paris agency, 4001
Parliamentary government, 1652
Passports, issuing of, 3988, 4708
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744
Pension board, resolution for removal, 3400
Pensions, old age
Legislation, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res. 1651
Mothers, and, conference with provinces, 3046
Petition of right, fiats, 3146
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1315, 1538
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 247
Prices, monopolies and, 2521
Printing Committee, 202
Private betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494
Private bills, consideration, 1836
Privilege, Mr. Carroll, 3270
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 417, 421
Single transferable vote, 1661, 2181
Public expenditure, 4556
Public Works
Estimates, 4557
Tenders, 4568
Publicity representative in London, 2984
Pulpwood, prohibition of export
Farmers and settlers, 4513
Royal commission, 4709
Purchasing commission, 3950, 4001
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Quebec, statutes of, 1660
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Redistribution bill, 250, 436
Special committee
Reference to, 488, 572
Report, 4742
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers unemployment relief, 1680
Returns, inquiry for, 3962
Roberts, J. H., imprisonment, 1660
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement on secession, 3145
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, hours, 4514
Rush-Bagot treaty negotiations, 2700
Russia, relations with, 3402
St. Lawrence river waterway, 204
United States, negotiations with, 3208, 4513
Saar valley commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Sales tax
Exemptions, 2998
Speech in 1921, 2997
Senate and House of Commons report, 2794
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4734
Senate, estimates, 2694
Sastri, Right Hon. Mr., letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Shipping combine, 4077
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207
Singapore naval base, 2470, 3822
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5
Stouffville, speech at, 1430
Supplementary estimates, presentation, 4558
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288, 1298
Toronto viaduct, 4441
Trade Mark and Designs Act Amdt. bill, 2063
Treaties
Newspaper reports, 245-6
Signing of, 4474
Triplets, bonus for, 3145
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., appointment to Bench, 1868
Unemployment relief
Conferences with provinces, 436
Expenditure, 1656
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1680
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
United States liquor laws, 4295
Vimy ridge memorial, 180
War
Commitments, 859
Glorification of, 2687
Wheat board
Extension of legislation, 2696, 2740
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

King's Birthday Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

King's Printer. *See* Printing Bureau

Kingston dry dock, 4563

Kitchener
Local improvement taxes, 1022
Manufacturers and United States markets, 2856

Kitsilano Reserve. *See* Indians

Klondike. *See* Yukon

Knitting Industry. *See* Textiles

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Agricultural conditions, special committee, 667
Canadian Air Force, 1750
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4319
Rejection by Senate, 4753
Fixed charges, qu. 814
Cheque tax, 3934
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4254
Drainage areas, 3259
Harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4680, 4685
M. for consideration of Senate report, 1032, 1079
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Route, investigation by air service, 1750
Statement as to cost, correction, 2296
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Welland canal and, 3779
Indians, 2162
Duck lake school, 2159
Lake Grain rates bill, 4226
Melfort branch line railway, 4319
Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
National Defence, ammunition, 1741
National monument, Connaught place, 2686
Order paper, absence of, 4744
Paddockwood branch line railway, 4319
Paris agency, 4001
Penitentiaries, 770, 773
Port Nelson dredging, 1012
Public buildings, rents, 1025
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions, 776
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2028

Knox, Mr. Andrew—*Con.*
Steamship services, 4003, 4004
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Waterhen lakes drainage, qu. 4303
Welland canal construction, 3779

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Arrangement between Whips as to adjournment, 53
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317, 4319
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4574
Hudson Bay railway, 1062
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse claim, 4574, 4725
St. Peter's-Louisburg branch line, 4319
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Wrecks, removal of, 3332

Labarre, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3138

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Returned Soldiers
Advertisements, 287
Asiatic competition, 2485. *See also* Immigration
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4016, 4041
British Columbia, conditions in, 1125
British National Labour party
Capital levy, 2722
Policy, 2721
Building trades. *See also* Building
Drift to United States, 1129, 1812
Canadian National Railways. *See also that title*
Directors, representation of, 1652-6, 3636
Labour costs, 1561
Capital and, 2744, 4026. *See also* Capital and Labour
Canadian Pacific railway shopmen, 3338
Cheap, 1118
Chinese, 2310, 2316, 2330. *See also* Immigration
Civil Service. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Special committee, representation on, 937
Coal miners from Belgium, 1177
Combines bill, trades unions not affected, 2666
Competition, 1287, 1418, 2485
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conferences, 1443, 1678
Conventions, 1645, 1652
Copper bounty and, 3031
Cost of living. *See that title*
Costs, 1561, 2748, 2876

Labour—*Con.*
Delegates from United States, detention, *See* Howat
Demand for, 1248
Department
Actuaries, 1677
Annuities branch, 1672, 1682
Old age, administration, 1639
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Superintendent, 1677
Assistant deputy minister, 1671
Canada Gazette, printing, 1707
Capitalistic, 1674
Co-operation with provincial departments of labour, 1678
Deputy minister, 1675
Employees and cost, 2970
Estimates, 1621, 1668
Reduction in, 1638-43
Immigration and, 1170
Salaries and contingencies, 1657, 1668, 1694
Staff, dismissals and transfers, 1671, 2032
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Discontent, 1194
Dominion and provincial
Conference, 1442
Jurisdiction, 1442
Eight-hour day, 131, 207, qu. 279, 287, 1643
4,000. *See also under this title,* Hours
Jurisdiction, 1650
Moore, Mr. Tom., 1427
Emigration of. *See* Emigration to the United States
Employers and immigration, 1193, 1194
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Employment, 1124. *See also* Immigration and *under this title,* Unemployment
Index number, increase, 3055
Employment offices,
Co-ordination, 1643
Director of, 1672, 1676
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Provincial, 2169
St. John, 3453
Espionage, 1142-3
Factory and Shop Act, 1443
Farm, 37, 38, 1100, 1174,1416, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Agriculture; Immigration
Competition of protected industries, 2731
Wages, 1240, 1355
Winnipeg, in, 1976
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Opinion of Justice department, 1650
Financial Post, labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
Grand Trunk, employees' compensation, 1564

Labour—*Con.*
Hours, 1416, 1643, 1841. *See also under this title,* Eight-hour day
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 4514
Station agents, 132
Howat, Alexander, detention. *See* Howat
Immigration. *See also that title.*
Attitude on, 332, 1167, 1177, 1186, 1193, 1197, 1224, 1241, 1337, 1413, 1426, 1892-3, 2816
Restriction of, 1104
Trades and Labour Council, and, 1419
"Unseen Hand," the, 1201
Imperial federation, 4651
Industrial disputes. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, 1141
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1655, 1702, 1716. *See also that title*
Federal jurisdiction, 1646
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Granting of boards under, 287
Limited application, 1702
Industrial and "closed" towns, 2886-91
International Association of Machinists, res. 1338
International Federation of Trade Unions, 3158
International labour bureau, 3994, 4000
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1642
Carnegie, Colonel, 1648
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1647
Incomplete return, 1539
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., 1539, 1647
Recommendations and conventions, 1643, 1645
Tabled, 1441, 1631
Report of 1922 meeting, 1442
Representation, papers tabled, 1483
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1648
Statistics, 1631
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Labour bureaus, 1424
Labour Gazette, 1621
Correspondents, 1626
Cost of living, 1684, 1812
Michell, Professor, figures, 1700
Cost prices and freight rates, 1958
Editor, 1625, 1671
Federal Printing Company, 1621
Hooper, Mr. Roland, 1625
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1708, qu. 3131
Union label on, 1621
Labour members, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033

Labour—*Con.*
Labour party platform, 2728, 2815
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Liberal platform "plank" 1652
Lord's Day Act, federal jurisdiction, 1646
Macdonald, Mr. Ramsay, labour vote in Great Britain, 2722
May Day, 3158
Mechanics, qu. 203
Skilled, emigration to United States, 2790
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention at border. *See* Meyerscough; Howat
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Moore, Mr. Tom
Delegate to International Labour Conference, 1642
Immigration, 1167
Labour representative on Canadian National Railway Board, 1654, 3636
National Industrial Conference, 2890
Organization of, 50, 123, 2815
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Organizing power of, 1857
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Chinese Immigration bill
Penitentiaries, 772
Pensions, old age, 1646
Popular attitude towards work, 1189
Powell River Paper Company, 2886
Printing bureau. *See also that title*
Estimates, 1710
Professional agitators, 2943
Public works, 950, 956
Railway companies acting as agents, 1191
Railways, 126, 132, 1426, 3621
Renovated butter, 4251
Representation in House, 3033, 3555
Requirements in northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Right to organize, 2886, 2890, 2896
Bank employees, 4084, 4161
British constitution, 2894
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Contract between workingman and employer, 2894, 2896
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2894
Legislation, necessity for, 2896
Treaty of Versailles, 2889
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duty, seven-day week, 4514
Espionage, 1142
Industrial disputes, 1141
Royal commission on industrial relations, 2889
Short hours and high wages, 1416

Labour—*Con.*
Shortage
Lumber camps, Financial Post, statement of, 1125
Saturday Night, statement as to, 1125
Skilled labour, 1224
Strikes, 84, 123-125, 1628, 1702. *See also under this title,* Industrial Disputes
Advocates of, deportation, 2434
Agricultural labourers, Great Britain, 2822
Cape Breton. *See under this sub-title,* Nova Scotia
Conciliation, 2786
District 18, coal miners, 1629
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Lewis, Mr. John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Nova Scotia coal miners, 495, 815, 866, 1627, 1716, 3155
Board of Conciliation award, 1628
Correspondence, 914
Troops, use of, 861, 893
Nova Scotia steel workers, 287, 397, 1643, 1703, 1705
Rainbow shingle mills, Chinese workmen, 2319
Shipping and railway, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) for papers, 245, 495, 815
Thetford Mines, 2207
Troops, employment of, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627, 2893, 3072
United States coal miners, 1262, 2786
Technical Education
Administration of act, 1637
Director of, 1674
Trade unions, 2786
Combines bill, not affected by, 2666
Congress at the Hague, 46
Troubles, 123, 2893. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Unemployment, 50, 628, 1125, 1168, 1187, 1194, 1242, 1348, 1657, 2819, 3032. *See also* Immigration; Soldiers
Calgary post office, 629
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3828, 3843
Decrease of, 15
United States in, 2650
Employment offices. *See under this title,* Employment Offices
Great Britain in, 1205
Hoboes, origin of, 1194
Insurance, 1638
International Labour Conference, 1646
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, letter, 2719
Municipalities, statements as to, 41-43
Order in council No. 220, 435

Labour—*Con.*
Unemployment—*Con.*
Pensioners, 2168
Provision for qu. 732, 1657
Purchasing power, limitation, 2716, 2725
Relief, 1644, 2730, 3032
Calgary, 1679
Expenditure, 1655, 2969
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Federal assistance withdrawn, 1655-58, 1678
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 689
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Responsibility for, 1657
Seamen, 3379
Value of time lost, 1685
Vancouver, 1340
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085
Winnipeg, 435, 1124, 1215, 1416, 1883
United Mine-Workers of America, 3155
Delegates, detention at border, 2297. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Unorganized workers, 3534
Unskilled, employment for, 80
Wages, 1240. *See also* Cost of Living
Average, 2720
Bricklayers, $12 per day, 3017
Building trades, 2165, 3004
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363
Inflation, 1167
Inquiry by fair wage officers, 2982
Loss through strikes, 1628
Manufacturing, 2876
Miners, 3206
Railway, 2800, 2876, 3190, 3205
Reduction, 2800
Textile industry, 3467
United States, 1165, 1248, 2650
Urban and rural, 35-36, 1240, 1355
Wage slavery, 2727
Wage system, 2723
War labour policy, 2887
Welland canal, 3762
Whitley councils, 1654
Workingman, position of, 2982

Labour Party, 2728, 2815

Labrador

Boundary, Mr. James White, salary, 4667
Discovery of placer gold, 1995
Report, 2611
Labrador Goldfields, Limited, qu. 2696

La Chambre de Commerce, Montreal, Bankruptcy Act, 1492

Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 208; neg. on div. 243-4

Lacroix, Mr. Eugene, postmaster, Sayabec. *See* Post Office

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4105-24
Bank loans and deposits, 1133
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1506
British Columbia fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1541
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1213, qu. 2611, 2419
Chinese immigration bill, exclusion, 2482
Civil Service patronage, 368
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4270
Emigration to United States, 1085
Exhibitions, 1467
Forest destruction by fungi and insects, qu. 2178, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1007
Freight rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1967
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 316
Illicit still cases, remissions, 2299
Immigration
Assisted class, 1100
British Columbia, co-operation with, 1096 1097
Empire settlement scheme, 1096
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098
Oriental, 506
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 506
Indians, potlatching, 2163
Interest rate, 4105, 4108
Labour department, co-operation with provinces, 1678
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 221
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 734
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2795
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2117, 2122
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3550
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-69
Disability attributable to war service Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3717, 3736
Royal commission, recommendations, 2983
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664

Ladner, Mr. L. J.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 390, 393, 398, 432
Renovated butter, 4270
Returned soldiers, death from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 921
Scientific knowledge, contributions to, 1286-7
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Titles, honours and decorations, M., 1285, 1297
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Unemployment, provision for, 1657
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 261, 332

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Imperial Conference, 4653

La Flèche, Colonel. *See* Purchasing Commission

Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 4, 6, 8, 16
Letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281

Lake, Mr. R. S., Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Lake Freight Rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake Grain Rates Bill
Res. 3960, 4218; 1r., 4235; 2r., 4276; com., 4290; 3r., 4295
Sections and subjects discussed:
Canadian and American ports, 4218-4234
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 4223
Cargo space, 4219
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4219, 4222
Discussion, opportunity for, 4225
Insurance, brokers prohibited from writing, 4219, 4223
Interpretation, "board", 4291
Jurisdiction of parliament, 4227-31
Penalties, 4219
Rates, discrimination in, 4218, 4222
Power to fix minimum, 4218
Receiving and tabulating charges, 4294
Shipping combines, prosecution of, 4227
Tariff to be filed with Grain Commissioners 4219

Lake Grain Rates Commission. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake of the Woods. *See also* Water Powers
Control board
Expenses, 4001
M. for papers, 247

Lake of the Woods—*Con.*
Levels, 247, qu 2700
Water powers, 3421, 3425

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act 1921 Repeal Bill
1r., 2885-6; 2r., on div. 4163-80; com., 4181; 3r., 4185
Agreement with Ontario government, 2885

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 3354

Lamont Park, Buffalo reserve, 3941

Lanark, election, 157

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual training, 865
Imperial Conference, 4656
Imperialism, 4657
Indemnity of members, 4242
Labour Gazette, 1622
Military expenditure, 865
M. for reduction, 866
Naval service, 4657
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
War, Canada's participation in, 4656

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Natural Resources
Clearing by fire, 1185
Colonization of, 1178
Decrease in value, 2019
Dominion reversion of. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Homesteads, second. *See* Dominion Lands
Hudson Bay railway, sold for, qu. 283. *See also that title*
Patents, issue of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bill
Policy, 1344
Purchase price of, 1178
Railway, purchases or sales, 1739
Reclamation, 2969. *See also* Dominion Lands
Sales of. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization
Immigrants, to, 1431
Scrip frauds, 730
School lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Schools
Settlement, 43, 1893, 3060. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldier Settlement
National land settlement plan, 1182
Soldier settlement and, 2019. *See also that title*
Speculation in, 1119, 1395, 1887, 2955

Lands—*Con.*
Taxation, 1178, 1395. *See also that title*
Land values, 2745, 2778, 2803, 3016
Tax sales, 4062
Unimproved, 1118
Vacant, 1105, 1344

Landlord. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Language Questions. *See* French Language

Lanoraie wharf, 969

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Eastern Lands Company, 626
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 661
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Georgian bay elevators, qu. 620
Immigration policy, 1401
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Lumbering in Timiskaming district, 1402
New Ontario, agricultural conditions, 1401
Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307
St. Lawrence river waterway, 661

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Alaskan, wreck of, 1660, 3330
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084, 3365
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3820, 3974
Boots and shoes, free admission, 3500
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540, 1544, 1546
Salmon canning industry, licenses, 1544
Business of the House, adjournments to discuss, etc. 1540
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coastal regulations, suspension, 4276
Distressed seamen, 574, 3969, 4207
Masters and mates certificates, 2418, 2668, 3146, 3972
Pilotage, 3146
Registration of foreign ships, 3749, 3961, 3973
Canadian Arctic expedition, reports, 3360
Canadian National Railways, Mr. Talbot, 2004
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 538
Detroit river, regulation of traffic, 3358
Dredging, unification of work, 3341
False creek bridge, 3376

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Fisheries
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Publicity, 3364
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
White Mud river, fishway, 3363
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 4009, 4207
French Treaty bill, 2216, 2256, 2815
Bottles, 2218
Bronze powder, 2217
Butter, 2217
Cotton, 2218, 2263
Dairy products, 2217
Favoured nation, 2219
France
Balance of trade, 2221
Exports to, 2216
Friendly relations with, 2216
Line of attack, 2216
Luxuries, 2221
Sales tax, 2279
Silks, 2221, 2256
Treaty of 1907, 2222
Grain shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Halibut fishery treaty, 4132, 4440, 4459
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4461
Visit to Washington, 858
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Johnston, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231
McConica, Mr., congratulations upon return, 1660
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 3371
Marine and fisheries
Annual report, 1080
Committee, report, 3084
Distressed seamen, relief, 574, 3332, 3375, 3969, 4207
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Thunder bay, etc. 3359
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Hopper barge, construction, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Ice obstruction, Cabot strait, 2614
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, British Columbia, 1660
Stations, Long Point, Lake Erie, 3335
Lighthouse service
Lights, new, 3357
Maintenance and repairs, 3353

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lighthouse service—*Con.*
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Marine signal service, 3358
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Masters and mates, examination, 2610. *See also under this title,* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, 3354
Navigation
Aids to, 3357
Obstructions to, 3334
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage, 3146
Administration of, 3358
Pensions, 3359
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3335
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334
Wrecks
Investigation into, 3160, 3330
Removal of, 3332
Montreal harbour commissioners bill, 4508
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2640, 3508
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Political patronage, 3344
Quebec arsenal, 888
Radiotelegraphy
Broadcasting stations, 3374
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
Regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill 2086, 2284, 2467
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Alleged dismissals, 3344
Tariff
Liberal policy, 2221
Opposition resolution of 1922, 2220
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3399, 3963, 4207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1290
United States steamer Siloam, capture, 2207
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 255-70, 332
Vimy ridge monument, 182
Visit to Washington, 734, 857

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 657
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Lard. *See* Meat Products

Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border. *See* Immigration; Labour

Larkin, Mr. P. C. *See* High Commissioner

Larouche, Que., postmaster, qu. 3137

Laurentians, The, 4312

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Administration, 2815
Canadian railways and ports, traffic for, 175ℓ
Conscription issue, 3015
Election of 1896, 2936
Hudson Bay railway, 1053, 1061, Announcement ,1047
Immigration policy, 1177, 1425
Imperial Conference, 4663
Last public address, 2995
On hour of meeting in 1918, 1
McMaster, M., and, 3030
Monument, 1017
Protective system, 2719
Reciprocity, defeat of, 3015
Tariff reduction and Senate reform, 2908

Lausanne Conference, 54

Lavaltrie, Que. wharf, 969

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Bank draft tax, 3929
Canadian National Railways, directors, 4525
Immigration dept. employees, Quebec, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Little, Mr. W. R., qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Transfers, qu. 2517, qu. 3141
Indemnity of members, 4240
Little, George, deportation of, qu. 3704
Orleans island bridge, 3646
Quebec, Champlain station, 4446
St. Charles river improvements, 4447
St. Malo repair shops, 4447
Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Talbot, Mr. O., 4525
Toronto viaduct, 4446

Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020

Lawyers, charges and standard of living, 1154, 2813. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Lead Pencils, marking of goods, 2988

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herds, 584, 2131, 2132
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2131, 2137
Assiniboine river
Damage by flood, 993, 3041
Expenditure on dyking, etc. qu. 3264
Budget, 3039. Reception of budget in West; district board, Portage la Prairie, resolution; betrayal of the people; British preference; direct importation; obligation to Great Britain for removal of cattle embargo; free admission of British goods; cheque tax charged by grain buyers to farmers, 3039; cattle trade; freight rates, ocean rates; Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels; statements of Mr. Motherwell and Mr. Grisdale, 3040; Assiniboine river floods; resolution of Elie branch of United Farmers; Canadian National Railways, traffic and management; annoyances and inconveniences to passengers; railway equipment; people patronizing their own road; cattle shipment over Canadian Pacific; Riley's army, transportation Ottawa to Toronto, 3042; government interference with railway management; government plea for economy not sincere; new officers with high salaries; Mr. Duncan Marshall; Hon. Mr. Pugsley; members' indemnities, reduction of; extravagance in administration; cabinet ministers absent from duty; cabinet ministers, number in Canada and United States; speech of Mr. McMaster on budget; Manitoba Free Press, stand in defence of common people, 3043
Cattle, ocean space, 2123, 3040
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Experimental farms, 461-486
M. to reduce neg. 486
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 943
Health of animals, 583
Hudson Bay railway, 461
International fishing boat race, 114
Live stock
Ocean shipping rates, 2133, 3040
Removal of cattle embargo, 3039

Leader, Mr. Harry—*Con.*
Ministers' salaries and members' indemnities, 3043, 4243
M. for reduction of, 1153
Reference to, 2915
Officials attending fairs, qu. 285
Portage la Prairie
Representation of, 2680
Sewerage outlet, 993, 997, 2680
Railway mail service, cost of, qu. 3143
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Deductions for non-attendance, 4243
Tuberculosis in cattle, 583

League of Nations. *See also* Imperial Conference
Activities and policies, 3993
Assembly
Tariff
Economic warfare, 3054
Stability, 3053
Canada's contribution to Permanent Secretariat, 3990
Canada's participation in foreign wars, 4000
Canada's withdrawal from, 3999
Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture in Ottawa, 1685
Criticism of, 3993
Expenses of Canadian delegation to, 3989
Franco-German relations, 4652
International Labour Conference, 1441, 1652
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
M. (Mr. Power) for withdrawal, 1529
Saar Valley Commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Silesia, partition of, 3995
West Ukrainian republic, settlement, 651

Leases
Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Coal lands. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Leather, free admission to United States, 3016

Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Leblanc, Mr. Louis, qu. 285

Le Droit d'auteur. *See* Copyright Act Amdt.

Lee, Miss Barbara. *See* Immigration department

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
English and French, harmony between, 1341
Export Act Amdt. bill (pulpwood) 4347, 4354
Kent Northern railway, 4190
Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Léger, Mr. A. T.—*Con.*
Lighthouses and lightkeepers
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347, 4354

Legislation. *See also* Government; House of Commons; Senate
Class, 2851
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
House of Commons, 2691
Committees, expenses of, 4674
Indemnity of members, 4674
In advance of public sentiment, 2925
Joint Committee on, 4008
Paternal, 727, 1133. *See also* Race Track Betting
Preparation and form of, 4007
Provincial, disallowance of. *See* Disallowance; Jurisdiction
Record of, 407, 408
Retroactive, 3128
Senate, salaries and contingencies, 3949
Too much, 2543, 2547, 3434. *See also* Combines bill
Uplift, 2054

Legislative Council. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Leitch, Professor
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Dairying industry, 1843

Leitche's Creek, N.S. wharf, 943

Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement. *See* Immigration; Japan

Lemont, Mr. Arthur. *See* Immigration, Agents

Leprosy, treatment of. *See* Health

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. 3870, agreed to, 3871
Petroleum, crude, bounty, 3914, 3922

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Level Crossings. *See* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Raiways; Toronto

Levels, National. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lévis
Dry dock, 1261
Postmasters, qu. 519
Quarantine station, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 117. Expenditure on agriculture; criticisms from Maritime province members, 118; condition of western farmers; immigration policy, 119; competition in wheat markets, 120; economy in length of session, 120; Near East crisis, 120-121; sales and stamp taxes, 121; necessity for economy in public expenditures. 121
Agricultural conditions in western provinces, 119, 1841
Agriculture
Department, salaries, 611
Immigration and, 1228
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4096-4116
Bounty system, 3922
Cadet services, 881
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3626, 4201, 4333
Dunblane-Mawer, 4201, 4333
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Paris offices, 3626
Cheque tax, 3933
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 543
Civil Service examinations, 366
Combines bill, 2599
Registrar, powers of investigation, 2626
Cost of living, combines and, 2599
Customs drawback, hatters' sweats, 3502
Domestic servants, provision on trains, 1477
Dredging, 1012, 3340
Eggs, price of, 1841
Expenditure in excess of revenue, 1230
Free trade, necessities of life, 1230
French treaty, agricultural implements, 2247
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 2105
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration
Alleged discrimination in favour of West, 1098
Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Child, 1227, 1470
Experience as an immigrant, 1226
Great Britain from, 1105
Literature, 1226
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
Policy, 1225
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2436

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J.—*Con.*
Indians, 2149
Interest rate, 4116
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 839
Matapedia bridge, 1014
Members' indemnity, 4009
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
National gallery, 1018
Naval service, 910
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3536
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849
Pension commissioners, board of, 3743
Petroleum bounty, 3922
Prices, spread in, 1230
Provincial educational rights, 1884
Public works, surveys and inspections, 1020
Quebec arsenal, 884
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3478
Royal Canadian navy, 910
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3778
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, abolition of, 1230
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
Soldier settlement, 2021, 2027
Sorel shipyard, 3349
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar duty, 3479
Swift current public building, 1023
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trade commissioners, 1841
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3777
Western provinces, conditions in, 1225
Wines, tax on, 3938
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334

Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815

Liberal Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2414
Charge of abandonment of policy, unfair, 3010
Conventions of 1893 and 1919, 2777. *See also under this title* Liberal Platform
Senate, elective or nominative, 1369
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2971
Disappointment with, 2812

Liberal Party—*Con.*
Election promises in 1896 and 1921, 2951
High protectionists in, 2931
Influences preventing carrying out of pledges, 2909
Liberal platform of 1919, 2603, 2777, 2885, 2932, 2952, 2974, 2991, 3007, 4393
British preference, increase in, 454
"Chart" 3047
Circumstances of adoption, 3019
Economy, 2003
Endorsed by opposition in 1920, 2994
Euler, Mr., statement of, 3019
Failure to implement, 2981, 3066
French treaty, 2211
Government should not be asked to carry out, 2852
Immigration, Chinese, 1652
Interpretation of, 3047
Labour legislation, 1651, 1652
Maclean, Hon. Mr. (Halifax), statement of, 3019
Planks from, included in amendment, 2861
Progressive party, opposition to, 2925
Proportional representation, 407
Quotation from, 3019
Repudiation of, alleged, 2994, 3019, 3047,
Resolutions moved in opposition, 2736, 3047
Tariff, 1222, 2714, 2718, 2736, 2737, 2872, 2904, 2957, 3008
Planks not carried out, 2220, 3062, 3033. *See also under this title,* Tariff
Taxation, 2003
Luxuries, 2011
Liberals and Conservatives, Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142
Liberals, responsibility for expenditure, 2921
Pledges and promises, 2908, 2981, 2992. *See also under this title,* Conventions; Liberal Platform
Elections of 1896 and 1921, 2908, 2981, 2992
Repudiation of, alleged, 2793, 3035
Senate elective or nominative, 1369
Tariff
Difference between Liberal and Conservative, 3008
Platform of 1896, 2908
Policy, 3007
Protective, 2818
Record since 1896 3009
Stability, new doctrine, 3064

Liberal and Conservative Parties
Alleged union on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142

Liberalism, "watchwords of the past", 3014

Libraries. *See* Public Libraries

Library of Parliament
Committee, 53, 202, 516
Change in membership, 615
Estimates, 2691
Salaries, contingencies, etc. 2692

Life Imprisonment. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Life Saving. *See* Canadian National Safety League; Marine

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers. *See* Marine

Lignite. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Lincoln, Abraham, on immigration, 1236

Lindsay
Arsenal 883, 1744, 1752
Market scales, 208

Linen
Linen thread. *See also* Textiles; Treaties, French Treaty
Bounty, 2647
Linen yarns, 3897
French treaty, 1981
Industry, 3897

Liquor. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Customs and Excise
Beer, excise taxes, qu. 518
Bonded liquor warehouses. *See under this title.* British Columbia; New Brunswick
Bootlegging, 2410, 2419, 3358. *See also* Belle River Harbour
Brandy. *See also* Treaties, French
Duty on, 2742, 2999
French, 444, 2643, 3478
Breweries and export liquor houses
Licensing, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, qu. 1866
British Columbia, 2405-11
Purchases by British Columbia government, 2410
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, qu. 1974, 2404-7, 3144
Canadian and Scotch whisky, competition of French brandy, 3478
Canadian National Railways, transportation, 1868, 3324
Drunkenness, convictions for, 2411
Exportation, 2404, 3144, 3704, 4295
British Columbia, qu. 1260
Government control. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Illicit stills
Prosecutions, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Remissions of fines, 2299

Liquor—*Con.*
Illicit traffic, Canada to United States, 2208
Importation
For sale under regulations, 2404, 3704
Provinces, into. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Intoxicating, consumption of, qu. 285
Laws, evasion of, 2543
Manufacture, 2410, 3704
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
United States laws, 4295
Wines, 3035. *See also* **Treaties, French**
Beer and, excise taxes, qu. 518
Duty, 2710, 2999
Abolition of, 2742
Reduction of, 2643
Excise tax, qu. 518, 2656, 3937, 4425
French treaty, 438, 442, 452, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225
Native, prohibition of, 2411
Port, manufactured at False Creek, Vancouver, 2411
Yukon, 86

L'Islet wharf, 969

Literature. *See also* Advertising; Immigration
National. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Recognition of work in. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Lithographic Works, marking of goods, 2988

Little Current, Ont., harbour, 982

Live Stock. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Live Stock Acts Amdt.
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill, *and under this title,* Health of Animals
Alberta, 1435
Animal contagious diseases. *See also that title*
Eradication board, 2699
Research, 2867
Canada's position as a live stock country, 2934
Cattle
Dairying industry. *See that title*
Diseases *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Embargo. *See also* Agriculture, Experimental Farms
Removal of, 15, 25, 26, 38, 48, 148, 170, 575, 1869, 2871, 3053

Live Stock—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Embargo—*Con.*
Removal of—*Con.*
Conference, 3989
Correspondence, 4132, 4184, 4295
Credit for, 3293
Doherty, Mr. Manning, 3293
Drury, Hon. E. C., 3293
Effect of, 1101
Health of Canadian herds, 2132
Inquiry, 575, 576
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3293
Pledge of British government, 3531
Shipment to Great Britain. *See under this sub-title,* **Shipment to Great Britain**
Stock, classification of, 3291
Export to United States, 1410, 2910, 3293. *See also* United States
Feeding
Shipment in car lots, 595
Winter feeding, 469
Markets, 2871
Ocean freight rates on, 2127, 2136, 2757, 2807, 3040
Prices, 300, 2877
Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, 2871
Weight and, 2871
Quarantined at Levis, qu. 3141
Reciprocity, 3082. *See also that title*
Scrub, 2810
Shipment to Great Britain, 208, 1036, 2807, 3017, 3324, 3641. *See also under this sub-title.* Embargo
Alleged unsanitary condition of boats, 2127, 2613
Finished cattle shipped as stockers, 2872
First, 3309, 3310
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, reported statement, 3041
Dundee at, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3811
Grisdale, Dr., statement, 3040
Rates, 2133, 2963
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Trial shipment, expenses, 4675
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Vessel space, 1868, 1869, 2757, 2963 3040
Testing, 1307, 2133
Trade, development of, 3040
Chicago Fat Stock show, 1398
Community breeding, 476
Condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Contagious diseases. *See under this title,* Health of Animals

Live Stock—*Con.*
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307
Destruction by timber wolves, 597
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Estimates, 575, 587, 4675
Experimental farms, 457, 460-85
Export. *See under this title,* Cattle, Embargo, Shipment; *and also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Feeding. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Health of Animals, 483, 575, 4676. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Accredited herds, qu. 206, 484, qu. 492, 577, 626, 3064, 3302
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim, 582
Compensation for slaughter, 462-486, 576, 582
Hall, O., and McDougall, W. F., veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hog cholera, 582
Contracted from whey, 3299
Pathological laboratories, 578
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579, 2866, 2868
Tuberculosis, 576, 2469
Buffalo, 3439
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Eradication, 3989
Restricted area, Manitoba, 576
Tuberculin test, qu. 1972, 3065
No encouragement to farmer, 2933, 3300
Hogs
Bacon type, 2864
Breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865
Corn-fed, 2865
Garbage feeding, 582
Grading, 466, 590, 1905
Prices, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Horses
Glanders, serum for, 579, 584
Horse-breeding, 588
Market for, 590
Racing of. *See* Race Track Betting
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207, 2253
Thoroughbred, breeding of. *See* Race Track Betting
Tariff on. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports and exports, supervision of. *See* Live Stocks Act Amdt
Improvement, 2773
Indian reserves, 2159, 2162
Infected, sale of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Live Stock—*Con.*
Loans, 4103
Loss from inferior, 2862, 2866, 2867
Markets, 588, 594, 1410
Prices and quality, 2862. *See also under this title,* Cattle
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See also that title* Cattle embargo, 3293
Reported statements, 2614, 3041
Trip to South America, qu. 1031
Poultry. *See that title*
Prices, 2862, 2877. *See also* Prices *and under this title,* Cattle
Decrease in, 1410
West, in, 1101
Propaganda, 594
Purchase of thoroughbred stock, by Mr. E. S. Archibald, 3290
Ranching, 588
Sheep, 2866
Pure-bred, importation, qu. 3141
Screenings, feeding on, 2040, 2867
Sheep-raising. *See* Textiles; Woollen Industry, M. (Mr. Drummond)
Shipments, inspection of, 3334. *See also under this title,* Cattle, Shipment
Stockyards
Agents at Prince Albert and Moose Jaw, qu. 1156
Fraudulent practices, 276, 485, 576
Moose Jaw, qu. 1156, 2779
Prince Albert, qu. 1156, 2779
Union, 2762
Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587
Trade. *See also that title*
South America, 594, qu. 1031
Visit of Canadian commissioners to, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Transportation. *See also* Freight Rates
Hudson Bay railway, 1071
Tuberculin test. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Western Canada Live Stock Union, 2699
World competition, 2781

Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill (Marketing, consolidation and amendment)
1r., 193; 2r., 276-277; ref, to Agriculture Com., 277; report of com. 1441; com., 2200; 2992; 3r., 2293; Senate amdts. 3150

Live Stock Exchanges. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill

Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745

Lloyd George, Right Hon. David
Agricultural conditions in Great Britain, 2755
Career of, 1399
Free trade and protection, 3012
German reparations. *See* Germany
Great Britain, unemployment, 1205
Liberalism, "fair play for the under dog," 3014
Near East question, 4655
Proportional representation, 392
Socialist strength in Great Britain, 2722
Turkey, threatened war with, 2815

Loans, 93, 630, 2642. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Harbours, advances to
Agricultural 1400. *See also* Credits
Borrowings of former government, 2831
Comparative commissions on, 158-9
Conversion, recent, qu, 386
Farm. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits
Interest, 2831
Live stock, 4103
New York, 1922, 154-155, 630, 640, 2963
Provincial, 2987
Roumanian and Greek, qu. 623, 2010
Vocational. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
War, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804

Lobster Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Local Improvements. *See* Public Works

Lockeport, N.S. wharf, 943

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079
Bienfait briquetting plant, 2512
British preference, direct importation, 3455
Coal, duty, 3498
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4671
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Johnston, Mr. Alex., Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 4671
Members' indemnity, 4009
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3878
Amdt. time for appeal, 3881, agreed to, 3881

London, publicity agent, reported appointment of Mr. W. T. Cranfield, 2927, 2983, 4707

London Times, comment on Canadian immigration, 1111

Lord Selkirk Association, monument to Indian Chief, Peguis, 4704

Lord's Day Act, discrimination against poor, 3585

Lougheed, Sir James
Hudson Bay railway, 1033
Labour members of parliament, 3033

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Annual training, 95th regiment, 863
Arthur Young and Company, qu. 1137
Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration, qu. 1633
Budget, 2944. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2944; budget generally acceptable; return of prosperity; tariff, downward revision; revenue requirements; postage rates, reduction; fishing industry handicaps and difficulties, 2945; reduced freight rates; United States markets; machinery for manufacture of fish waste into fertilizer; optimism of Maritime provinces; immigration; pessimistic utterances of Progressives; Mr. Forke on the budget; statement of Mr. H. W. Wood, 2946; amendment; agriculture, assistance of; forest conservation, 2947; pulpwood, restriction of export; work of Mr. F. J. D. Barnjum in interest of forest conservation; cheque tax; bounties, free admission of machinery; sugar duty; sales tax; British preference; reciprocity, 2948
Civil Service Commission
Appointments, 535
Cost of 1917-22, qu. 1137
Clementsport postmaster, 1796
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4351
Forest conservation, 2947, 4351
Foster, Mr. A. deWitt, qu. 1633
Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 1137
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4571
Military hospitals, medical staff, 677
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3855
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 2948, 4351

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2138
Budget, 2871. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Canadian cattle embargo, removal of; value of British and United States markets; prices, Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, Scotland; weight and price; finished cattle shipped as stockers; unlimited quantity of cattle available for shipment; agricultural conditions; protection unfair to West; double standard of selling

Lovie, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and buying; Premier Dunning on the tariff; Liberal tariff planks; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; revenue tariff and protection; excise duty, 2872; taxes paid to protected manufacturers; agricultural conditions in Western Canada; statement of Mr. Samuel Larcombe at Winnipeg; wheat, market for; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; unprofitable crop of 1922, 2873; hard wheat; mixed farming; letter from Mr. J. Scott; farmers who own automobiles; automobiles in Ottawa, 2874; mill feeds, adulteration of; freight rates; lumber, price of, 2875; freight, classification of; transfer charges; express rates; labour costs in industrial and agricultural occupations; cost of living, 2876; protective tariff; disparity between producer's and consumer's prices; cheque tax, limitation; discrimination in favour of rich; protection, 2877; Hudson Bay railway; British preference; world conditions; cancellation of war debt, 2878; Sir George Lawson Johnston on payment by Great Britain of debt to United States; dollar reserve fund in Canada, 2879
Experimental farms, 477
Farms of 160 acres, 1087
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4546
Health of animals, 580
Horse-breeding, 588
Mill feeds, adulteration of, 600, 2875
Seed inspection, 196

Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695, 2795

Lower, Mr. A. R. M., fisheries of Hudson bay, 1065

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Address in reply, 74, 75. Unfair criticism of Progressive party, 75; Great Britain our best market; condition of western farmers, 76; immigration policy of government, 77; revision of Bank Act; transportation of grain; comparative grain rates; economy in administration, 78; the government and its platform; old party divisions, 79
Agricultural loans, 1400
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4041
Bruederheim branch railway, 4199, 4316
Canadian air force, 1749, 2418
Central repair shops, 1750

Lucas, Mr. W. T.—*Con.*
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4198, 4316
Canadian Pacific Railway, qu. 625
Land, 3704
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Disallowance, Nova Scotia statute, 2378
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1011
Elevators, dockage, 2044
Finance Act 1914 Amdt bill, 4408
Freight rates, reduction of, 1400
Grain pooling, 1400
Immigration
Banks and, 4042
Canada Colonization Association, 1399
Chinese, 1445
Policy, 1397
Institutions, surplus of, 1400
Lloyd George, Right Hon. David, 1399
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261
Public Works engineering branch, 1017
Railway mail service, 1790
Raisins and dried currants, 3478
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Tariff reduction, 1400
Western provinces, conditions in, 1398

Lumber. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Alleged labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
British Columbia in, 1245
Combine, 2593
Competition and prices, 2593
Creosoting industry, qu. 813, qu. 1137, 1245, 3234
Vancouver Creosoting Company. 3231
Depression, 3002
Freight rates, 139, 1961, 2855, 2875, 3036
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Importation for Welland canal, qu. 1867
Manufactures of, 1989. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Prices, 2875, 3036
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Railway ties, freight rates and prices, 3036
Sales tax, 4181, 4418
Sawdust pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Temiskaming district, 1402
Timber exportation, 3416
Wood-working industry, 2806

Lumbermen, emigration to United States, 1125

Lunenburg, N.S. harbour, dredging, 4576
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580

Luse Land Company. *See* Immigration

Lusitania. *See* Germany, Reparations

Luxuries. *See also* Taxation; Treaties, French Treaty
Demand for, 1856

Macallum, Dr., discoveries in helium, 4439

Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpœna, 4145. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill, Merchants Bank

Macbrien, General. *See* National Defence

Maccan Coal District. *See* Coal

Macdonald, Hon. E. M. (Acting Minister of National Defence)
Acting Minister of National Defence, appointment, 2295
After war conditions, 1231
Annual drill, 4635
Bank Act Amdt. Bill, 4064
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Chair ruling of, 4720
Motions, anticipatory, 3329
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3961
Rejection by Senate. 4698
Coal
Freight rates on, 1277
Purchase of in United States, 3493
Management, responsibility and powers, 3690
Paris offices, 3616-17, 3689
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3617
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition, 1937
Class consciousness 1233
Coal
Canadian National Railways, 1277, 3493
Duty 3493
Nova Scotia 1277
Combines bill enforcement of 4229
Criminal Code amdt. (Betting information) 4733
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute 2372

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Dredging Maritime provinces 4591. *See also under this title* Harbours and Rivers
Emigration to the United States 1234
Eskimos, trial of, 4674
Experimental farms, buildings, 4630
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
Freight rates
Coal, 1277
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1937
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1937
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1277
Halifax grain elevator 4714
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 4586
Nova Scotia, 4561, 4563
Dartmouth, 4568
Digby, 4568
Dredging, 4569, 4591
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Little Anse, 4722
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4572, 4722
Lunenburg, dredging, 4576, 4577
Ship Harbour, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Ontario, 4589, 4594
Belle River, 4596
Port Maitland, 4589
Prince Edward Island, 4586
Georgetown, 4587
Quebec, 4588
Rimouski, Raymond and Talbot, Messrs. claim, 4588
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3597
Hector celebration, grant, 4636, 4705
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 510
Homestead lands in the West, 1087, 1090
Hudson Bay railway, discontinuance, 1062
Immigration
Empire settlement board, 1237
Hebridean, treatment of, 3597
Maritime provinces, and, 1236
Oriental, 509
Policy, 1230-38
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 509
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3452
Justice, administration of, 4674
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4229
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2052, 3582, 3975

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 1738
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2121
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, desertions, 2418
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Estimates, 4635
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976. *See also under this title,* Petawawa
National spirit, 1232
Naval service, recruiting, 2897
Northover, Major H. R., claims, 4635
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3552
Discussion of, 3329
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Policy, 3451
Parliament buildings, common meeting room, 1727
Party system, 1235
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 3749
Public buildings
New, 4615
New Brunswick, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4613, 4628
Ontario, 4615
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, architects, 4633
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public Works
Estimates, 4561, 4594
Roads and bridges, 4590
Reciprocity, defeat of, 1233
Redistribution
Intention of government, 4250
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee, 857, 937
Reports
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4736
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Sworn as member of Privy Council without portfolio, 1764
Toronto
Customs building, 4624
Harbour improvements, 4610
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Seed branch building, 4622
United States civil war, conditions following, 1232

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.
Confederation and, 1366

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.—*Con.*
National policy, 2838
Reciprocity, 2922
Senate and House of Lords, 1374
Title, 1295

Macdonell, Rev. Father
Immigration
Hebridean, 3585
Scotland, from, 1876

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
British Columbia telegraph lines, 1017
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4314
Chinese immigration bill, 2322
Conditions in British Columbia, 2322
Merchants, Vernon, telegram, 2322
Officer in China, 2322
Codling moth, 597
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 1014
Experimental farms, 464
Fruits and vegetables, registration, 2307
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Hope-Princeton highway, 2342
Immigration
British Columbia, into, 1095
Canada Colonization Association, 1346
European, 1346
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Oriental, 509, 1346, 2322
Policy, 1345
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 509
Indians, British Columbia, Major McGraw, 2163
Kamloops-Okanagan line, 4314
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837
Mara, B. C., postmaster, qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Military hospitals, 671
Okanagan lake wharves, 1008
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3723
Seed testing bill, 2307
Sugar lake telegraph line, 1017
Summerland experimental farm, 464
Western provinces, conditions, 1347

Mackenzie River District
Half-breed claims, 3409, 3444
Steamship services, 2176

Mackenzie, William Lyon, 47

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Annual drill, 4637
Artificial limbs for disabled soldiers, 675
Boy Scouts, 879

MacLaren, Mr. Murray—*Con.*
British preference, direct importation, 1772, 2948
Budget, 2948. British preference, increase of direct importation, 2948; French and Italian treaties, limitation to Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, comparison of mileage and traffic; Canadian grain passing through United States seaports; petroleum bounties and tariff on oil; proposal to curtail and discontinue; immigration policy; Maritime provinces ignored; lecture of Mr. F. W. Kerr in Isle of Man, 2949; Hebridean immigrants; naval recruiting in the interior; forest conservation; government economy, 2950; civil government; Hudson Bay railway, 2951
Cadet services, 879
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3970
Canadian air force, 1748
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Negotiation for sale of 27 ships, 1975
Steamship sailings, qu. 4511
For 1924, qu. 4751
Canadian National Railways, 2944
Atlantic division, 1770
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Chicago traffic originating at, 1769
Comparison, mileage and traffic, 2949
Directors, New Brunswick representative, qu. 282
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal. 1768, 1769
Halifax terminals, qu. 4510. qu. 4751
Policy, discussion of, 1762, 1764
Regulations, 496
St. John station, 4310
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1009
Emigration to United States, 1198
Employers' liability compensation, 695
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Flour shipments, Canadian and United States ports, 1767
Forest protection, 2950
M. (Mr. Michaud) 822
French treaty, direct importation, 2303, 2949
Grain shipments, 1767
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 948
Hector celebration, 4637
Hudson Bay railway, 2951, 4681, 4684
Immigration
Bowder, Mr., agent in Great Britain, 1198
Distribution of, 1198
Farm labourers and domestic servants, 1200

MacLaren, Mr. Murray—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Hebridean, 2950
Maritime provinces ignored, 2949
Officers in Great Britain, 1879
Policy, 1197, 2949
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty, direct importation, 2401, 2948
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as minister, 1764
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2116, 2119
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021, 2685, 2688
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4706
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854-67, 4747
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3711
Petroleum bounty, 3919
Post Office department, printing, 1818, 1820
Public ownership, railways, 1770
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Questions unanswered, 4455
St. John
Employment office, 3453
Harbour improvements, 2677
Immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, 1021
Terminals, 4445
St. John and Quebec railway extension, 4310
Sales tax, 4427
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, 3822
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4427
Taxation, payment in postage stamps, 1821
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Vancouver harbour bill, 261
Venereal diseases, 705
Vocational loans, 687

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4083
Budget, 2967. Congratulations to Finance Minister; debt and interest charges; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2967; budget the best possible under circumstances; tariff revision; tendency downwards; reciprocity, offer to negotiate; attitude of United States; British preference, increase in; sugar duty; expenditure and economy, 2968; irrigation, water power survey and land reclamation; immigration; unemployment relief, 2969; migration of Can-

MacLean, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
adians; air force; Civil Service, number of employees; Civil Service Commission; government departments, increase in cost of, 2970; Canadian National Railways; improved situation on eastern division; courtesy of officials; Crowsnest pass agreement, claim that concession forced by Progressives, 2971; natural resources of western provinces and Maritime provinces; agricultural conditions in Prince Edward Island; fishing industry; reciprocity; distribution, cost of; middleman; producer and consumer; confidence and co-operation; evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; cost of living, 2972; tariff stability; deficit; reduction of; reasons for supporting budget; amendment, 2973
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3436
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 557
Combines bill, 2601
English and French, harmony, 1341
Forest protection, 3419
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Maritime provinces, summer resorts, 3436
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Natural resources, 2972, 3436
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3730
Proportional representation, 432
Public expenditure, east and west, 3436
School lands, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed potatoes, inspection, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035, 4080-4124, 4133-60, 4509
Merchants' bank, 4037, 4050, 4156
Proceedings before Banking and Commerce Com. 3887
Shareholders' audit, 4090
Bank mergers, 4138
Merchants' bank 4037, 4050, 4156
Banking and Commerce Committee
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Printing of proceedings, 3887
Reports
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Committee—*Con.*
Reports—*Con.*
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Budget, 3000. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3000; speech of Mr. Meighen; budget, form of presentation; budget statements in Great Britain; budget well received in country; expenditure and taxation, burden upon taxpayers, 3001; the future bright; agriculture; fishing industry; business and industrial depression; problems should be faced in national spirit; Canada difficult country to govern, 3002; secession, talk of; accentuation of provincial and local problems; group political organizations; Alberta farmers resolution; European reconstruction; European origin of Canadian commercial conditions, 3003; wheat prices; emigration to United States; government not responsible; economic causes of movement; inflation in the United States; building trade, 3004; balanced budget; public expenditure; attitude of public and parliament; Hudson Bay railway; commission to inquire and investigate, 3005; commercial feasibility of route; Welland canal; railway extension in the West; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, deficit; deficit in financial operations of government; railway deficit and taxation, 3006; tariff policy of government; Liberal platform of 1919; too much importance attached to; statesmen who have reversed opinions on public policy; Sir Robert Peel and repeal of Corn Laws, 3007; tariff declarations of Liberal Convention; unwise to re-write tariff schedule; Progressive platform; inconsistency of Conservative party; consistently protectionist; Conservative arguments in favour of protection; position of Liberal party, 3008; tariff board; tariff reduction; free trade; Progressive party, inconsistency of; Alberta coal, transportation to Ontario; record of Liberal party since 1896; preferential tariff, 3009; reciprocity agreement with United States; opposition to reciprocity by Progressive members; recent tariff reductions; free trade and revenue; amendment;

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
taxation; income tax; reliance upon customs tariff; tariff, unwise to abandon; United States, attitude towards Canada; Fordney tariff, 3010; reciprocity offer; tariff stability, 3011; problems to be solved, 3012
Speech on, reference to, 3070
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Committee on, 2474
Competition with subsidized service, 3381, 3385
Deficit, 3006
Canadian National Railways, 3006
Committee, 2474
Management, responsibility and power, 3695
Paris offices, 3694
Cheque tax, 3934
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 272, 273
Commercial union, 3907
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4214-17
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 631
Distressed seamen, 3973
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Freight rates, control of, 4226
French treaty, 444
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Hudson Bay railway commission to inquire, 3005
Insulin, supply of, 704
Interest rate, 4105
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 232
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4224-28, 4292
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3997
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003, 3019
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3318
Merchants' bank merger. *See under this title,* Bank mergers
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3274
Nova Scotia miners' strike, troops, 398
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Reciprocity with United States, 3010. 3907
Steamship services, West Indies, 3379
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 258, 259, 262

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4135-45, 4147
Banks
Charters, limitation of time, 4147
Combinations of, 2578
Mergers, 4135
Notes, substitution for national notes, 4408

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Banting, Dr. F. G.. 4440
Budget, 3055. Mr. McMaster in "Greenland"; doubtful virtue of consistency; speech of Prime Minister; professed protectionist; grievances of East and West; railway question; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific; public vs. private ownership; effort to acquire or destroy national system, 3056; strategic advantages; present deficits but success assured; waterways complementary to railway system; company-owned railways; railway situation in United States, 3057; traffic pools and running rights; personnel of management; capitalization; stock exchange gambling; necessities of life; grain and sugar speculation, 3058; race-track betting; new Franchise Act needed; equality of citizenship as between men and women; previous discussion in parliament; right to revise constitution, 3059; tariff; immigration and land settlement; grievances of Maritime and western provinces; banking legislation; rural credits; war clouds 3060
Canada, constitutional development, 4473
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3842
Canadian National Railways, 1050, 3056
Annual statement of minister, 1617
Branch lines construction bill, 4193, 4335
Courtesy, 2971
Electrification, 3203
Estimates, 1566
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1667
Public ownership, 1618, 3056
Report, 3223
Securities, approval of, bill, 4403
Toronto approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Unification of system, 3195, 3223
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2575
Parliament, right to investigate, 2666
Combines, steamship, 2667
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4209-15
Constitution
Right of Canada to make her own, 1378
Right to revise, 3059
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3327
Farm loans, 1088, 3060, 4366
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4407
Forest protection, M. Mr. (Michaud) 824

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Franchise Act Amdt. 3223
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1965
Grain, 1965
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1965
Reclassification, 1618
Waterways, 1619
Fuel supply, 3198
M. (Mr. Church) 1272
Government printing, 1733
Halibut fishery treaty, 4473
Hebridean immigrants, 2950
Highways, effect on railways, 1619
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3222
House of Commons acoustics, member should occupy central position, 1721
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374, 1378
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1049
Hydro Electric Commission, 2682
Imperial Conference, 3223
King's birthday, observance, 3323
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4219
Merchants bank, 2576
Mining companies shares, 4209
National Defence estimates, 859
National land bank, 4366
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2185
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Parliament buildings, 1725
Peat experiments, 3199
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3851, 3860
Petition of right, fiats, 3146, 3222
Proportional representation, 420
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Public ownership, 3842
Railways, 3056, 4194
Railways, co-operation between, 4337
Redistribution bill
Opportunity for discussion, 488
Representation by population, 572
Rural credits, 1088, 3060, 4366
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Sales tax, imports, 4409
Senate, elective or nominative, 1373, 1378
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, qu. 3820
Sugar trust, 2576, 3058
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Viaduct, 4447
United States Federal reserve bank, 4407
United States, preferential treatment, 440

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
War commitments, 859
Water powers
Export of electrical energy, 1272
Survey of, 3203
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummand) 933

Macneil Case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Macphail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Agricultural conditions, 1190, 1844
Agriculture, expenditure, 3241
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4048
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Experimental farms, 3241
Farm women, 1844
Immigration
Domestic servants, 1189
Farmers and farm labourers, 1190
Policy, 1189
Labour, attitude towards mental and physical work, 1189
Life on the farm, 1189
Members of parliament, party funds and, 4237
References to, 1243, 1249
Rural depopulation, 1189, 1844
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-47
M. to refer back, neg. 4247
Sessional allowance, M. to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242
Soldier settlement, 2022, 2026
Questionnaire, 1845
Trade
Encouragement, qu. 284
Representatives, qu. 284

Macphail, Sir Andrew, immigration, 1393

McAdoo Award, 126

McArthur, J. D. & Co., Hudson Bay railway claim, 4686, 4689

McArthur, Mr. J. J., international boundaries, 3246

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Annual training, 872
Army officers, settlement in Canada, 1432
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4065, 4096
Mutual insurance companies, 4037
British Columbia
Agricultural production, 1432
Liquor law, administration, 2427

McBride, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
Brule lake-Grande Prairie projected railway, 4699
Budget, 3031; pessimism; playing politics; sales tax; pyramiding; equalization of the tax; copper bounty; hemp bounty, 3031; proposed extension; employment of Canadians; British preference, clothing; old age pensions; unemployment relief; highway construction; immigration bill, statement by Sir James Lougheed and Senator Fowler, 3032; labour members, reflection on; people from British Isles, 3033
Building materials, prices, 2165
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2412-15, 2427
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3825
Disposal of, 3385
Grain trade, 4234
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4315
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canoe wharf, 1005
Cariboo wharves, 1005
Chinese immigration bill, 2309-27
Coal
Freight rates, Mines and Minerals Com. 4514
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202
Conscription of fire fighters, 3409
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Easter adjournment, 1162
Exhibitions, 1467
Experimental farms, 475
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4352
False Creek bridge, 3376
Fishways, 3363
Forest protection, 3409
Fruit industry
Alleged combine, 2616
British Columbia, in, 147
Fuel supply, 3202
Grazing inspectors, appointments, 3254
Harbours and rivers, British Columbia, 1005
Hemp bounty bill, 3913, 4388
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4641, 4648
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202
Immigration
Chinese, 2309-27
Estimates, 1446

McBride, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Chinese—*Con.*
Exclusion of, 2327
Schools, 2326
South Africa, 2327
Hindu 1128
Franchise, 4641, 4648
Literature, 1433
Oriental, 511
Policy, 1432
Imperial Conference, 4641, 4648-60
Indians, 2152
Kamloops-Okanagan railway, 4315
Kamloops public building, 1006
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4234
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2199
Navigation schools, 3331
Oleomargarine, Agriculture Com. discussion, 3267
Ore-testing plants, 2507
Peace river district
Immigration, 1433
Railway construction, 1433, 4698
Peat, comparative value of, 3202
Penitentiaries, 771
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Prince George-Peace River railway, 1434, 4701
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4352
Railway rates
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1926
Grades, etc. qu. 625
Renovated butter, 4263
Rural depopulation, 1432
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1789
Salmon Arm wharf, 1006
Settlers' relief, 3447
Steamship services, 2171
Taxation, building materials, prices and, 2165
Telegraph lines, revenue, 3946
Trent valley canal, qu. 4301
Western provinces, conditions, 1252
Winter trips to California, 1252

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Address in reply, 166. The late Mr. Stewart; condition of the West, 166; wheat prices; amendments of Messrs. Hoey and Shaw 167; economy everywhere necessary, 168
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4201
Paris offices, 3700

McConica, Mr. T. H.—*Con.*
Congratulations upon return to House, 1660
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3531
Wheat Board, correspondence, 626

McCraney, Mr. George E., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Haileybury public building, 4615
Unemployment, 1125

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 378
Government workkshops Ottawa, 4620
Private Bills Committee
Reports
First, 936
Fourth, 2204
Fifth, 2417
Sixth, 2837
Seventh, 3323
Eighth, 3887
Tenth, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

McInnes, Mr., resources of Hudson bay region, 1072

McIsaac, Mr. C. F. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317
Half Island cove, 4572
Sonora wharf, 4585
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4317

McKenna, Mr. J. A. J., Hudson bay route, 1063

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria; Solicitor General)
Appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Canada Temperence Act, 574, 767
Correspondence with British Columbia, 1032
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Fuel supply, 800
M. (Mr. Church) 1273, 1283
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382
Nova Scotia coal, 800, 1273
Reported statement in Halifax, 147
Resignation, 1763, 2392

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Budget, 2981. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff on sugar and clothing; Liberal pre-election promises; tariff

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
changes not very encouraging; by-election results; handwriting on the wall; duty on exports and imports of beans, 2981; production of beans in Canada; competition with Austria and Japan; Japanese wages for labourers; prices of beans to consumer; conditions of workingmen; fair wage officer; satisfied labour a bulwark against Bolshevism; country needs strong national policy 2982
Civil Service
Appointments, 1922, 3324
Returned soldiers, 386
Grain dockage, qu. 4300

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McLean, Kennedy and Company, ocean rates, 2127

McLennan, Professor
Helium 703
Scientific discoveries, 1287

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R. (Brome)
Acoustics, "bedside" manner of speaking, 2446
Address in reply, 172. The amendments; view of Minister of Finance, 172; amendments sanctioned by best modern constitutional practice, 173; necessity for a downward revision of tariff, 174
Agricultural conditions, 1858
Special committee on
Leave to report, 911
Reports
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136, 1209
Fourth, 2127
Fifth, sixth and seventh, 4007, 4075
M. to concur in, 4295, 4363
Tariff Commission evidence, 2296
Agriculture, economic organization, 1858
Alpine Club grant, 3954
Attitude towards tariff policy, 3055
Audibility of debate, 3327
British Empire exhibition, 3949
Budget, 3012. Speech of leader of Opposition; reference to Mr. Sinclair; Great Britain and debt reduction; free trade; Mr. Lloyd George, statement by; 3002; United States tariff; reciprocity; permanency of arrangement;

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
treaty of 1854; trade relations and national spirit; defeat of reciprocity agreement of 1911; proposed remedy for unsatisfactory economic conditions —protection and high taxes; Liberal party, attitude towards tariff; a mere "attitude of mind" not sufficient, 3013; to vote for amendment of Mr. Forke and against budget; to sit on cross benches; justification of action; Liberal principles; "need of retrenchment and reform"; "free trade, peace, good will amongst the nations"; "trust in the people"; Mr. Lloyd George's definition, "fair play for the under dog;" absurdities of protectionist principles; language of Liberal statesmen; election of 1896; Liberal budget of 1897; British preference and reciprocity; advances to Washington; reciprocity campaign of 1911, 3014; flag-flapping; racial cries and appeals to sentiment; "No truck or trade with the Yankees"; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; conscription issue; protectionist budget with strong Maritime flavour; amendment, 3015; claims for protection; reciprocity clause; revenue, methods of raising; tax on unearned increment of land; reciprocity negotiations; standing offers on Canadian and United States statute books; questions of permanence, 3016; United States offer of reciprocity in boots, leather and agricultural implements; ups and downs of the budget; raisins and dried currants, duty; artificial silk duty; hemp and copper bounties, 3017; protection governing principle of budget; not much difference between Liberals and Conservatives on tariff; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; protection a dismal failure; National Policy, anti-national and anti-social; Edmund Burke on function of parliament, 3018; repudiation of Liberal platform of 1919; attitude of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) and Mr. Euler; framing of tariff plank; the platform quoted, 3019; claim of Minister of Finance that he is not bound by platform; acceptance of nomination for leadership; amendments moved by Mr. Fielding in 1920 and 1921, 3020; budget repudiation of utterances of Finance Minister integrity of public life and maintenance of parliamentary institutions; reasons for undertaking an "unpleasant task"; relationship between member and constituent; Edmund Burke, 3201; not leaving party but refusing to support budget, 3022
Speech, comment on, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 4393
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4306
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Combines bill, 2581, 2660-69
Application for investigation restricted, 2617
Civil Service appointments, 2662
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Copper bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances to be repayable, 4369
Cross benches, 3014
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3366
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2349
Experimental farms, 471
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4393
Free trade, 3002
Agriculture and, 1858
French treaty bill, 454
Favoured nation, 2210
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 340
Grain inquiry, royal commission, 1209, 1212
Hemp bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances repayable, 4376
Immigration, undesirable classes, 2669
Liberal platform of 1919, 3019, 4393
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 853
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1212
Maple products industry, 1810
Marriage with deceased husband's brother, bill, 1256, 1836
Moose Jaw election, point of order, 1714
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2453
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3533
Parliament buildings, 1718
Commons galleries, members, 1729
Patents of Invention bill, 2069-78, 2083, 2097
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
New or amended patents, 2082
Points of order
Members coaching each other, 405
Moose Jaw election, 1714
Relevancy, 2663

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 403, 430
Protection, combines and, 2581
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4393
Purchasing commission, 3951
Purchasing power, depreciation in Europe, 1859
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 728
Res. in 1919, free food and implements, vote on, 2996
Rural depopulation, 1860
Shipping combine, 2583
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 3012
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget
Commission, evidence, 2296
Duties, pyramiding, 2998
High, revolt against, 1859
Policy, attitude on, 3067, 3013
Proposals, vote against, 3022, 3081
Trent canal, Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954
McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Binder twine, 4376
Educational opportunities, foreigners and, 1885
Government printing, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Hemp bounty bill, 4376
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3587
Policy, 1880
Immigration Act Amdt bill, 2429
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4277
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4168
Municipal and provincial extravagance, 1890
Natural resources, 1880-1
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2463
Judges, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2463
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 404
Railway problems, 1880
Shipping combines, 4277
Soldier settlers, fire insurance, 496
Taxation, burden of, 1880
Unemployment in Winnipeg, 435
Unrest, alleged, in western provinces, 4514
Winnipeg coal purchases, 496
McNeill, Paul. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation
McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1453
Appeals from convictions bill, 4250
Bamfield public building, 1024
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1505, 1525
McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Bribery charge, Revelstoke and Nelson electors, 2941
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1553
Liquor legislation. *See under this title,* Liquor
Orientals and fishing industry, 1899
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-17, 2428. *See also under this title,* Liquor
Amdt., 2415, neg. 2428
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Chinese immigration bill, 2308-22
Merchants, amdt., 2320
Trade, 2320
Civil Service
Appointments, 372-3
Number in, 3264
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 370
Coast Range Steel Company, 2508
Downie, Mr. Donald, 777
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
Fraser river improvements, 1003
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 316
Health department, returned soldiers, 2171
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1324
Oriental, 1307, 1893
Child, 1453
Chinese, 1446, 2308-22
Assimilation of, 2321
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Labourers, 2310
Merchants, admission of, 1445, 2320
Regulations, evasion, 1445
Statistics, 1445
Students, 2319
Treaty with, 1448
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1261
Exclusion, demand for, 503
Hindu, franchise, 508
Japanese
Alleged rights as British subjects, 1899
Correspondence with Consul-General, 1894
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
Fishermen, 1899
Lemieux agreement, 1447, 1894
Petition against further immigration and naturalization, 2837, 2885, 4075

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con*
Stowaways on freighter, 859, 1448
Naturalization, 1453, 1899
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 503
Japanese trade, 1453
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 211
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia law
Administration, 2412, 2428
Bootlegging, 2414
New Westminster, sale of liquor, 2415
Ottawa Citizen editorial, 2412
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1974
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Correspondence with Vancouver county court judges, 2199
Japanese, 1899
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2183, 2199, 2465
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Orientals. *See also under this title,* Immigration, Oriental
Business competition, 1902
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Pacific highway, 2341
Parliament buildings, members' rooms
Allocation, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Pensioners, unemployed, relief, 2169
Petroleum bounties, 781
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, employment, 733
Returned soldiers
Health department, 2171
Unemployment, 2169
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, legal adviser, 777
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 925
Salmon fisheries, British Columbia, 1553
Secret agreement, 1448
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, qu. 3137

McRae, General. *See* Canada Colonization Association

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Agricultural conditions in West, 1352
Dominion lands, alienation of, 1353
Homestead pre-emption and purchase, qu. 1030, 1032, 4202

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H.—*Con.*
Immigration policy, 1352
Livestock agents, qu. 1156
School lands, 1032
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4204

Machinery. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Customs Tariff Items; Prices
For manufacture of fertilizers. *See* Customs Tariff Items
French treaty, 1981, 1988

Magazines and Periodicals. *See also* Press
Canadian
Competition, 1418
Encouragement of, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Postage, 4436, 4528
Sales tax, 4415, 4421

Magdalen Islands
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Pointe à Elie wharf, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) wharf, 977
Steamship service, 2174

Magna Charta. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Magrath, Mr. C. A., Fuel supply, 799

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Catalogue Prices. *See* Bancroft; Prices

Mail Subsidies. *See* Steamship Services

Main Estimates. *See* Estimates

Maine, state of, railway construction, 2902

Majority Government. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Majority Rule. *See* Proportional Representation

Malbaie, Que. wharf, 968

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British preference, cotton goods, 3466
Civil Service Act, special committee
Order of reference, 1256
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4592-3
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 762
Redistribution bill, 572
Textile industry, 3466

Malcolm Island, Finnish settlement, 1247

Malone, late Lieut. Col. W. P., qu. 206

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manila Fibre. *See also* Bounties; Hemp
Bounties, 4369
Rope, oil used for, drawback, 3502

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Adjournment, time of, 2694
Agriculture, votes for, 3237
Automobile insurance, 3148
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Budget, 2746. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of Mr. Raymond; conditions serious; emigration to the United States; causes; high taxation; railway deficits; small and scattered population; sectional interests and problems; depression, causes of, 2747; prices of manufactured articles and agricultural products; Europe, chaotic condition of; production costs; France, occupation of the Ruhr; world conditions; United States tariff against Canadian products; grain, exports of; home market; lower production; grain, exports of; home market; lower production costs; interprovincial trade; immigration, 2748; European immigrants, assimilation of; taxation, reduction of; Great Britain, retrenchment and tax reduction; sugar duties; national debt; stumping machines, lowering of duties on, 2749; boots for cripples; sales tax; contracts affected; too much pessimism; wheat export; gold output; coal deposits; silver production; cobalt; nickel; asbestos; water powers; pulp, paper and forest products; fertile lands; fisheries; iron ore; vigorous and virile people; causes for optimism; agricultural conditions; farm mortgages; farm credits; United States and protection; claim that United States is a free trade country; high duties imposed by United States; industrial development of United States, 2751; free trade, advocacy of in western Canada; protection and war; trade competition between Great Britain and Germany; Great Britain and protection, 2752; tariff as it affects East and West; world opinion favourable to protection; free raw materials, 2753; agricultural implements; tariff, periodical revision; advisory tariff commission; tariff revenue in Great Britain; taxation on necessaries of life; free trade and unemployment; poverty and pauperism in Great Britain, 2754; British agriculture under

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
free trade; Lloyd George, statement of; Liberal tariff policy; National Policy tariff; stability; amdt. of Mr. Forke, 2755
Building materials, prices, 2164
Canadian Air Force
Camp Borden, 1775
Hospital, 1775
Forestry protection, 1776
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Long Lake branch, 4310
Paris offices, 3631
Cattle embargo, removal of, 3293
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions, 330
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction qu. 278
"Lady who rides to work in automobile", 1772
Returned soldiers, 1792
Cloud Bay wharf, 982
Combines bill, 2542
Copper bounty bill, 3237
Copyright Act Amdt bill, 2287, 3154
Song writers, 2287
Divorce proceedings, publicity, 2054
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 2034
Elevators. *See under this title,* Grain
Emigration to United States, 1113
Empire Settlement scheme, 288
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 3413, 4347
France, occupation of the Ruhr, 2748
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 329
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Leases qu. 4132
Screenings, 2039
Inquiry by Grain Commission, 2254
Sale of, qu. 1633
Unscalped or uncleaned, qu. 1739
Grain commission, 2036, 2254
Grain shipments, 3769, 3789
Injustices to western farmers, 1114
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar), 295
Port Colborne, qu. 1209
Shipments, 3769, 3789
Great Britain, to qu. 1867
Health department, salaries, 2170
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3597
Icebreaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 1105
Northern Ontario, 1097, 1112
Policy, 1110-1115

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Western Canada, conditions in, 1112
Indians
Agent, Mr. J. Garry Burke, 2151
Education, 2164
Northern Ontario, 2151
Preservation of, 2151-2
Tuberculosis, 2152
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3148
Labour
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1702
Strikes, 1702
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Legislation
Estimates, 2691
Too much, 2543
"Uplift," 2054
Lighthouses, date of closing, 3356
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 840
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 2116
Home-brew, conviction, 2121
National Defence
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1772
Expenditure, 3238
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 896
Orders in council passed, 1921-1922, qu. 1488
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3853-86
Amdt, 3886, agreed to, 3886
Pensions
European War and active militia, 2166, 3707, 3713
Pension Act, suggested amendment, 2166
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 3742
Royal commission
Findings, action, 2639, 3400
Interim report, 2166
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Pilotage, administration of, 3358
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Progressive members and protection, 3237
Proportional representation, 431
Public Works, salaries, 2684
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413, 4347
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3474
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744, 3892
Returned soldiers in civil service, 1772
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3769
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Soldier settlement, 2020, 2027, 2028
Tariff
Advisory tariff commission 2754
Agricultural implements, 2750, 2754
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1293

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Trade
Commissioners, 1837
Manufactured goods, exports, 1839
Trade and Commerce, estimates, 2031
United States tariff, 1113, 1119, 2751
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Wages, building trades, 2165
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3769

Manitoba. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural and economic conditions, 1213, 1220, 1404, 1462, 1906, 2766
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Bracken, Premier, statement on immigration, 1123
Canada Colonization Association, 1877
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal supply, 1265
Court of Appeal
Grain Inquiry Commission, decision, 1210
Trueman, Mr. W. N., K.C., appointment, 1868
Dairying industry, production in 1921, 2744
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2060
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 459
Freight rates, 1931, 1932
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Grand Jury system abolition of, 2695, 3272
Harbours and rivers, 993, 4589
Hemp production, 2780
Highways, 3184. *See* Canada Highways bill; Highways
Illicit stills, prosecution for operating, 3280
Income tax, 2859
Indians, 2145, 2153
Institutions and services in excess of present needs, 1214, 1400, 1890
Lake of the Woods bill, 2885
McLeod, Hon. G. L., help for needy farmers, 1404
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Mixed farming, 2772, 2773
Natural resources. *See also* Lake of the woods Regulation bill
Cost of administration, 2782
Political patronage, 3348
Prohibition referendum, 2414
Public buildings, 4628
Radio-telegraph service, 2285, 2468, 3338
Reclamation of land, 1065
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1156

Manitoba—*Con.*
Taxation
Agricultural products, 1404
Production and, 1391
Tax sales 2961
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Telephone system, 2285
Unemployment relief, discontinuance, 1658
United Farmers of Manitoba, 1404, 1462
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation bill
Wheat board, 2836

Manitoba Free Press, Sir Clifford Sifton and, 3043

Manna. *See* Dairying Industry

Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney-General, British Columbia
Asiatic immigration 1901
Liquor legislation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Manton, Judge, immigration, 1234, 1237

Manufactured Goods. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Industries; Textiles
Binder twine discrimination against, 2964
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Prices 1167, 2748. *See also* Prices
Spread between producer and consumer, 2713

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers Association
Difficulties, 2854
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Farmers and, 2716
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Japan, competition from, 2861
Licensed, 4410. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Markets, lack of, 2856
Not able to compete, 3062
Ontario and Quebec, 2910
Orient competition from, 2861
Profit, 2854
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue
Securities of manufacturing companies, 2720
Understanding between and people of East, 3023
United States
Competition from, 2861
Markets, 2856

Maple Products industry, 1810

Maps. *See* Interior, Surveys

Mara, B.C., post office, qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Marchand, Mr. J. O. *See* Parliament Buildings, Architects

Marcil Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Business of the House
Debates, official report, returns, 940
Private members' day 1160
Questions right to put on orders of day, 734
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4186, 4307
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 542, 553
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
Gaspe and Bonaventure forest fires, 4010
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4186, 4307
Grondines wharf, 967
Hudson Bay railway, 1041
Japanese immigration, Lemieux agreement, 1448
La Societie des Artisans Canadians Francais, 1028
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 843
National gallery 1018
Oleomargarine M. (Mr. Carroll) 3535
Petition of right, fiats, 3223
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 742
Rulings as Chairman
Amdt. not relevant, 3667
Debates, official report, statements not read, 1830
General argument on particular clause, 4069
Governor General acknowledgment of address, 1256
Member may not reflect on vote of committee 4119
M. that committee rise not debatable, 1836
M. to postpone resolution in supply, 3667
Newspaper article reflecting on proceedings, 4126
Reference to com. in advance of report, 2970
Reflection on sincerity and integrity of members, 4067
Rule 17B, closure, 3667
Supply, relevancy, 808, 871, 1847, 1858, 1861, 4336
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
Special delivery letter postage, 1872
Toronto viaduct, 4307

Marcouiller, Mr. C., St. Barnabé Nord postmaster, 1830

Margaree River Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Margaretville, N.S. harbour, 4581
Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Acts Amdt; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763 3160, 3330
Annual report presented, 1080
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Biological board, 3371
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Expenditure by provinces, statement, 3888
Johnston, Mr. Alex, deputy minister, 3373, 3671, 4667
Publicity, 3364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dredging
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Unification of work, 3341
Examination of masters and mates, 2610
False Creek bridge, 3375
Halibut Fishery treaty. See Treaties
Hopper barge, self-propelling, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Icebreakers, 3160
Ice obstruction in Cabot strait, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Murray Stewart, 3354, 3359
Thunder bay, etc., 3359
Inspection
Boats over 100 tons register, 1660
Live stock shipments, 3334
Steamboats, 3360
Institutions assisting sailors, 701
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, 3171
British Columbia, 1659
Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Rewards, 3335
Lights and lightkeepers
Boudrot, Mr. E., Green island, qu. 2613
Classification, 3352
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Descheneaux, Mr. Patrick, dismissal, qu. 4512
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lights and lightkeepers—*Con.*
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Reliance, wreck of, qu. 812
Richibucto cape, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Marine signal service, 3358
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, purchase, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354, 3359
Navigation
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Closing of, date, 3356
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3357
Obstructions, Seymour Narrows, 3333
Safeguards, lake Superior, qu. 812
Schools, 3331
Wireless telegraphy, 1046
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3375
Investigation into wrecks, 3160
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330
Maintenance and repairs to steamers, 3160
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Administration, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Pilot boats, 3358
Eureka, qu. 1364
Father Point, 3358
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3339
Dredging and maintenance, 3375
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trout-fishing season, 1686
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3356
Wrecking plants 3334
Wrecks, Alaskan. *See under this title,* Alaskan

Marine Hospitals. *See* Health; Marine and Fisheries

Maritime Provinces. *See also* New Brunswick; Nova Scotia; Prince Edward Island
Bank centralization, 4079
Boards of trade, conference with Sir Henry Thornton, 1755, 1771

Maritime Provinces—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, 1764, 1770. *See also that title*
Coal. *See that title*
Conditions in, 1207, 2763, 2936
Dredging 1009, 4590
Freight rates, 1963, 3192. *See also that title*
Coal from, 1272, 1813
Grievances, 3056
Immigration, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236. *See also that title*
Natural markets, loss at confederation, 2852
Natural resources, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Public buildings, 1022, 4614
Secession talk 1757, 2940. *See also* Secession
Roberts, Hon. W. F. reported statement, 3145
Senate elective or nominative, 1376
Shale deposits, 2513

Markets. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Industries; Live Stock; Manufacturers; Prices; Reciprocity Trade; Treaties
Access to, 2937
Agricultural products, 2731, 2861, 2910
Great Britain, 2869. *See also that title*
United States 2869. *See also that title*
Bacon, 2864
Beans, 2982
Cattle, 2871
Competition for, 2725
Dairy products, 2863
Development of, 2869
Disorganized, 2861
Export, 2869
Fish, 2906, 2946, 3002
Foreign, 4054
Fruit, 463
Hogs, 2864
Home, 2869
Industries and, 2975
Horses, 590
Live stock 588. *See also that title*
South America, 594
Manufactured products, 2910
Maritime provinces, 2852
Marketing and quality, 2862, 3066, 4027
Production exceeding demand, 2957
Purchasing power, 637
United States. *See also that title*
Fish, 2946
Wheat, 3068. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Marketing of Grain. *See* Grain

Markham, Violet. *See* Carruthers, Mrs. James

Marking Act. *See* Customs and Excise; Imports

Marking of Woollen Goods. *See* Wool

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4121
Budget, 3022. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of leader of Opposition, able but lacking in generosity; Sir Henry Drayton, amendment; position of Progressive party; difficult country to govern; understanding between manufacturers and people of West; agricultural and business conditions, 3023; difficulties universal; lower freight rates; loss of purchasing power, inflation; rural credits; demand for lower tariffs; free trade "a splendid theory"; revenue; not a protectionist but a development tariff; without moderate tariff industries would close, 3024; prices, Canada and United States; revenue and tariff, 3025; income tax; tax on unearned incomes; inheritance tax; excise duties, 3026; natural resources, development of; capital and people necessary; taxation direct and indirect; expenditure and economy; civil government costing too much; ratio of employees to population, 3027; deficit; spend only what we have to spend; tariff stability; tariff committee; permanent advisory tariff commission, 3028; production costs; distribution; spread between manufacturer and consumer; speech of Mr. McMaster, "chasing a rainbow"; free trade impossible, 3029; rejection of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's tariff policy; result of government defeat; Wheat board a protective measure, 3030
Cabot strait, ice obstruction, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3836
Canadian National Railways, debenture holders, 3507
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Canadian Pacific Railway dividends, 1203
Civil Service Commission, 1800
Combines bill, 2536, 2615-21
Definition "combine" 2615
Registrar, inquiry, 2619
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3464
Emigration to the United States, 1128, 1392

Marler, Mr. Herbert—*Con.*
English and French speaking people, 1341
Firebrick, duty, 3482
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1948
Railway rates equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1947
Girl Guides, grant, 3954
Government publications, waste, 1713
Hospital supplies, coverings, duties, 3501
Immigration, 1391
Attitude of the West, 1129
Restrictions upon, 1128
Income tax, 3026
Proposed amendment, 4503
Unearned income, 2882, 3026
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4500
Labour, employment for all willing to work, 1124
McMaster, Mr., speech on budget, 3026, 3029
Montreal, postal appointments, 1800
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-82
Amdt. 3881, neg. 3882
Pension Commissioners, duties, 685
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1128
Taxation, increase of, 1121
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954
X-Ray plates, coverings, duties, 3501

Marriage
Publication of evidence, 1971
Settlements. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriage with deceased husband's brother, Bill respecting, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Married Woman, rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriott, Professor, England since Waterloo, 1231

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 70, 286, qu. 384
Agricultural instruction grant, 608, 3293
Appointment as Commissioner of Agriculture, 2615, 2710, 3043, 3150, 3303, 3320
Order in council, 3294, 3320, 3303
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Cattle embargo, removal of, 2614, 2871, 3041, 3293
Fordney tariff, 3293
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Qualifications, 3306
Redistribution, 3313
Reports, 3705
Salary, 608, 3043, 3287, 3309, 3352

Marshall—*Con.*
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, 3595
South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309, 3316
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Great Britain, 3290, 3308, 4675
Florida, 3307, 3311
South America, qu. 1031

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Address in reply, 101. Congratulations to mover and seconder, 101-102; deceased members; the Maritime provinces and representation, 102; government ownership of railways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; development of Canadian ports, 103; Minister of Justice, 104; Hants county; Mr. Shaw and Progressives; Near East crisis, 105
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Alaskan, wreck of, 3164
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3099, 3126, 3220
Bay of Fundy, icebreaker, 2615
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
British Columbia
Fisheries Commission, 3372
Fishing licenses, 1548, 1554
British common law, 2894
Budget, 2904. Liberal tariff platform, 2904; tariff for revenue; railway deficit and direct taxation; public ownership and low tariff; relations with United States; reciprocity; printing industry and United States market, 2905; Fordney tariff; markets; fish, 2906; reciprocity agreement of 1911; negotiations with President of the United States; the weapon in our hands; Treaty of 1818; use of Canadian ports by United States fishing vessels; license system, 2906; trans-shipment of catch; shipment in bond; suggested denial of privilege; bounties preferable to tariff increase; reasons for supporting budget; revenue requirements; revision downward; British preferance; elected to support Liberal party, 2907
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2694, 3452
Business profits tax, 4490
Calder Act, 2926
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3818

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4333
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3291
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3189
Civil service
Commission, ministers and, 371
Technical and professional officials, 815
Civil Service Act, M (Mr. Power) 525, 545, 546
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal, duty, 3499
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 273, 2056, 2086
Incorporated companies, 2058
Private enterprises, 2059
Constituents, interests of, 3550
Dairy industry, protection, 3552
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2350
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1010
English and French, harmony, 1341
Exchequer Court judgeship, 2500
Experimental farms, 461
Fertilizers, nitrate of soda, 2307
Fishways, 3363
Fort Edward, N.S., historic site, 3406, 3432, 3435
Fruit trees, new varieties, 2307
Fruits
Pre-cooling, 2056
Vegetables and, freight rates, 626
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs, detention, 3157
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Hydrographic survey, 3337
Immigration
Assisted, 1178
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Chinese, 1445
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3587, 3589
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4646
Japanese, Lemieux agreement, 1447
Imperial Conference, 4645
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4360, 4362
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Johnston, Mr. Alex., salary, 4667
Labour, representation in House, 3555
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 226
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4282, 4290
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Litle Anse, Morrison claim, 4723

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Narcotic Drugs Amdt. bill, 2118, 2122
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2185
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4619
Nova Scotia
Historical society, 3406
Secession talk, 2057, 2177
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3554
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4707
Patents of Invention bill, 2072
Pensions
Appeal board, 683
Old age and mothers, conference, 3046
Pension board, removal, res. 3399
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128, 3223, 3224
Playgrounds, children, 3407, 3432
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4679
Privilege—Civil Service Com. report, 4363
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Railway rates, reductions, 118
Representation, irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, 4490
St. John—Windsor steamship service, 2176
Sawdust pollution of rivers, 3364
Schofield, Rev. Dr., 3399
Seed distribution, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306
Steamship services, Maritime provinces, 2177
Tariff items carried without discussion, 3492
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1298, 4645
Toronto seed branch building, 4623
Windsor-Chester branch line railway, 4333
Windsor, dredging, 1010

Martello Tower, St. John, 3444

Marvale, wreck of, 3333

Massey Harris Company. *See also* Agricultural implements
President of and free trade, 2911
Settlement of war claims, 2497

Masters and Mates. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Matane, Que. wharf, 970

Matapedia Bridge, qu. 4184

Maxwell, Mr. C. F., Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2901

May, Mr. *See* Immigration, Agents

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Dryden, Mr. W. A., payments to, qu. 3704
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, and, 3705
Government offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Grasshopper pest, 596
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Seed-cleaning stations, 600
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973

Mayberry, Col. Thomas R., 286

Meaford, Ont., wharf, 983

Meagher, Mr. N. H. *See* Disallowance

Meats. *See also* Bacon; Cold Storage; Live Stock; Treaties
Canned, inspection, 2202
Chilled and preserved, shipment to Great Britain, 463, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fresh and cured
Exports, 1984
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
Inspection. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Meat products, lard, 1978
Pork products, French treaty. 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978

Mechanics. *See* Labour

Medals. *See* War, Medals

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions

Medical Care. *See* Health; Indians

Medical Course, length of, 2934

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance

Medical Inspections. *See* Health; Immigration; Pensions

Medical Research. *See also* Scientific Research
Banting, Dr. *See that title*
Helium, discoveries by Doctors McLennan and Macallum, 703, 4439
Insulin treatment, discovery of, 703. *See also* Banting
Standardizing and testing laboratories, 703

Medical Students. *See* Universities

Medicine Hat
Customs employees, qu. 3505
Dominion lands office, 3250

Medicines and Drugs. *See also* Health; Narcotic Drugs
"Metagen", analysis of, qu. 1867
Patenting, 703, 2077, 2078
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261

Medicines and Drugs—*Con.*
Proprietary or patent, 700
Supplies for hospitals. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Hospitals

Mediterranean
Fish from Maritime provinces, 3002
Steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636

Meductic-New Brunswick boundary line, 4309

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Address in reply, 17. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 18; delay in coordination and amalgamation of Canadian National Railways, 18-19; Grand Trunk not yet amalgamated with Canadian Nationals; railway expenditure without authority of parliament; immigration policy of government, 19; export of grain crop; export of settlers' effect, 20-21; no government policy to check emigration, provide employment or reduce taxation, 21; natural resources of western provinces; the tariff question; customs collections, 22; national debt increased under present administration, 22-23; decrease in respect to soldiers' pensions, increase in sales tax; added burden of taxes; post office revenue and the stamp tax, 23; late government and reorganization of departments, 24; Great Britain paying off a portion of her national debt, 24; conduct of Dominion finances during war years, 24; western Canada and the harvest of 1922; sounder agricultural conditions; Canada anxious for peace and prosperity; Near East crisis, 25; removal of cattle embargo, 25-26; condition of the western farmer; Bank Act revision, 26; redistribution, 27
Alleged understanding, Mr. Shaw's amendment, 987
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Agricultural conditions, 1853
Committee reports, 1209, 4363
Great Britain in, 1861
Leitch, Prof., dairy industry, 1858
Luxuries, demand for, 1856
Agricultural implements duty, 2246, 2990
Reduction by Conservative government, 2756
Speech of 1910, 2848
Agricultural products, distribution, 1857
Agriculture, estimates, 575

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Alpine Club grant, 3415
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annual drill, 863, 4635
Appointments by government, 2502
Artificial silk, duty, 2990, 3489
Arts, literature and science, recognition, 1289
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084
Attorney General, Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2560
Auditor General, vacancy, 3307, 4512
Australia, trade treaty with, 245, 1849, 1850
Banff park, water powers, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4133-4160
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on, 4143
Newspaper articles, Montreal Standard, 4143
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 496
Bank charters, renewal of, 4143
Bank mergers, 4138
Banking and Commerce Com. proceedings, 4143
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3213-14
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4437
Belgium, treaty with, 246
Belle River wharf, 4594
M. to reduce 4600, neg. 4610
Personal explanation, 4638
Binder twine, duty free, 4379
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, 6
Board of Commerce, 2558, 2571
Boots and shoes, free entry to United States, 3499
Breweries and export liquor houses, 1636
British and foreign news service, 4712
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1546, 1547
Liquor law administration, 2425
British preference, 453
Fifty per cent, 3049
Increase, 3487
Woollen goods, 3460
Brussels postmaster, 1800
Budget, 2984; expressions of good will towards Finance Minister; courtesy and frankness; budget disappointing; omissions from presentation; what a budget should contain; analysis of financial position and trade conditions; budget speeches in Great Britain and Australia; public debt, 2984; additions to; demobilization and war

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
responsibilities; revenues collected during the war; comparison with Great Britain and Australia; taxation of incomes and war profits, 2985; returns for war expenditure; per capita debt; demand for a balanced budget; debt reduction by sale of war material; expenditure, reduction of, 2986; railway obligations; soldiers' civil re-establishment; pensions; soldier settlement; housing; unemployment; expenditure and revenue; tax reductions and debt increases; sugar duty; reduction; refiners' protection not interfered with, 2987; rigid adherence to protective principle; depreciated currency clause; marking clause; orders in council; two favoured industries; lead pencils; lithographic works; dumping clause; tobacco duty, cigarettes, 2988; bootlegging in tobacco; injury to tobacco-manufacturing industry; beet sugar duty; proposals of budget of 1923; British preferential tariff; reasons for changes not apparent; combines and mergers; woollen industry; duty on raisins and currants, 2989; French treaty debate recalled; tariff increase to facilitate negotiations with Australia; artificial silk duty; inconsistency of government; protection principles intact; woollens, tariff reduction and price; farm implements, reduction of duty, 2990; reduction in output and advance in prices; moderate protection; free trade sentiment not making progress; United States competition, 2991; protection cannot be abandoned; reciprocity offer; no change in opinion on question; arguments against reciprocity; geographical considerations; industrial and agricultural competition; organization and production; no guarantee of permanency, 2992; abrogation of the treaty of 1854; termination of recent trade arrangement; trade reprisals, 2993; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; fidelity to political pledges flouted; statements of Mr. Euler, Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Fielding; responsibility of Minister of Finance for Liberal Convention; Prime Minister and the "chart"; declaration of Prime Minister in 1920, 2994; con-

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
vention of Alberta Liberals; endorsement of Liberal platform, 2995; double-dealing policy; appeal to the farmer, assurance to the business man; stability; apostacy of western ministers; declaration for free food and implements of production, 2996; vote in 1919 on the resolution of Mr. McMaster; new taxation unaccompanied by economy; sales tax; declarations of Prime Minister in 1921, 2987; business profits and luxury taxes; pyramiding of taxes; cost of living, comparison of Canadian and United States prices; whole tax passed on to consumer; exempted articles, 2998; addition of newsprint to list; raw wool; agricultural implements; review of government taxation records; necessities of life; implements of production; luxuries; French treaty; embroideries; boots and shoes; wines and brandies; cost of living, 2999; descending curve succeeded by upward movement; professions of economy; direct taxation and "invisible" tariff; political shilly-shally; government losing ground; heroic policy needed; needs of the West and the Maritime provinces, 3000
Speech,
Comment on, 3047, 3077
Revenue statements omitted, 2860, 2898
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House, 179
Adjournments
Early, 74
Hour of, 382, 3208, 3261
Bills
Alteration of, 3449
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3976
Business for to-morrow, 3750
Closure, Rule 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
Committees
Conduct, review by House, 3270
Discussion of questions not referred, 3268
Voting in, 4611
Legislation
Old age pensions, 2518
Pending, 2518, 3265, 3452
Motions
Anticipatory, 3327, 3329
Non-debatable, ruling of Mr. Speaker, 4076
Order of, 4163

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Post office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' day, 1158, 1161-2
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Answers to, 343, 1385
Dropping of, 4511
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 1139, 1385, 4303
Right to put on Orders of the Day, 734
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Resolutions, explanations on, 3483
Returns, inquiry for, 2208, 2394, 3324, 3962, 4513
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4295
Rules
Closure, 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
M. (Mr. Johnston) for special committee, 1301
Supply
Amdt. to amdt. 1301
Motion to postpone, 3667
Procedure, 179
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report of debates, 3285
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada Grain Act administration, 4710
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canada's participation in war, M. (Mr. Power) 1537
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2425
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3827, 3830
Construction without tender and contract, 957
Cost per ton, 957
Policy, 3827
Vote under closure, 4598
Canadian National parks and historic sites
Expenditure, 3941
Water powers, 3939
Canadian National Railways
Advances, $13,099,493.34, 1753
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 34, 58, 2471
Economies resulting, 1616
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 4303-39, 4397, 4689
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4303, 4339, 4397
Amdts. 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Finance, 4329, 4337
Rejection by Senate, 4695

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian Northern, 57, 1615
Acquisition of, 1937
Coal purchases, 4708
United States, 3494
Committee on, 2473
Deficits, 1613
Directors, board of. *See also under this title,* Management
Additional director, Quebec, inquiry, 34
Labour representation of, 1653
Removal of late, correspondence, 3962
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Equipment orders, 2701
Estimates, 1620
Expenditure, 4304
Express and electric lines, 2470
Fixed charges, 1614
Grand Trunk and, 1562
Arbitration, 60
Gratuities to directors and officials
Royal commission 1665, 1668, 1976
Condon, Mr. F. T., K.C., 2297, 2502
Operating results, 1613
Shareholders, list of, 940
Hanna, Mr. D. B., resignation, 1666
Insurance, 1616
Mortgaged premises, 1635, 2048
Management. *See also under this title,* Directors
Changes in, 1612
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., 1612
Non-interference with from day to day, 2473
Responsibilities and powers, 3653, 3677 3687
Resolution of 1921, 3688
System of, 2472
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Minister's annual statement, 1612
Paris offices, purchase, 3208, 3653, 3676, 3683, 3687
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), Chairman's ruling, 3667
Forke, Mr., reference to, 3675
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Real estate transactions, 2518
Revaluation, 2860
Robb, Mr. 2471
Securities, approval of, bill 4403, 4516
Expenditure to be voted by parliament, amdt. 4527, neg. 4528
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Appointment, correspondence, 495
Traffic staff, removal to Halifax, 4708

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Transcontinental, 1615
Unification of systems, 1616
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See under this title,* Labour, International Labour Conference
Cattle embargo, removal of, 575
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
Cheque tax, 3923
Chinese immigration, 1441
Estimates, 1443
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-34, 4536
Cigarette duty, 2988, 3230
Civil Service
Appointments, 208
Bonus, 1811, 1814
Commission, appointment of postmasters, 1798, 1829
Political partisanship, 286
Reform, 409
Superannuation, 3402
Work outside regular duties, 1675
Civil Service Act
Abuse of, 3254
Combines staff, appointment, 2661
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 356, 368, 374, 529, 550
Special committee, 937
First report, 1256
Civilization, evolution of, 1856
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal. *See also under this title* Fuel,
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Reciprocity, 3497
Combines, 2989
Printing, 1623
Combines bill, 496, 990, 992, 2519, 2556, 2604, 2607, 2624-29, 2660-68
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2560
Civil Service Act, violation of, 2661
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Legislation, history of, 2557
Privy Council judgment, 2559
Registrar, appointment of, 2628
Commissioner, and, 2558
Senate amendments, 3505

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2559
Appeals, 2051
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 484
Conferences, 3411
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C., appointment, 2297, 2502
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Copper bounty bill, 4370, 4374
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2345
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 1860
Cost of living, 1684, 1812, 2999
Increase of, 1812, 1853
Sales tax and, 1813
Cotton fabrics for pneumatic tires, 3487
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Inquiry, 1483
Publication of evidence in marriage and divorce proceedings, 1971
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1929. *See also under this title* Freight rates
Extension, 2741
"Cuckoo" government, 3451, 3510
Customs duties, reduction, 90
Customs tariff items, passing of, 3486
Dairy Industry Act, Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Deceased members, tributes to, 6
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1805, 1808
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1806
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2364, 4678
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dominion archives building, 1730
Dominion arsenals, 887, 1752
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4365
Dominion lands and parks
Contingencies, 3408
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Salaries, 3250
Dominion Textile Company, stock, 1853
Dredging. *See also under this title,* Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 1012
Manitoba, 1013
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Unification of work, 3341
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Dry red lead, etc., duty, 3481
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2252
Editorial Committee 1670, 1675-86, 1714
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Emigration to the United States, 211, 1093, 1657

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Emigration—*Con.*
Montreal, from, 2216
New York Tribune, reported statement of, 2790
Esquimault dry dock, 2671
Estimates.
Canadian National Railways, expenditure, 4304. *See also that title*
Commitments, 4598
Obligations maturing 1754
Supplementary, 4420
Time of presentation, 4420, 4422, 4594, 4605, 4703
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1817
Experimental farms, 484
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4012, 4354
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742
Finance Act, 255
Firebrick duty, 3482, 3896
Fiset Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. bill 4009
Forest protection, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
France
Imports and exports, 2015
Trade arrangements, termination, 1999
War losses, 2215
Free trade
Great Britain in, 1860
Not making progress, 2991
Freight rates, 3194
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1948
Suspension of, 1948
Equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1307, 1928
Manitoba, 1931, 1932
Shipping. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates
Legislation, 3265, 4710
Westward from prairie provinces, 1158
French-speaking deputy ministers, 1806, 1808
French treaty, 440, 456
Analysis 449
Border states, 440, 450, 2215
British preference, 453
Concessions to United States, 449
Consideration of, inquiry, 1740
Luxuries, 450
French treaty bill, 2013, 2209, 2239, 2242, 2259-63, 2299-2304, 3910
Agricultural implements, 2246
Boots and shoes, 2240
Brandy, 2302
Bronze powder, 2016, 2217

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
French Treaty bill—*Con.*
Butter, 2217
Buttons, 2214
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Embroideries, 2214
Exports and imports, 2222
Exports to France, 2210, 2213
Favoured nation, 2210, 2213, 2402
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Livestock, 2211
Luxuries, 2213, 2259
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2212, 2259
Revenue, loss of, 2209
Sales tax, 2299
Silks, 2215
Specific duties 2215
Treaty of 1907, 2212
Value of, 2210
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wines, 2302
Fuel supply, 790
Children, death of, 751, 1657
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey estimates, 2504, 2508
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 338
Government commissions, appointments of, 2502. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Government publications. *See also under this title,* Editorial Committee
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste, Judge Snider's report, 1715
Grain and grain trade
Grain inquiry commission, 1210, 4710
Delay in appointment, 2254
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Grain sample market, 304
Grain shipments, Quebec elevator, 3768
Halifax elevator, 4713
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695
Great Britain
Depression in, 1854
Free trade, 1860
Taxation, 2796
Great Lakes disarmament, 244, 247, 494
Grant, Dr., civil service, 558
Graving docks, 2682
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3254
Grondines wharf, 959
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Halibut fishery treaty, 4456-79
Correspondence with British government, 1032
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Halibut fishery treaty—*Con.*
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4480
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title,* Dredging
Estimates, 2671
Manitoba, 993
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Saskatchewan and Alberta 1001
Tenders for repair work, 950
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1692
Hector celebration grant, 4636, 4705
Helmer, Mr., appointment, 3254
Hemp bounty bill, 3912, 4378, 4384
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4658
Homesteads
Inspectors, 3252
Second, 4365
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 3226
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Housing legislation, 2518, 2987
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4683
Correspondence, 208
Feasibility of route, 1069
History of, 1076
Letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co., claim, 4690
M. (Mr. Knox) 1075
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686
Rail removals, qu. 203
Senate investigation, 1076
Welland canal and, 3787
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigraton. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Advertising, 1085
Black, Mr. W. J., appointment, 2664
Canada Colonization Association
Agreement with, 1321
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1334
Field supervisors, Soldier Settlement Board, 1090-2
Chinese. *See under this sub-title,* Oriental
Estimates, 1387
Hindu, 4640, 4658
Ingram, Mr., appointment, 2664
Late administration and, 1335
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1086
May, Mr., appointment, 2663
Oriental
Chinese, 1441, 1443, 2327-34, 4536

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1262
Japanese, 1450
Legislation, principle of, 2328
Policy, 1164, 1335
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2430, 2669
Legislation of 1919, 2431
Undesirable classes, 2669
Vessel crews, 2671
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Egypt, British policy, 4663
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495, 4504
Indians, 2154
Agents, 2162
Perth, N.B., 2154
Cattle, 2162
Doctors, Portage la Prairie, appointments, 2160
Education, 2158
Greater production, 2155
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Reorganization, 2162
St. Peter's reserve, hay lands, 2154
Treatment of, 2158
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4359
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3230, 3969, 4528
Inspection of livestock shipments, 3334
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3045
International boundaries, surveys, 3246
International Labour Conference. *See under this title.* Labour
Italian treaty bill, 2401-04, 2701
Favoured nation, 2402
Lord Curzon, signature, 2403
Japanese fishing licenses, 1547
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status of, 202
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3265
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 6
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1668
Labour
Department
Estimates, 1621
Reduction of officials, 524
Drift to United States, 1812. *See also under this title* Emigration

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1648
Incomplete return, 1539
Report of last meeting, 1442
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Organizing power of, 1857
Labour Gazette, cost of printing, 1621, 1708, 1712
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 227
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 6
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 3265, 4710
Lake of the Woods
Control, M. for papers, 247
Levels, 247, qu. 2700
Lake of the Woods bill, 2886, 4163, 4165
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands, Immigration
Homesteads, 3252, 4365
Soldier settlement, 2019. *See also under this title,* Soldier Settlement
Speculation and taxation, 1395
Laurier monument, 1017
Legislation, record of, 407, 408
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250
Liberal appointments by late government, 2503
Liberal Convention of 1919, 2994
British preference, 454
French treaty, 2211
Labour res. 1651
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on Bank Act, 4143
Library of Parliament, 2693
Life-saving service, 3335
Lindsay arsenal, 884
Linen yarn duty, 3898
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment, 1764
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.
Appointment to Bench, 1764, 1810
Retirement, 2392
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 849
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Marine and Fisheries
Committee report, 3084
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3293, 3303, 3320
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Live stock shipments, 3334
Salary, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Masters and mates, examination, 2610

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Mennonites
Contract with, 1885
Emigration of, 1884
Merchants' bank investigation, 4159
Militia and Defence disbursements, 345
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3976
Mines department, salaries, 3207
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways, appointment, 519
Ministers' and officials' travels, 343
Moderate protection, 2991
Moose Jaw election
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 1686
Murdock, Hon. Mr., 1714
National Defence
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 887, 1752
Estimates, 1751
Pay of staff, 890
Salaries and contingencies, 902
National gallery, 1019
National ownership, 93
Natural resources, western provinces, 2782
Expenditure upon, 2510
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2188, 2191, 2195, 2440-63
Judges, 2446, 2451
Favourable report necessary to issue of certificate, 2440
Secretary of State
Administration by, 2440
Certificates, issue, 2440
Powers of, 2188
Naval service, 902
Department, 3341
Navigation schools, 3332
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Near East crisis, 25, 31
New departmental building, Ottawa, architects, 4633
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
North Essex by-election, 4595. *See also under this title,* Belle River
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2014
Fielding, Hon. Mr. and, 2013
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480, 4487. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Nova Scotia strikes, troops, 868, 898
Offensive partisanship, 3344
Oil bounty, 2511
Old age pensions, legislation, 2518
Oleomargarine
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3449

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
Inquiry, 1309, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 2519, 3526, 3536, 3573
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Precedence, 3271, 3451
Point of order, Mr. Sutherland, 3327
Ontario
Elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4162
Number of members, 252
Orders in Council, 1027
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354, 4487
Repeal by statute, 3504
Ore flotation, 2509
Ore-testing plants, British Columbia, 2509
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Ottawa Typographical Union, copyright, 2144
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Pan-American union, 496
Paper. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Control, 2573
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Prices in Canada and United States, 829
Parliament buildings, cost, 1725
Parliamentary government, 1652
Patents of Invention bill, 2129
Penitentiaries, 771
Penny Bank of Toronto bill, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703, 4746, 4748
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
Federal appeal board, 4703
Old age, 1651, 2518
Women, 1651
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4162
Petition of right, fiats, 3226
Petroleum and Naptha Inspection bill, 3969
Pledges, violation of, 2220
Point of order, relevancy, 2663
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Policies, review of, 408, 409
Political patronage, 2160, 3344
Population, increase of, 1398
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Indians, medical service, 2160
Sewerage system, 993, 2679
Postmaster General, absence of, 1314, 1538
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Post Office department
Administration, 1817
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1825
Revenue attributable to postal service, 1817
Ross, Mr. George W., retirement, 1825
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prices. *See also under this title,* Budget; Cost of living
Agricultural products and manufactured goods, 1853
Producer and consumer, 1853
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4678
Printing
Contracts to newspapers, etc., 2394
Reduction in cost, 1671
Printing bureau, new building, 1735
Fire hazard, 1736
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Privilege
Carroll, Mr., 3267
Committee, discussion, anticipatory, 3267
Production costs and labour organization, 1857
Progressive party, Union government and big interests, 1853
Promissory notes, tax, 3923
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389, 410
M. (Mr. Good) 406, 430
Protection, increase in industries, 2798
Public buildings
New departmental, 1729
Nova Scotia, 4612
Renting or building, 1736
Public debt, responsibility for, 2920
Public expenditure. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Estimates
Public Service Act Amdt. bill, 3402
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950-5
Public works, committments, 962
Publication of evidence, etc., 1971
Publicity agent, London, Mr. W. T. Cranfield 2927, 2983, 4707
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4012, 4354
Royal commission, 3412, 3413, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Quebec
Champlain dock, 2675
Grain elevator, 3768
Statutes of, 1660
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2467
Railway Commission, 3192

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Railway Commission—*Con.*
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Minister of Agriculture, 3192
Criticism of, 3192
Railways. *See also under this title,* Canadian National
Branch lines, 1735
Financial situation, 1753
Railways and Canals, Minister, appointment, 1081
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Reciprocity with United States
Agreement of 1911, 3902
Agricultural implements, 3499
Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A., 2922
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
Offer to negotiate, 3901, 3908
Permanency, 3079
Request for information, 3504
Redistribution, 27, 162, 487
Ivel, Mr. W. M., 733
Special Committee on bill, 937
Printing of proceedings, 3399
Report, 4736
References to, 89-96. *See also speeches* on Budget
Returned soldiers
Appointment, 1800
Civil Service appointments, 1797
Revised Hansard, inquiry, 122
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company; tax, 4490
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1849, 3475
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1149
Reason for increase in force, 1149
Royal Canadian navy, 902
Recruiting for volunteer reserve, 2898
Rural credit system, 4144
Rural population, 1854
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John harbour improvements, 2677
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., 1006
St. Lawrence river waterway, qu. 204, 3786
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Second homesteads, 4365
Secretary of State dept. estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 4367
Seed testing bill, 2304
Senate estimates, 2694
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 2996

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Singapore naval base, 3822
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Expenditure, 2894
Walkerville, alleged statement at, 2014
Reference to, 670, 708
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 2892
Soldier settlement, 2987
Advertising, 2023
Expenditure, 2018
Land taxation, 3260
Legal expenses, 2018
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344
Special War Revenue Act Amdt., 4364, 4409
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 7
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; French Treaty
Agricultural implements, 2756
Election pledges, violation, 1658
Figures, 90
Luxuries, 2015
Policy of government, 3492
Reduction of duties, 2561
Rural population and, 1854
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Address; Budget; Income Tax; Special War Revenue
Increased burden of, 1854
Sales tax, 4409
Imports, 4410
Increase in, 2213
Necessaries of life, 94-5, 2999
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682
Terrebonne public building, 2690
Thornton, Sir Henry, qu. 284, 495. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3208, 3845
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288
Tobacco duties, smuggling, 2989, 3230
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3244
Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Harbour improvements, 985, 2678
Viaduct, 4441
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French; Halibut; Italian
Government and, 1850
Signing of, 4457
Tree-planting, 3416
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 898

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Trusts, 3231. *See also under this title,* Combines
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unemployment, 2987
Minister of Labour, responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
United States. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Borrowings from, 95
Industries in Canada, 4380
Liquor laws, 4295
Obligations to, 23, 93
Unrest, western Canada, 4514
Vancouver harbour bill, 259
Victoria dry dock, 1002
Vimy Ridge memorial, 182
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1747
War profiteering, 2921
Waste paper, sale by government, 1714
Water powers, forest reserves, 1256
Welland canal construction, 3786
Western provinces, conditions, 1854
Wharves, revenue, 977
Wheat board
Establishment of, 409
Extension of legislation, 2696
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Native, 2011
Wingham postmaster, 1800
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Melita, Man. bank robbery, 1147

Melville, Mr. G. D., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

Members of Parliament. *See* House of Commons

Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Emigration; Immigration

Mental Tests, 1219

Merchants' Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
Immigration policy, 1115
Lachine canal bridge, 2299
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Transcontinental, Montreal branch line, qu. 2392

Mergers. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Combines bill

Merit System. *See* Civil Service

"Metagen" analysis of, qu. 1867

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service. *See* Marine

Metric System, qu. 914

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 859, 867
Hamilton public building, 4628
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4588
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3329
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3859
Port Maitland pier, 4589
Sales tax, 4418

Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention of, 2297, 2469

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Bankruptcies among farmers, 1495
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3105
Capital punishment, 769
Civil Service salaries, qu. 2086
Dorchester penitentiary, supplies, qu. 494
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4345
Forest protection, M., 816
Fuel supply, qu. 203
Indian agent, Perth, N.B., 2155
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 310
Amdt. 311
Mechanics, qu. 203
New Brunswick forest fires, relief, 4010
Pensions, European war, 3713
Political patronage, 3348
Potatoes
Exports, qu. 621
Industry, 310
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
Steel, L. R. Company, qu. 1994

Michell, Professor, cost of living, 1700, 1812

Michigan Central Railway, bridge, qu. 1257

Middleman. *See* Prices

Midland wharves, 983

Migration. *See* Emigration

Migratory Birds Convention Act, administration, 3443

Militarism, 4652. *See* National Defence, Annual Drill, Cadet Services

Military Camps. *See* Petawawa

Military Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner); War

Military Expenditures. *See* National Defence

Military Hospitals. *See* Hospitals

Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See* Labour, Strikes; National Defence

Militia and Defence. *See* National Defence

Militia Pensions. *See* Pensions

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bills
1. Retired war officers in Public Service.
Res. 1740, 2052; 1r., com., 2053; 3r., 2086
2. Period of service entitling to pensions.
Res. 3582, 3975; 1r., 2r., com., 3976; 3r., 3977

Milk. *See* Dairying Industry; Prices

Mill Feeds, adulteration. *See* Agriculture; Feeding Stuffs Act; Grain and Grain Trade; Milling Industry

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply, 50. Unemployment question, 50; immigration; soldier land settlement; Canada Colonization Association, 51; lake grain rates; deep waterways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; com. on agricultural conditions, 52; marketing of grain, 53
Agricultural expenditure, 3239
Agricultural implements, standardization, 789, 805
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2135, 2137
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4081-4113
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Binder twine industry, 4386
Canada Grain Act, administration, 784
Canadian Air Force, Saskatchewan, 1784
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3407, 3434
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4336
Paris offices, 3610
Cattle shipped to Great Britain, 2135
Report as to tuberculosis, 2469
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Cold storage companies, 188
Combines bill, 2546
Copper bounty, 3239

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 3152
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4670
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4368
Dominion lands and parks, 3252
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Experimental farms, 469, 485
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4407
Freight rates, shipping, 3763, 3787
Fuel supply, 792, 805, 3205
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Dockage, 784
Government, mixing, 2036
Screenings, 2039
Sheep feeding, 2040
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commission, appointment, 1763
Marketing and shipment, 53, qu. 494
Amendment, 311
Insurance, 3764
Motion, 288
Shipping rates, 3787. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates bill
Grants to military associations, 889
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Health of animals, 576
Historic sites, 3407, 3434
Hogs
Cholera contracted from whey, 3299
Grading, 591
Homestead inspectors, 3252, 3254
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1057
Immigration, Canada Colonization Association, 51
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4497
Interest rate, 4111
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4221-33
Lightkeepers salaries, 3352
Live Stock Acts Amdt., 276
Live stock industry, 469
National gallery, 1019
National monument, Connaught place, 2688
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2457, 3985
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Judges, 2457
Naturalization, obstacles in way of, 2457
Oil-drilling, southern Alberta, 2508
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions, European war, 3722
Public expenditure, 4422
Public works, apportionment of, 4561
Quebec wharves, 980
Rural mail delivery, 1790

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
St. Lawrence river
Ship channel, 3340, 3343
Waterway, report, 3428
Sales tax, 4422
M. (Mr. Stevens) 922
Saskatchewan wharves, 1001
Seed Purchasing Commission, qu. 279
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, qu. 206, 2021
Special war revenue, 4422
Tree-planting stations, 3413
Tuberculous cattle, fraudulent trade, 485, 576
Vancouver harbour bill, 262, 263
Wages, 3205
Water power leases, 3426
Welland canal construction, 3763, 3787
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345

Miller Bill. *See* Race Track Betting

Miller, Mr. Roger, claim, 4676

Millerand, Mons. A., President French Republic, 1538

Milling Industry. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act; Flour; Grain and Grain Trade
Millers, conference, 604
Millfeeds. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act
Adulteration of, 600, 2875
Legislation, inquiry, 2795
Milling in bond, 2960
Protection, 146-147
Selection of wheat for milling, 2980

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Binder twine, price, 4387
Experimental farms, 470
Fuel oil, standardization, 808
Fuel supply, 808
Gasoline, short measure, 810
Hemp bounty bill, 4387
White Mud river, fishway, 3362

Milner, Lord, credit and industry, 627

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Fuel; Geological Survey
Asbestos, 460, 2750
Assay office, Vancover, 3207
Cobalt, 2750. *See also* Treaties, French
Committee, 3204
Changes in membership, 1483, 2047
Failure to function, 1271
Reports
Coal on, 4514, 4743
First, 1384, 1738
Second, 1738
Third, 4436, 4592

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, 3235
Copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 3035. *See also* Bounties; Copper
Customs drawback, 2655
Rod mill, opening of, 2943
Copper Mountain, 2504
Department
Deputy minister, Mr. Camsell, 1265
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Publications, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207
Dome Mines Company, 4209
Explosives division, 2514
Fuel-testing division, 3197
Gaspé, 1242
Gold. *See also that title*
Labrador gold discovery, 1995, 2611, qu. 2696
Output, 2750
Percentage of national wealth, 2720
Gypsum, 2349
Plaster quarries and, 1010
Hudson bay region, 1049, 1076. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
Alberta coal, 1163
Edmonton, 1268
Iron ores
Alberta 2512
Deposit, Vancouver island, 2514
Irrigation, rights of leaseholders. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
Miners' strikes. *See* Labour
Mining companies
Dividends. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
Shares, 4208
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Nickel, 2750
Shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Ontario Goldfields, 4209
Ores
Flotation, 2509
Ore-dressing division, 3197
Ore-testing, Nelson, B.C., 2505
Shipment to Ottawa testing plant, 2505
Precious metals, content of, 4371
Quartz mining in Yukon, 249
Queen Charlotte islands, 150
Revenue from leases, 2510
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Silver production, 2750
Sudbury copper mines, 4371

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Trail, B. C., smelter, 2861, 3235
Refractory ores, 2506
Yukon, 86-89, 249. *See also that title*
Exhibit, British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Mayo silver strike, 3943

Mining Companies. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill

Mining Leases. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill

Mining Rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act; Yukon Act Amdt. bill

Ministers of the Crown
Absence of, 2934, 3043. *See also* Murphy, Hon. Charles
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Appointed acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
Number of, 3043
Salaries, 4671. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act
Proposed reduction of 12½ per cent, M. (Mr. Leader) 1153, 2915
Travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1848-9 2815, 3017, 3474-5

Minorities, Senate and, 1377

Miramichi River fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Miscellaneous Private Bills. *See* Private Bills

Miscou-Shippegan Steamship service, 2173

Mitchell, Mr. A. J. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Interest in insurance companies, 2050

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140, 4145
Banking and Commerce Com., Mr. D. C. Macarow, 4145
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2390

Mixing of Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Modus Vivendi. *See* Fish and Fisheries; United States

Moncton, N.B.
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, 1756
Transfer to Montreal, 574
Headquarters, 13, 2971
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307

Moncton and Buctouche Railway, qu. 203, 3646, 4197

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Prices; Public Expenditure; Purchasing Power
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666
Origin and function of, 632, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 44, 1167, 1168, 4666

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Monk, the late Hon. F. D. *See* Proportional Representation

Monopolies. *See* Combines

Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912

Montreal (city)
Canadian National headquarters, suitability, 62-63
Chamber of Commerce, Bankruptcy Act, 1492
Coal situation, 254
Customs house and revenue, 3280
Daylight saving, post office, qu. 3143
Emigration, 2216
Skilled mechanics, 2790
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, 2719
Ordnance stores building, 1022
Post office
Appointments, 1800
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Postal stations
Number of, qu. 3135
Postal station "G", qu. 623
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Public Works employees, 381
Transcontinental railway, connection, qu. 2393
Unemployment, 42, 2719
Union stockyards, 2762

Montreal (port). *See* also Vancouver Harbour Bill
Cold storage warehouse, 185, 272, qu. 1633, qu. 1488, qu. 2204, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt
Grain elevator
Capacity, 3767
Grand Trunk, qu. 1974
New, qu. 1663
Grain shipments, 1768, qu. 1973, 1974, 4230
Shortages, complaint of British importers, 1764, 2037
United States grain handling, 1760
Wheat shipments, qu. 385

Montreal (port)—*Con.*
Harbour commission. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
Advances, qu. 812, 4363, 4508
Lumber importations, qu. 1867
Names and salaries, qu. 1137
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Montreal Corn Exchange, lake tonnage, 4289

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Advance of $10,000,000.)
Res. 4363; 4508; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4508

Montreal Shipping Federation. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Vessel crews, 2670

Montreal Standard editorial, Bank Act, 4125, 4142

Monuments and Memorials. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; War
Baker, Late Lieut Col. G. H., M.P., 435, 730
Champlain monument, Orillia, 4705
Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, 3433
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 1017
Law, the late Bowman B., 1020
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, 4704
Vimy Ridge monument, 811. *See also that title*

Moore, Mr. Tom, President Dominion Trades Congress, 1170
Immigration, 1167
Labour
Eight-hour day, 1427
Representative on Canadian National board, 1652-6, 3636

Moose Jaw. *See also* Elections; Johnson, R. M.
By-election, 2224, 2760
Announcement of vacancy, 615
Certificate, Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Eggs, price of, 1852
Hopkins, Mr. E. N.
Congratulations to, 2760
Introduction, 2417
Hudson Bay railway
Alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell. 1686, 2774, 2787, 4683
Promises, 1073
Murdock, Hon. Mr. 1714
Oleomargarine, 3536
Results, 2760

Moose Jaw—*Con.*
By-election—*Con.*
Return, delay, 2295
Tariff, one of main issues, 2714
Income tax office, qu. 2699
Member for and reciprocity agreement, 3010
Public building, 1023
Stockyard, 2779

Moose Mountain
Forest reserve, 3453
Pleasure resort, 3408, 3453

Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259

Morel, Mr. E. D. *See* Germany, Reparations

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3211
Canada, constitutional development, 4469
Halibut fishery treaty, 4469
Imperial Conference, 4653
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Translation of bill, 4435
Treaties, signing of, 4469

Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028

Morrisburg and Waddington ferry, qu. 1029

Morrisburg dam, 1270

Morrison, Mr. D. W., postmaster, St. Peter's, N.S. qu. 1488, 1489

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2928. Congratulations to Finance Minister; agricultural conditions; prices of agricultural and manufactured products;purchasing power; manufacturing overhead; "calamity howlers"; British preference; further increase; combines; shipping; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2928; trade with Great Britain and the United States; high duties interfering with trade; cigarettes; immigration; branch lines; emigration to the United States; farm credits; rural credits; commission on banking and credits; unjust treatment of farmers by banks; United States credit service; amortization plan; Canadian Pacific railway, land sale contracts; copper; artificial silk and hemp bounties; assistance to capitalists

Morrison, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
but nothing for the farmer; budget a step backwards; high protectionists in Liberal party; camouflaged Tories masquerading under false colours; reciprocity, defeat of in 1911, 2931; Conservatives true to false principles; Liberals false to true principles; election promises not carried out; Liberal platform of 1919 treated as scrap of paper, 2932
Cold Storage bill, 187, 189, 275
Economic conditions, 1238
Farm labourers, wages and dwellings, 1240
Forestry, fire prevention, 4346
Hudson Bay railway, 98
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1240
Literature, 1239
Policy, 1238
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Land, sale of to immigrants, 1091
Postmasters, appointment of returned soldiers, 1799
Tariff as it affects East and West, 2753
Western provinces, conditions in, 1238
Woollen industry
British preference, 3471
Protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 933

Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater claim, 4572, 4722

Mortgaged Premises, Insurance. *See* Canadian National Railway Bills

Mortgages. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Farms, Mortgages

Moss, Mr. H. R., illegal arrest, 2030

Mothers' Pensions. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Accredited herd system, 577. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Special committee, 667, 706
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agriculture department
Dairy branch activities, 3283
Deputy minister
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Salary, 611
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3988, 4674
Salaries and contingencies, 610
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Alberta coal, freight rates, 3201
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 666, 2047, 2131. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290
Bacon
Grading, 593
Salty, 3301
Bees, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Bounties, copper and hemp, 2778
Budget, 2756. Tariff of Sir John Macdonald on agricultural implements; civil service, increase of; Department of Agriculture, staff; civil government, cost of; estimates, preparation of, 2756; grain shipments; stream of wealth from the West; wheat board; demands from the West; idle statements and threats; no turning back; cattle shipments, space on ships; Manitoba Free Press, 2757; Canadian Government Merchant Marine and cattle shipments; letter from Mr. R. B. Teakle; letter from Sir Henry Thornton, 2758; fictitious demand for space; rates, 2759; cattle embargo, removal of; Moose Jaw election; Atlantic shipping rates; conference in Great Britain; report of North Atlantic Conference; rate on Canadian and United States flour, 2761-2; union stockyards, 2762; agricultural conditions; Maritime provinces; specialized farming; potato-growing in New Brunswick; fruit industry, 2763; Quebec; co-operative cold storage; silos and ensilage; farming on poor land; farm credits, 2764; dairying; Ontario fruit-growing; pre-cooling plants; dairy industry; modernized methods; antipodean competition; butter and cheese, 2765; grading; western provinces; dairying; improved methods; cold storage; diversified farming; chief industry; grain-growing, 2766; failures and successes, 2767; debt, 2768; farm credits; dairying; Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, record production; debts of municipalities; unpaid taxes, 2769; Saskatchewan farm loan bonds bought by farmers; Premier Dunning on economic conditions, 2770; wheat production; cost and selling price; Premier Dunning and the budget, 2771; tariff stability but not finality; agricultural questionaire and answers; mixed farming, 2772; grain unsold, 2773; insect and fungus pests; grasshoppers; live stock and dairy industry; Moose Jaw election; Hudson Bay railway; immigration, 2774; disparagement of the country; opportunities and prospects, 2775; amdt. (Mr. Forke); tariff reduction, Progressive party and; British preference, list of articles admitted at 40 per cent or over of present general tariff rate, 2776; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks; free trade with Great Britain, 2777; reciprocity agreement of 1911; revenue; land values tax; not a protectionist budget; bounties, 2778; assistance to new industries, 2779; excise tax on luxuries; hemp bounty; binder twine, 2780; discrimination against the West; protection of no essential value to prairies; cause of discontent; bad farming, 2781; natural resources; cost of administering; transfer of to western provinces, 2782; terms of settlement discussed with Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2783
Speech, reference to, 2845, 3064
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3819
Cattle shipments. *See also under this title* Cattle
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4316
Management, responsibility and power, 3657
Paris offices, 3657
Canned meats, inspection, 2202
Carvell, Hon. F. B., statement regarding, 3188
Cattle
Cattle embargo
Breeding cattle, 3291
Correspondence, 4295
Removal of, 575, 2760
Shipments
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2758, 3040, 3819
Cattle boats, unsanitary conditions, 2613
Chilled beef, trial shipment, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fat cattle, trial shipment, 3091, 4675

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Vessel space, 1869, 3040
Fictitious demand for, 2759
Cereal rust, 595
Civil Service
Commission, appointments, delay, 3292
Increase of, 2756
Codling moth, 597
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 184, 271-6, 2054, 2055, 2086, 2199
Cold storage plants, 3289
Cheese, 2055
Co-operative, 2764
Pre-cooling, 2056, 2765
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 484. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bills
Butter substitutes, 2518, 3150, 3325
M. for discharge of order, 3325, 3449
Renovated butter, 2961, 4251, 4270, 4344, 4510
Dairying industry, 609, 2765, 3283
Butter grading, 2766, 3283
Butter, pasteurization, 3298
Certified milk, 3300
Cheese grading, 2766, 3283, 3295
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Milk
Filled, 3152
Pasteurizing, 3283
Research laboratory, 3297
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive insect pests, 595, 2774, 3988
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, 3294
Experimental farms, 456-485
Buildings, 4631
Ottawa Central, 481
Farm and Ranch Review, fraudulent stock-yard practices, 576
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4271, 4273, 4538
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Field crop competitions, 602
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 193, 277, 2105, 2131, 3150
Fruit industry, 598, 2763
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, 2307
Grain
Grain-growing, 2766
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar) 301
Unsold, 2773
Grasshopper plague, 596, 2774

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Health of Animals, 575-87, 4676. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle; Live Stock
Contagious diseases, 484
Tuberculosis, 484, 580, 2134, 2469
Eradication, 3989
Tuberculin test, 3300
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hog grading, 594
Horses
Horse-breeding, 589
Market for, 590
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2253
Hudson Bay railway, 2774
Alleged statement, 4683
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3594
Policy, 2774
Progressive members, 2774
"Someone with more money than brains" 1205
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Live Stock, 587. *See also under this title,* Cattle; Horses
Commissioners, visit to South America, 1213
Tuberculosis. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192, 276-7, 2200, 2292, 3150
Penalties, 2203
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Activities, 3310
Appointment, 2614, 3305, 3310
Cattle embargo, reported statements on, 2614
Political partisanship, alleged, 3316
Qualifications, 3306, 3310
Salary, 608, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, in, 3595
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Florida, to, 3311
Great Britain, 3291, 3310, 4675
Millfeeds, adulteration, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs Act
Moose Jaw by-election, reported statement, 1686, 2774
Moose Mountain forest reserve, 3453
Noxious weeds, 2305
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Attitude on, 3576
Dairy Industry Act, correspondence, 3327

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
"Manna" 3152
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3574
Quebec harbour, cold storage, 2055
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 746
Renovated butter, 3151, 4251. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3283, 3288
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed potatoes, inspection of, 2306
Seed purchasing commission, 599
Seed testing bill, 195, 277, 2304
Seeds, purity of, 601
Speeches, pre-election, 2952, 3188
Spruce bud worm, 596
Stock Growers' Protective Association grant, 588
Supply, undiscussed items, 3285
Tariff, attitude on, 2996
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4316
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Tuberculosis in cattle *See under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Winnipeg Free Press, 2790
Woollen industry protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Moving Pictures, fisheries publicity, 3365

Mowat, Capt. Henry, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Mulgrave-Guysboro steamship service, 2173

Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257.

Multi-Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas. *See* Secretary of State

Municipalities
Extravagance, 2797
Historic sites, 3432
Municipal cold storage. *See* Cold Storage
Municipal government in park areas, 3436
Soldiers, hospital treatment, 673
Taxation, 4493. *See also that title*
Irritating, 2804
Land taxes, 1395
School taxes, 3445, 4205
Unpaid, 637, 2953, 2961, 3445, 4205
Tax sales, 2961

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Annuities
Agents for, 1642
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Old age pensions and, 1639, 1651, 1682
Board of Commerce, 2564, 2570
British Empire Steel Corporation employees, 1705
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada National Railways, printing, 1623
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Combines bill, 2562, 2616-34
Definition "combine" 2616
Distribution of report, 2634
Registrar, inquiry, 2620
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2565
Cost of living, 2569
Reference to, 1812
Statistics, 1684
Michell, Prof., 1700
Dominion-provincial labour conference, 1442
Editorial committee, cost, 1669
Emigration to United States, 1657
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 321
Government publications
Distribution, 1712
Waste paper sold, 1713
Hansard
Distribution of, 1715
Revised, inquiry, 122
Immigration, contingencies
M. to reduce, agreed to, 1908
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 1361, 2061
Senate amdts., non-concurrence, 4357
King's Printer, 1669
Labour
Concilliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conference, 1678
Department
Annuities branch, 1639, 1682
Cooperation with provincial departments, 1678
Estimates, 1621, 1637, 1668
Decrease in, 1643
Salaries, 1657, 1668
Staff, reduction of, 1671
Statistics, 1682
Eight-hour day, 1650
Employment offices, 1674
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Employment service director, 1676
St. John, 3453
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 1646, 1702, 1707, 1716

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442
Incomplete return, 1539
Delegates and expenses, 1642
Draft conventions and recommendations, 1441
Papers tabled, 1483
Recommendations
Federal-provincial jurisdiction, 1645
Text, tabled, 1631
Report of last meeting, 1442
Joint Industrial councils, 1654
King's Printer, 1668
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Provincial departments, 1706
Right to organize, 2889
Strikes, 1628, 1702
Nova Scotia miners, 915, 1627, 1716
Sydney steel workers, 287
Thetford Mines, 2207
Year, 1922. M. (Sir Henry Drayton) 245 495, 815
Technical Education
Administration, 1637
Director of, 1674
Labour Gazette
Correspondents, 1626
Editor, 1671
Expenses, 1624
Hooper, Mr. Ronald, 1625-6
International Labour Conference, report, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1625, 1708, 1712
Ministers of the Crown, number, 3043
Moose Jaw, by-election, 1714
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3456
Pensions, old age, 1648. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Post office supplies, purchase, 3953
Powell River Paper Company
Labour organization, 2889
Speech, reference to, 3072
Printing bureau
Employees, 1623
New building, 1731, 1735
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Printing contracts to newspapers, 2394, 2614
Purchasing Commission, 3953, 4002
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 764
Reference to, 3067
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Unemployment
Federal-provincial responsibility, 1678
Meighen, Mr., responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
Relief, 1644, 1658
Calgary, 1683
Expenditure, 1655
Responsibility for, 1657, 1678
Returned soldiers, 1679
Winnipeg, 435

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Absence through illness, 1538, 1816, 1826
Boulay, Mlle., Sayabec postmistress, 3706, 3756
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
Parliament buildings committee, 1718
Patronage, 1795
Postal treaties, 4529
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528
Railway mail service, 4529

Murray Bay Point au Pic wharf, 973

Murray Stewart, steamer. *See* Marine; Vessels

Musgrave, Governor, 1916

Musk Ox in Barren Lands, evidence of Mr. Stefansson, 1073

Mustapha Kemal. *See* Near East Crisis

Naphtha. *See* Petroleum and Naphtha

Nappan, dairy herd, 2863

Napoleon, Code. *See* Code Napoleon

Napoleonic Wars
Agricultural products and rents, 1858
Conditions following, 1231

Narcotic Drugs
Export of, 698
International conference, 698
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 1443
Enforcement by Mounted Police, 1142
Prosecutions, 698

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill
(Consolidation; appeals; identification; penalties)
1r., 1136; 2r., com., 2114; 3r., 2124; Senate amdts; 3149

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of, 2120
Certificate of Dominion analyst, 2119
Definitions, 2114
Deportation, convicted alien, 2123
Importing or exporting without license, 2114
Licenses and fees, 2114
Liniments, ointments, etc. 2117
Onus of proof, 2117, 3149
Opium
Resort, being in, 2117
Smoking, 2117
Penalties, 3149
Persons to whom drugs may be sold, 2115
Physicians, veterinary surgeons, dentists, 2115
Power to search for drugs, 2120
Records, not keeping, 2115

National Council of Women, Mrs. James Carruthers, 1647

National Dairy Council. *See* Dairying

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence
Accounts, qu. 205
Active militia, pensions, 2166, 3706
Ammunition, 884
Artillery, 1740
MacBrien, General, 1742
Great Britain from, statement, 1740
Quantity in store, 1741
Small arms, 1741, 1743
Annual training. *See under this title,* Militia
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1024
Haileybury, 4615
Minto Street, Winnipeg, qu. 2084
Army, mental tests, 1219
Arsenals, 2165
Lindsay, 883, 1744
Quebec, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 877, 1743
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749
Approaches to, improvement, 1749, 4565
Building and equipment, acquisition of, 1777
Desertions, 2418
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Repair shops, 1750, 1774
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, new, 1774, 1748

National Defence—*Con.*
Canadian Air Force—*Con.*
Expenditure, 2970
Forest patrol, 1776
Royal air force, aeroplanes, gift, 1748
Vickers company, 1748
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Colt machine guns, inventions, 4635
Department
Acting Minister, 2710. *See also* Graham; Macdonald
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., financial controller, 1806, 3342
Estimates, 859, 1740, 1772, 4635
Expenditures by provinces, 3891
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, 1806
Retirement, 891, 3342, 3135
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as Acting Minister, 2295
Naval Service, amalgamation, 3342
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, amalgamation, 3893
Staff reduction, 1773
Survey work, 2508
Disbursements, qu. 344
Engineer services and works, 4638
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Grants to associations, 889
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
May, Miss H. M., compassionate grant, 900
Militarism, 866
Military districts, reduction, 868
Military expenditure, 858, 873, 901, 2921, 3076, 3238
Reduction of, M. (Mr. Lanctot) 866, neg. 876
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Military signal service, 3338
Militia
Annual training, 859, 4635
Expenditure and results, 2933
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Payments since 1922, 386
Pensions. *See* Militia Pensions bill; Pensions
Petawawa Camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Services, 859, 1747
Use of in strikes. *See under this title,* Troops
Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See under this title,* Troops
Naval Service, 1744
Consolidation with National Defence and Marine depts., 3341
Curtailment of, 2933

National Defence—*Con.*
Naval Service—*Con.*
Esquimalt
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634
Stores, 4638
Expenditure, 3076
Naval colleges, Esquimalt and Halifax, 1744
Royal Canadian naval reserve, recruiting, 2897, 2950
Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
War claims, adjustment, 900
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1745
Vickers Company, contract, cancellation, 1746
Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635
Ordnance
Arms, lands, etc. 890
Montreal stores building, 1022
Pay of staff, 890
Peachy, Mr. C., Regina, grant, 4638
Permanent force, 892
Physical training, 877
Royal Canadian regiment, 4638
Schools of instruction, 900
Tecumseh barracks, London, 4638
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627
Valcartier camp grounds, qu. 2298
War claims, adjustment, 1745
Militia services, 900
War medals, 1743
Warlike stores, 900
Wireless stations, 3337
Wolseley barracks, London, 4638

National Fuel Policy. *See* Fuel

National Gallery, 1018, 2688

National Industrial Conference. *See* Labour

National Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Ottawa

National Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Lands and Parks

National Parks and Reservations Bill
(Separation of parks from reservations; administration as recreation grounds; bird and wild animal sanctuaries; historic sites) 1r., 3131

National Policy. *See also* speeches on Budget
Adoption by Liberal party, 2838
Agriculture and, 2786
Anti-national and anti-social, 3018
Budget in accordance with, 2718
Canada's development due to, 2818
Permanency of, 4652
Results, 3060
Rural interests, unjust to, 2786
Special privileges, 2786

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Trust Company, 57
Statement of president on immigration, 1123

National Status. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

National Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, Conservative alliance with, 2924

Nationality. *See* Naturalization
Mental tests according to, 1219

Natural Gas. *See* Natural Resources

Natural Resources, 1880-1, 2836. *See also* Coal; Forests and Forestry; Fuel; Hudson Bay Railway; Immigration; Mines and Minerals; Timber
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Development, 2785
Capital necessary for, 2744, 2802, 3027
Estimate of value, 2719
Valuable only when developed, 2744
Drainage, 3256
Forests, 3416. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Gaspe, 1242
Hoppe leases, 3128. *See also* Hoppe
Interchange with United States, 2910
Maritime provinces, equity of, 2972
Minerals, 3198. *See also* Coal; Mines
Investigation of, 3197
Natural gas, well-drilling machinery, 3487
Ownership and taxation, 2729
Paternalism, 3071
Per capita value, 2714
Regaining of, 2728
Unemployment, 629
Water powers, 3420
Western provinces, 21, 2782, 2972, 3424
Expenditure upon, 2510
Immigration policy and, 1092. *See also* Immigration

Naturalization. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Administration of acts, 2495
Judges and. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Jurisdiction over. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental
Repatriation, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1379, withdrawn, 1382
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Naturalization Acts Amdt. Bill
1r., 1384; 2r., com., 2107; com., 2182; 2437; 3983; 3r., 3985
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for naturalization, 2109
Arbitrary powers, 2456
British system, 2438
Citizenship, obstacles in way of, 2455
Consolidation, 2110, 2182, 2199, 2437
Correspondence, Secretary of State and county court judges, Vancouver, 2199
Denaturalization, 2332, 2451, 2456
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Japan, nationality, 2443
Japanese, 1899
Judges, 2437, 2446, 2451
Application for naturalization, 3983
Investigations, "huge joke," 2446
Judicial and executive authority, 2462
Nationality, dual, amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2442, 2451, 2456, 2463
Natural-born British subject, definition, 2107
Naturalization
Imperial, 2463
Limited, 2461
Politics and, 2438, 2466
Orientals, 2461
Relationship, naturalization law to Immigration Act, 2455
Repeal, 3983
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Administration by, 2437, 2453
Discretion, 2447
Winnipeg Free Press, editorial, 2454

Naval Defence. *See under* National Defence, Naval Service

Naval Protection. *See* Canada's Participation in War

Naval Service. *See* Imperial Conference; National Defence

Navigation. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence

Near East Crisis. *See also* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference
Canada's participation, 12-13, 25, 40, 45, 71, 105, 120-121, 141, 162, 169, 1266, 2815, 4655
Prime Minister, statement, 29-33

Necessaries of Life. *See* Address; Budget; Combines; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices; Tariff; Taxation

Negro Point breakwater, 4587

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 174; the two amendments, 174; economy and free trade, 175-176; policy of moderate protection, 177
Agricultural conditions in West, 1192
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, 3160
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Business of the House, M. to increase taxation, 3937
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 114
Canadian National Railways, agents for labour supply, 1191
Canadian Pacific railway, labour supply, 1191
Certificated masters, coasting vessels, 3971
Cheque tax, 3925, 3931
Amdt. 3935
Payment with postage stamps, 1818
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-36, 4537
Children born in Canada, 2323
Head tax, 2323
Merchants and students, 2323
Fraudulent entry, 2324
Merchants
Definition of, 2483
Retail, attitude towards, 2322
Scope of, 2323
Coal, bituminous, duty, 1278, 3495, 3499
Eight-hour law, conference, qu. 207, qu. 279
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fish and fisheries
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Freight rates, 1953
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Free trade, Progressives and, 1196
Freight rates
Oliver, Hon. John, 1952
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1951
Original motion, effect of, 1953

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Fuel oil, competition with coal, 807
Fuel supply, 807
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4643
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1193
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific agents, 1191
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Labour employers and, 1193
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Chinese, registration certificates, 1452
Exclusion from United States, 1194
Japanese
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1450
Lemieux agreement, 1450
Naturalization, 2442
Registration system, 1452
Supposed special privileges to landholders, 1450
Violation of regulations, 1451
Policy, 1191
Population not increased by, 1195
Propaganda, 1192
Railways and, 1193
"Unseen Hand", the, 1193
Immigration Act Amdt. bills, 3981
Intending immigrants, 74, 497, 4441
Imperial Conference, 4643-49
Income tax, 1195, 4501
Japan, trade with, 1450
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Discontent, 1194
Right to organize, 2896
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4240
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Japanese, 2442
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109, 2442, 2465
Amdt. 2442
Nationality, dual, 2442
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3564
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 700
Pacific coast steamship services, 4003
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3860
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
Committees, 288
Powell River Paper Company, 2886, 2896
Promissory notes tax, 3925

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 393
Railway Commission, steamship services and, 4003
Reciprocity with United States, 1196
Renovated butter, 4266
Revenue stamps, 1818
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Seymour Narrows, obstruction to navigation, 3333
Steamship services
Canada-West Indies, 3388
Competition, 3398
Railway Commission, control, 4003
Tax exempt bonds, qu. 342
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291, 4645
Amdt. (Mr. Neill), 1292
Seconder, 1308
Uchucklesit-Ecoole telegraph line, 1017
Unemployment, 1193
Hoboes, 1194
Wheat bounty, 1196

Nelson, B.C.
Board of Trade, Mounted Police, 2943
Ore-testing plant, 2505, 2507

Netherlands, The. *See also* Holland; Immigration
Senate, constitution of, 1372

New Brunswick. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Assignments and Preferences Act, 3087
Bonded warehouses, 1212
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Coal, 804
Dredging, 4951
Employment offices, 1630
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Gas and oil fields, 2949, 3920
Geological survey, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 945
Highways, 3182, 4587. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1086, 1198, 1476
Bowder, Mr., representative, Great Britain, 1086
Indians, 2124, 2153
Kent Northern railway, 4189
Labour scarcity in lumber camps, 1125
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949, 3920
Permanent force, strikes, 1627
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Potatoes, 137-139, 2763

New Brunswick—*Con.*
Public buildings, 4613
Representation, Canadian National board, qu. 282
Shale deposits, 2513
Veniot, Premier, statement, qu. 1488

New Carlisle, Que., wharf, 973

New Ontario. *See* Ontario

New Westminster, liquor sales, 2415

New York
Canadian customs officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272, 3275

New York Tribune, reported statement, Mr. Meighen, on immigration, 2790

New Zealand
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3297
Immigration
British, 2932
Chinese, 2313
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Immigration Act, 497
Policy, 1882
Land settlement policy, 1406
Legislative council, constitution, 1371
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis

Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C.
Opinions
Canada Temperance Act, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' Case, 2521
Visit to United States, 3823

Newfoundland steamship service, 2171, 2173, 3377

News Items, dissemination of. *See* Press

News Service. *See* Press

Newspapers. *See* Press

Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper

Niagara and St. Catharines Railway, 2475

Niagara Falls
Michigan Central bridge
Construction contracts, qu. 1864
Remission of sales tax, qu. 1257
Power. *See* Welland canal

Niagara District, Grape-growers, competition, 452. *See* Treaties, French; Wines

Nickle Resolution. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Nickle, shipments to Germany during war 4371

Nicolet
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., election, 2837
Vacancy, 2178

Nicomen Island, protection, 626

Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307

Nitti, Ex-Premier, of Italy, 46, 313

"Noble Eighteen". *See* Reciprocity

Noble Foundation Farm, 2813

Nolin, Mrs. J., St. David postmistress, 1489

Nominative Scheme. *See* Immigration

Nominative Senate. *See* Senate

North Atlantic Trading Company. *See* Immigration

North Atlantic and U.K. Conference. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

North Essex Election. *See* Elections

North Vancouver. *See* Vancouver

Northern Ontario. *See* Ontario

Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection Bill. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
(Close season; use of Canadian ports; seizures; International Fisheries Commission)
Res. 4480; 1r., 2r., com., 4485; 3r., 4489

Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635

Northwest Rebellion. *See* Pensions

Northwest Territories
Administration, 3944, 3948
Indians, 2145
Procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974
Purchase and maintenance of new ship, 4702

Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 180; 2r., com., 270; 3r., 271; Senate amdts., 2050

Norway
Immigration from, 1191
Storthing, constitution of, 1372

Notes, Tax. *See* Taxation

Nova Scotia. *See also* Maritime Provinces
British Empire Steel Corporation, employees, 1705,
Coal, 1269, 1273, 1277, 3199. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Coke and, 1268
Freight rates on, 1277, 2828
Production, qu. 490
Resources, 800
Confederation, attitude towards, 1376
Disallowance of statute. *See* Disallowance
Dredging, 4591
Emigration from, 1404
Expenditure, 4555
Experimental farms, 460
Harbours and rivers, 941, 4554, 4560, 4635, 4722. *See also that title*
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
Highways, 3183. *See also that title*
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1086, 1200, 1476
Indians, 2124, 4702
Markets for, 2243
Miners
Strike, 495, 1627, 1716
Troops, use of, qu. 624, 866, 869, 892, 2893
United States delegates, detention, 3155. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Nova Scotia Historical Society, 3406
Ports, used by United States fishermen, 3906
Public buildings, 4612
Redistribution and, 73. *See also that title*
Representation, reduction. *See* Redistribution
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Secession, 2057, 2177
Resolution, 2243
Senate, elective or nominative, 1368-76
Sessional indemnity, reduction in, 1155
Steel bounties, 4371
Steel-workers strike, 1643
Supreme Court, Hon. D. D. McKenzie, appointment, 1810
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Windsor, site of Fort Edward, 3406

Noxious Weeds. *See* Seed Inspection

Nursery Stock. *See also* Horticulture
Insects and pests, 596
Sales tax, 4432

Oaths of Office Bill, 1r., 3

Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

Ocean Freight Rates, 69. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Ocean Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Ports

O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Officials, travels of. *See* Government; Marshall

Ogilvie Milling Company, mill feeds, 2875

O'Halloran, Mr. George F. *See also* Patents Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2346

O'Hara, Captain Marshall. *See* Marine

Ohta, Hon. T. *See* Immigration, Oriental, Jananese

Oil. *See also* Bounties; Natural Resources; Petroleum
Alberta, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Prospecting and development, 780
Revenue from, qu. 2515
Southern, 2508, 3423
British Columbia oil companies, 2505
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, drilling, 2508
Customs drawbacks, 2655
Drilling operations, 2505
Fort Norman, 3423
Fuel oil
Competition with coal, 807, 1245
Importations, 1245
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Standardization, 808
Hudson's Hope, 4699
Imperial Oil Company, 4380
Leases, 3423
Lubricating, standardization, 808
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 3920
Petroleum. *See also that title*
Bounty, 2648, 2510, 3914
Duty, 2653, 2644
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Search for, 2802
Speculation in claims, 3423
Southern Alberta, 2508, 3423
Used in manufacture of manila rope, 3901
Drawback, 3502
Well-drilling machinery, 2653, 3487

Oil Springs, Ont., postmaster, qu. 518

Old Age Annuities. *See* Labour, Annuities

Old Age Pensions. *See* Pensions

Oleomargarine. *See also* Dairying Industry
Agriculture and Colonization Com., discussion in, 3266
Butter and, 386. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada Food Board, 3520
Canada only country prohibiting, 3531
Canadian Lumberman's Association, 3508
Class interests, 3534
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3325, 3449. *See also that title*
Dairying industry and, 3296
Denmark, 3515, 3523
Difference of opinion in government, 3530
Duty, 2777
French treaty, 1984
Great War Veterans' Association, 3547
Health and, 3558
Ingredients, 3562
Labelling, 3152
Local Council of Women, 3513
"Manna," 3152
Manufacture, 3153, 3553
Manufacture, importation and sale
Further legislation, inquiry, 230, 1309, 2519, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3508; agreed to as amended, 3581
Amdt. (Mr. Kay), reversion to status quo ante, 3520, agreed to, 3580
Point of order, amdt. direct neg, 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) govt. to submit legislation before end of session, 3567; neg., 3581
Point of order, 3571
Opportunity for discussion, 3510, 3519
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3326
Precedence of, 3451
Materials for, imports, duty and drawback, 3503, qu. 3505
National Dairy Council, 3269, 3509
Order in council suspending prohibition, 3520, 3525, 3526
Pledge to dairymen, 3525, 3531
Propaganda, 3266, 3402
Protection, 3534, 3546
Regulations, 3517
Restaurants, sale in, 3517
Restrictions, 3517
Retail Merchants' Association, 3508, 3551
Substitute, 3522
Victoria Board of Trade, telegram, 3513
War measure, 3520, 3525
Western farmers and, 1423
Women, 3508

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Oliver, Hon. John
Freight rates, 1915, 1952
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383

Olivier, Hon. Mr., Senate, elective or nominative, 1367

Olympic Games, Canadian team, 4706

One-Sixth Vote. *See* Supply, Interim Supply

Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 2765
Attorney General
Betting information, 1483
Combines, 2585
Wholesale Grocers case, decision, 2051 2521
Bootlegging, 2410
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Coal, reported discovery, 2512
Court of Appeal, decision, 2051, 2521
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Drury government, expenditure and debt 2824
Experimental farms, 459
Farm labour, scarcity, 1416
Farmers and protection, 2818
Farmers' government and immigration, 1420
Government house, 4628
Government savings offices, qu. 1488
Interest rate, 1697
Grain elevators, 2037, 4716, 4719
Harbours and rivers, 981, 4588, 4594
Highways, 3177. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Expenditure, 2489
Home markets, 2818
Hydro-electric development, 426, 3056. *See also* Hydro
Hydro Power Commission, 1270
Immigration, 1085, 1096-8, 1320, 1428, 1475, 1476. *See also that title*
Child, and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Indians, 2124, 2146
Lake of the Woods. *See that title*
Legal, fees, expenditure, 1155
New Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 1401
French-Canadian settlement, 1401
Market for agricultural products, 1402
Northern Ontario
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Conditions and possibilities, 3037
Immigration into, 1097, 1112, 1320
Indians, 2151
Opportunities for settlers, 1097

Ontario—*Con.*
Oil bounty, 2510
Ontario elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4005, 4162
Ontario Factory Act, printing bureau, 1763
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public ownership, 3056
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Radial railways, 3056
Raney, Hon. W. E., Attorney General
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Race-track betting, 712
Letter from, to Mr. Good, 2181
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, qu. 1255
See also Post Office
Soldier settlement, qu. 492
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, 1071, 3056
United Farmers, co-operative stores, 4068
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

"Opium Joint". *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Opposition. *See* Conservative Party; Meighen

Orders in Council
Canadian National Railways, 815
Civil Service Commission
June 29th, 1922, qu. 278
September 22nd, 1922, 380-1
Depreciated currency, 2988
Duties against United States, reduction by, 2649, 2650
Exemptions by, 359
Expenditure by, 949, 950
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354
Marking of goods, 2988
Lead pencils, 2988
Lithographic works, 2988
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4487
Number passed, 1921 and 1922, qu. 1488
Numbers
P. C. 220, unemployment, 435
P. C. 223, 815
P. C. 1053, qu. 516
P.C. 1566, 249
Oleomargarine, suspending prohibition of, 3520, 3525, 3526
Peace treaty, under, 767
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4349, 4393
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474, 3479
Repeal of by statute, 3504
Tariff reduction under, 3049
Wheat Board, 3046
Legislation extended, 3045

Ordnance Lands. *See* Interior

Ore-Testing. *See* Mines and Minerals

Orient, Trade with. *See* Trade; Vancouver Harbour Bill

Oriental Immigration. *See* Immigration

Orientals. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration; Labour; Narcotic Drugs Act; Naturalization
British Columbia in, 1541, 1893-1903
Deportation. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Fishing licenses, reduction, 1548
Naturalization of, 2442. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Orillia, Champlain monument, 4705

Orthopedic Boots. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Ostrea Lake, N.S. wharf, 943

Ottawa
Canadian Press, Limited, 2523
Chateau Laurier, deficit, 2976
Daly building, purchase, 1023
Dominion Archives building, addition, 1730
Dominion observatory, 3242
Government workshops, 4616
National Gallery, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020 2685
New departmental building, 1729, 4617
Architects, compensation, 4633
Newspaper combine, 2522, 2630
Ore-testing plant, 2505
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015, 4590
Parliament buildings, 1716
Printing bureau, 1022. *See also that title*
Too much government from, 3434

Ottawa Dairy Company, 2526, 2569

Ottawa Free Press Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085

Ottawa Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa River
Water powers, qu. 1974
Point Fortune, qu. 1974
Water storage, 815

Ottawa Typographical Union, copyrights, 2144

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Overseas Settlement Board. *See* Immigration

Owen, Admiral Sir W. F. W., St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

Owen Sound Wharf, 2690

Oxford Paper Company, Rumford, Maine, 835-6

Pacaud, Mr. L. T.
Appointment, 2710
International Labour Conference, 1539, 1647
Pacific Cable Board, representative, 1832

Pacific Cable Board, 1832

Pacific Coast Trade. *See* British Preference; Customs Tariff; Trade

Pacific Fisheries. *See* Japanese; Treaties, Halibut

Pacific Ocean ports. *See* Vancouver Harbour

Pacific Salvage Company, payments, qu. 1763

Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1832

Paints, 2739. *See also* Customs Tariff Items

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Panama Canal. *See also* New York, Customs Officer
Canadian customs regulations, 2519, 2615
Canned salmon via, 2615
Duty on goods passing between Canadian ports, 2519, 2615
Grain shipments, 77, 1921. *See also* Grain
Imports through to British Columbia, 1921
Rail and water competition, 1920
Trade from western to eastern Canada, 2868
Trade, Great Britain to Pacific ports, 3053

Pan-American Union, 496

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment. *See* House of Commons

Paper. *See* Press; Prices; Pulp and Paper

Paper Control. *See* Pulp and Paper

Paper Makers. *See* Powell River Company

Papineau, Mr. L. J. (Beauharnois)
Estimates, time of presentation, 4555
Public expenditure, 4554

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Arctic expedition, 4012
Arctic islands and northern Quebec, 814
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Canadian Pacific railway, Quebec terminals, 815
Cold storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868
Ottawa river, water storage, 815
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Quebec Harbour Commission, cold storage, 2055
Raisins, imports, qu. 2699

Pari-Mutuel System. *See* Race Track Betting

Paris Agency, expenses, 4001

Paris Offices. *See* Canadian National Railways

Park-Davis Company, Metagen, qu. 1867

Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands and Parks; Interior

Parliament
Farmers in, 2732. *See also* Progressive Party
Function of, statement of Edmund Burke, 3018
Opening of, 1
Prorogation, 4755

Parliament Buildings, 1716
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Baker, the late Col. G. H., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Central column at entrance, memorial, 2685
Committee, 1718
Common meeting room, 1727
Commons chamber
Accoustics, 1721. *See also* House of Commons
Lighting, 1728
Members' galleries, 1729
Estimates, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) to reduce, 1727, neg. 1728
Expenditure
To complete, 1716
To date, 1718
Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Marchand, Mr., architect, commission, 1718
Members' rooms
Allocation of, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Ventilation, 1728
Old walls, destruction of, 1723-24
Pearson, Mr. John A., architect, 1716
Policing, 778
Tower, 1722
Chimes, 1722
Completion of, 1719

Parliamentary Documents. *See* Government Publications

Parliamentary Library. *See* Library

Parliamentary Practice, amending of. *See* Lack of Confidence, M.

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Responsibility. *See* Canadian National Railways, Branch Lines, Management Lack of Confidence

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee, 53, 382

Parole System. *See* Justice

Participation in War. *See* Canada; Near East Crisis

Partisanship. *See* Political Partisanship

Party Funds, members and, 4237

Party System of Government, 1235, 1254

Passamaquoddy Bay, harbour, 2899, 2938

Passports
Immigrants, 1170
Passport office, 4707
Requirements as to, 3988

Pasteur, Louis, scientific contributions, 1287

Patent Medicines. *See* Health

Patents. *See also* Patent Act Amdt. bill
Revocation of, 2528
Under Combines Act, 2522

Patents and Copyright Branch. *See* Trade and Commerce

Patents of Invention Bill. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs Bill
(To amend and consolidate acts)
1r., 331; 2r., 2064; com., 2064, 2086; 2128; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts., 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, 2129
Exchequer court, 2079
Application for patents, 2067
Conflicting
To be decided by Exchequer court, 2079
To be submitted to arbitration, 2129
Joint, assignments, 2057, 2104, 2130
Particulars required, 2073
Withdrawal of, 2079

Patents of Invention Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Assignments, refusal to execute, 2069
Berne convention, 2064
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2064, 2104, 2128
Conditions, 2089, 2104
Definition, 2064
Domicile, election of, 2070
Food or medicines, 2078
Foreign patents, 2068
Form of issue, 2082
Government use of patented inventions, 2100
Improvements, patenting of, 2069
Inspection by the public, 2101
Issue of new or amended patents, 2082
Models and specimens, 2076
Oath of inventor, 2069
Patent agent or attorney, 2102
Patent office, 2064
Patents for inventions by persons in Public Service, 2082, 2104
Patents to be assignable, 2083, 2086
Register of attorneys, 2101
Repeal, 2102
Restoration and revival of patent, 2100
Revocation of patent, time limit, 2099
Right of appeal, 2100
Special methods or processes of manufacture, 2076
Specifications, drawings, etc., 2073
Suit pending, 2102
Tariff of fees, 2100
Term limit, 2082
What patents shall contain, etc., 2082

Paternalism, excess of, 1133. *See also* Legislation

Patronage. *See* Civil Service; Political Patronage

Patterson, Hon. J. C., investigator of titles, 3360

Peace Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations

Peace River District
German settlers, 1184
Immigration literature, 1433
Railways, 4324
Construction, 1433, 1440, 3006
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Prince George railway, 1434, 4701
Survey, 4698
Settlement in, 1184
Soldier settlers, 1185

Peace Treaty. *See* Germany, Reparations; Treaties

Pearson, Mr. John A., architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Peat. *See* Fuel Supply

Pecuniary Claims Convention, with United States, 779

Peel, Sir Robert, Corn Laws
Abolition of 3050
Reversal of policy on, 3007

Pelee Island steamship service, 2174

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Belanger, Mr. A. C., 1489
Boulay, Mlle, postmistress, Sayabec, 3751, 3759
Matane harbour improvements, 971
Printing committee, fourth report, 4510

Penitentiaries. *See* Justice

Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463

Penny Bank of Toronto Act Amdt. Bill
(Change of name)
1r., 1739; 2r., com., 3r., 2052

Pension Act Amdt. Bill
(Cases subject to review; district appeal boards; federal appeal boards)
Res. 3401, 3748; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3848; 3r., 3887; Senate amdts. 4744
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals to district review board, 3875
Recommendations final, amdt. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 3875, neg. 3881
Time for, 3881
Extension from 3 months to one year, amdt. (Mr. Logan) agreed to, 3881
To be decided under Pension Act, amdt. (Mr. Marler) 3881, neg. 3882
British expeditionary force, members, 3873
Date of coming into force, 3873
Death within five years, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Clark) 3884, agreed to, 3885
Disability
Attributable to military service, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Extent of, how estimated, 3873
In respect of which pensions claimed, 3848
Pensions according to, 3873
Pre-enlistment, 3849
Time of appearance, 3872

Pension Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
District review boards, 3874
Staff or ex-staff officer not eligible, amdt. (Mr. Black), Yukon) 3875, neg. 3875
Federal appeal board, 3875
Insurance principle, 3851
Payment of expenses, 3881
Pension payable to descendants, amdt (Mr. Manion) agreed to, 3886
Review of pension legislation, 3851
When no deduction of pension, 3873
Widow, 4745
Bigamous marriage, 3732, 3886
Who marries after disability appears amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 3882, agreed to 3884
Widowed mother, 3870
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. (Mr. LeSueur) 3870, agreed to, 3871

Pensions. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Judges; Militia Pension Act; Ministers' Salaries and Members' Indemnities; Pensions Act Amdt. Bill
Appeals
Appeal boards, 77, 3875
Dominion Veterans Alliance, com. 3860
Federal, 4703
Attributability, 3850
British expeditionary force, members, 3873, 3885
Committee, re-appointment, inquiry, 288
Commutation of, qu. 4132. *See under this title,* European War
Decrease in amount, 23
Disability entitling to, 677
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166, 3706, 3707
Estimates, suggested postponement, 2166
Expenditure, 2987
Fenian raid, 3742, 3873
Great War Veterans' Association, 2167, 4535
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway employees, 3195
Judges, qu. 492
McDougall, Mrs. William, 3949
Malone, late Lieut.-Col. qu. 206
Medical examination of prisoners, 670
Militia. *See* Militia Pension Act. Amdt bills
Mothers, 2827
Conference with provincial governments, 3046
Northwest rebellion, 3742

Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1646, 2817, 2827, 3032. *See also* Labour, Annuities
Conference with provincial government, 3046
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Inquiry as to legislation, 733, qu. 2517, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res., 1652
Pension Act. *See also* Pension Act Amdt.
Administration of, 3706
Suggested amendments, 2166
Pension Commissioners, board of
Appeal from, 677
Charges against, 685
Estimates, 2166
Interpretation of Pension Act, 2639, 2943
North Essex election and, 670, 708, 2014
Report, 516, 4736
Res., Victoria, B.C., for removal, 3399
Salaries and contingencies, 2168, 3742
Pension legislation, review of, 3851
Petition from veteran organizations, 4535-36
Pilots, 3359
Ralston report. *See under this title,* Royal Commission
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Royal commission
Expenses, 691
Recommendations of, 2394, 2942, 3733
Legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 3400. *See also* Pensions Act Amdt. Bill; Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill
Inquiry as to, 2639, 2983
Opportunity to discuss, 674, 2394
Reports
First interim report, 2166, 2926, 2983
Final, inquiry, 2516
Printing, qu. 207, 288, 1631, 3401
M. for 1992, 2128
Senators, 1376
South African War, 3873
Tuberculous patients, 3850
Unemployed relief, expenditure, 2168
Women, 1651
Widows, 681

Perfumery. *See* Treaties, French

Peribonka, Que., wharf, 973

Periodicals. *See* Magazines and Periodicals;

Permanency. *See* Reciprocity; Tariff

Permanent Force. *See* National Defence

Peru, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Petawawa Camp, Ontario elections and, 3976, 4005, 4162

Peterborough, weights and measures inspection, qu. 492, 810

Petition of Right Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Coal Leases)
(Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud)
1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3127; 3r., 3130
Sections and subjects discussed:
Fiats, issue and publication of, 3222, 3224
Hoppe leases, 3127
Isenberg estate, 3128
Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud, 3127

Petroleum. *See also* Oil
Administration of act, 780
Bounty, 2510, 2648, 2949, 3914, 3963
Duty, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3963
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949
Production and payment, qu. 3262

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act Amdt. Bills
1. Regulations governing sale of naphtha
Res. 3749; order discharged, 3969
2. Sale of naphtha
1r., 4248; 2r., 4249; com., 4276; 3r., 4276

Petroleum Bounty Act Amdt. Bill
(Reduction and discontinuance of bounty)
Res. 2657, 3914, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Pharmaceutical Preparations. *See* Health

Physical Training. *See* National Defence, Cadet Services,

Piche Point, Que. wharf, 973

Pictou, N.S., dredging, 4584. *See also* Harbours and Rivers

Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish steamship service, 2174

Pictou-Souris-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 2174

Pictures. *See* National Gallery

Pierreville, Que., postmaster, qu. 4511

Pilotage. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Pineapples, production in Fiji Islands, 1848

Pioneer, the, recognition of, 1394, 2870

Piracy. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Pitt, William, reciprocity treaty, France, 3050

Plains of Abraham, Battle of, soldiers who became farmers, 1188

Plaster Quarries. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute

Playgrounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites

Plebiscites. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Pocket Boroughs. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Pointe à Elie, Que. wharf, 974

Point au Pic, Murray Bay, wharf, 973

Pointe aux Trembles, Que. wharf, 974

Pointe Shea (Amherst) pier, 977

Poland
Immigration, 1204
Treatment of Ukrainians. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Political Offenders, imprisonment, 3157

Political Parties. *See also* Conservative; Liberal; Progressive
Big interests, contributions, 2856, 3070
Capital and, 2810
Liberal and Conservative, 2793, 2812

Political Partisanship. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Costly, 2787
Dismissals for, 3344

Political Patronage. *See also* Civil Service; National Policy
Alberta, 522
Appointments, 2710. *See also* Post Office
Boulay, Mlle, dismissal of, 3706, 3750
Canadian National Railways, 134-135
Charlotte county, N.B., 945
Civil Service, 519
Indians, medical service, doctors, 2160
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3303. *See also that title*
Patronage list, 946
Political supporters, jobs for, 2710
Post offices, 3316. *See also* Post office
Sorel shipyard, 3344, 3374

Political Policies. *See also* speeches on Budget; Conservative Party; Liberal Party; National Policy; Progressive Party; Reciprocity
Appropriation of, 2781
Big interests and, 2856, 3070
"Doubtful virtue of consistency," 3056
Economic group organization, 3003
Graft, big interests and old parties, 2855
Liberal and Conservative, 2812
Platforms
Repudiation of, 2973, 2994
Value of, statement, Mr. Euler, 2852, 2974, 2991
Proposed, Hon. Mr. Tolmie, 2870
Reversal of, 3007
Two parties but one policy, 2793

Pollution of Boundary Waters. *See* Health

Pollution of Rivers. *See* Marine

Pool Rooms. *See* Race Track Betting

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Pope, Sir Joseph. *See* External Affairs

Population. *See also* Budget; Emigration; Immigration
Birth rate, 1197
Death rate, 1197
Distribution of, 2747
Immigration
Natural increase and, 1871-1921, 1207
Not increased by, 1195
Increase, 1398, 2819
Net, 1173
Loss of, 119, 1439, 3018. *See also* Emigration
Ratio of public employees to, 3027
Representation by. *See* Proportional Representation
Tax burden upon, 3001. *See also* Taxation
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Pork Products. *See* Bacon; Meats

Port Arthur
Grain shipments, 1114. *See also* Grain
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, 3354

Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012

Port Colborne elevator, 4690. *See also* Grain

Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, monument, 3433

Port Elgin breakwater, 2690

Port Greville, N.S. breakwater, 944

Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or Lakes steamship services, 2174

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Port Renfrew, B.C. wharf, 1008

Portage la Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 993, 998, 3041
District board, resolution, 3039
Indians medical service, doctors, 2160
Sewerage outlet, 993, 2679

Portage River, N.S. breakwater, 950

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Vancouver harbour bill, 269

Portland, Maine. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Terminals
Grain shipments via, qu. 1484

Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Imports and Exports; Shipping, *and also* their individual titles
Canadian, 2898. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
British preference and, 140, 2948, 3053, 3454. *See also* British Preference; Budget
Direct importation by, 3454, 3895
Discrimination against, 2960
Loading of grain cargoes at, 3974
Shipments via, 4714
Use of. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut treaty
United States fishermen, by, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Montreal. *See that title*
Ocean ports, 2937. *See also* Halifax; St. John
Comparative mileages, 2939
Passamaquoddy bay, 2938
St. Croix, 2899, 2938
Shippigan, 2938
Comparative mileage, 2939
Pacific, trade through Panama canal, 3053
Quebec. *See that title*
United States, grain shipments through, 3764
Vancouver. *See that title*
Wardens. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Portugal, Upper Chamber, constitution, 1372

Postal Conference. *See* Post Office

Postage Stamps. *See* Post Office

Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1314-15, 1538, 1816, 1821, 3067

Post Office
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
British mails, delay in, 2639, 2694, 2695
Canadian federation of postal employees, salaries, 1794
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Department
Acting Minister, 2710
Annuities branch, 1640-42
Transfer to Labour dept., 1639
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032
qu. 1138
Coolican, Mr. P. T., General Superintendent of Postal Service, 1816
Deputy Postmaster General
Appointment of, 1805, 2710
Coulter, Dr. R. M.
Retirement, 1822, 1825
Service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135
Estimates, 1778, 1814
Proceedings in minister's absence, 1314
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Purchasing Commission and, 4001
Revenue
Gross, 1818, 1825
Not connected with postal service, 1815
Salaries and contingencies, 1793-4, 1814
Staff, 1824
Superintendeent of mail services, 1814
Superintendent of postal services, Mr. George Ross, retirement, 1825
Supplies, purchase of, 3951
Surplus claimed, 1817
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Dismissals and appointments. *See under this title,* Postmasters
International Postal Conference, 4529
Letter carriers
Bonus to, 1784
Salaries, 1780
Mail contracts. *See also under this title,* Rural Mail
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868, 1977
Sporting Mountain, N.S., qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, qu. 4302
Mail service, 1778
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions. *See* Steamship Services
Ocean mail, pilot boats and, 3359
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Patronage, 1794. *See also under this title,* Postmasters

Post Office—*Con.*
Postage rates
Letter rate
United States and Canada, comparison, 2745
War tax, 2744, 2858
Newspapers and periodicals, 4436, 4528
Public libraries, 1809
Reduction of, 1779, 2824, 2945
Special delivery, 1872, 2933
Postage stamps
Commission on sale of, 1819
Payment of excise taxes with, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3937, 4435
Sale of, 2979
Selling cost, 1818
Postal contracts. *See under this title,* Mail, Rural Mail
Postal service
Quebec district, extra service compensation, 1832
Postal Treaty with United States, 2, 4529
Postmasters
Agents for annuities, 1641-42
Appointments and dismissals, 1809, 1827, 4534
Appointments
List of, 1830
Members' recommendations, 1799-1829
Political patronage, 3316
Returned soldiers, 1799
Dismissals, 4534
Angouleme, Quebec, qu. 3139
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boucher, Mrs., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, Sayabec, 3706, 3750
Brussels, 1800
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, qu. 2698
Herbertville, qu. 3139
Labarre, Que. dismissals, qu. 3138
Larouche, qu. 3137
Levis county, qu. 519
Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Midland, qu. 623
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
North Oakville, 914
Oil Springs, Ont., qu. 518
Portsmouth, Ont., 1832
Rawding, Mr., dismissal, 1795
Renfrew, qu. 205
St. Barnabe Nord, Que., 1830
St. Bruno, Que. qu. 3140
Ste. Claire, Que., qu. 1031

Post Office—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
Dismissals—*Con.*
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140
St. Peters', N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D.W., qu. 1488
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, Que., qu. 3139
Wingham, 1800
Woodbridge, 1821
Commission on stamp sales, 1818
Patronage, 3316
Residence, 1796
Post office money orders, tax, 3923
Post Offices
Grade Three, qu. 4300
Montreal. *See also that title*
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Number of post offices, qu. 3135
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Promotions, qu. 2298
Saskatoon post office, 1785
Toronto
Postal station "A." 4624
Post office building, 3277
Revenue, 1779
Radio equipment, 1780
Railway mail service, 1783, 4529
Payments to Canadian Pacific, qu. 3143
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1821
Carriers
Compensation for loss, 1832
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim, 1832
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Remuneration, 1780, 1822, 3070, 3076
Ontario, average, qu. 1259
Contracts, 1781
Extension of, 1802
Improvement of, 1780, 2830
Spur lines, 1826
Western provinces, 1441, 1790, 1801
War loan dividends, delivery of, 1804
Winnipeg postal employees, salaries, 4672

Post Office Act Amdt. Bill
(Rates on newspapers and periodicals)
1r., 4436; 2r., com., 4528; 3r., 4535

Potatoes. *See this title under* Vegetables

Potlatch. *See* Indians

Potter, Mr. Howard G., Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795

Poultry. *See also* Eggs
French treaty, 1983
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 3071
M. (Mr. Neill) to adjourn House, 2886; withdrawn, 2897

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 861, 872
Canada's participation in war, M., 1529
Civil Service Act, M. for repeal, 345, 371, 519, 520, 568
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4346, 4348, 4395
Amdt. six months' hoist, 4396, neg. 4397
Forests, preservation of, 4349
Grondines wharf, 965
Labour troubles, use of troops, 861, 893
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3998
Withdrawal, M., 1529, 3999
Military expenditure, 873
National Defence, pay of staff, 890
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-87
Pension commissioners, removal, 685
Pensions, commutation of, 3725
Permanent force, 892
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4346, 4348, 4395
Quebec riots, 893
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 712
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3744
Saar valley, administration of, 4000
Soldiers 'Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Vocational loans and training, 688

Power Development. *See* Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers

Prairie Provinces. *See* Alberta; Manitoba; Saskatchewan; Western Provinces

Pre-Cooling Plants. *See* Cold Storage

Pre-emptions, sale of. *See* Lands

Preferential Tariff. *See* British Preference; Reciprocity; Treaties, French, Italian

Press
British and foreign news service, 4712
Canadian Press Limited, 1464, 2555, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727

Press—*Con.*
Canadian Press Limited—*Con.*
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Ottawa franchise, 4730
Payments to, qu. 3703
President, 2630
Subsidy, 2631, 4535, 4728
Control, 3074
Capitalistic, 2726
Fisheries publicity, 3364
Gambling in staples, justification of, 3059
Hearst syndicate, 828
Magazines and periodicals, Canadian, encouragement, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Newspapers
Alleged combine, 2522, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630, 4728
Postage rates on, 4436, 4528
Printing contracts with government, 2298, 2394, 2614
Quotations from. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Registration of ownership, 615
Size of, 4534
Statement as to treaties, 245
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2979. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Publishing business, difficulties of, 4415
Reuter's news service, 4712
Subsidy to, 2631
Windsor Telegram, Canadian Press and, 2630

Preston, Mr. R. F. (Lanark)
Introduced, 3

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., qu. 206, 247, 1362. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4312
Grande Freniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312
Laurentians, the, 4312
Quebec highways, qu. 814
Railway commissioners, qu. 1260

Price Waterhouse & Company, report, 2954

Prices. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Customs Tariff Items; Finance; Immigration; Markets; Taxation; Trade
Agricultural products, 2731, 2835, 2862, 3068-9
Higher south of boundary, 2715
Manufactured products and, 1403, 1407, 1851, 1853, 1885, 1907, 2747, 2787, 2873, 2928 3018, 3024
Past and present, 2978

Prices—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2836, 2991, 3070
Comparative, 1407
Babson, Mr. Roger, report, 1084
Bacon, 2933
Banks and, 4047
Binder twine, 4377
Building materials, 2164, 3004
Butter, 2821, 3513, 3533. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada and United States, 2801, 3025
Comparison of, 2738, 2742, 2836, 2916, 3025
Canadian Pacific railway lands, 3704
Cattle, 2871
Cheese, 3295
Coal, 1812, 2824, 3198. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Combines and, Jenks, Professor, 2600
Combines in restraint of trade. *See* Combines bill
Commodity, 1167
Agricultural and, 1083
Consumer. *See also that title.*
Producer, and, 1813, 2727, 2829
Control of, 2812, 4226
Cost, 1851
Cotton goods, 3463
Credit inflation and, 4226
Dairy supplies, 2740
Denims, drills, ginghams, 2738
Electric energy, 3784
Farm products. *See under this title,* Agricultural
Fencing and poultry netting, 2740
Fixing, 2520, 2606, 2786
Food, 2584, 2824, 2933
Clothing and, 2873
Freight rates and, 1958. *See also that title*
Furnaces, warm air, 2739
Gasoline engines, 2740
Harness, 2739
High, 2583, 2737, 2748, 2812
Hogs, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Increase, 2713
By taxation, 2716
Since 1912, 1408
Indians, charged to, qu. 3142
Inflation and deflation, 64, 647, 2800, 3024, 4226
Interest rate and, 4166
Live Stock. *See also that title*
Producer and consumer, 2877
Lumber, 2875, 3036
Manufactured goods, 2823, 2836, 2972, 3018, 3029, 3068
Higher, north of boundary, 2715
Middleman and, 1230, 2972

Prices—*Con.*
Milk, 2569, 2591
Monopolies and, 2521
Nails, 2740
Oleomargarine, 3513
Paints, 2739
Paper, 829, 2888
Potatoes, 2820
Price level, inequality of, 629
Producer and consumer, 1853, 2727, 2829
Pulpwood, 3036, 3417, 4345. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Railway ties, 3036
Re-sale, fixing of, 2525, 2546
Rubber boots, 2740
Safety razors, 2740
Sewing machines, 2739
Silks, 2397-2400
Spread
Producer and consumer, 1852, 2713, 3029
Wholesale and retail, 1230
Stabilization of, 4069, 4666
Sugar, 2646, 2888, 2933, 3069
Gambling in, 3058
Tools, 2740
United States. *See under this title,* Canada and United States
Washing machines, 2740
Wheat, 628, 3004. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Wheat Board, 2857
Woollen goods, 2990, 3459

Prime Ministers' Conference. *See also* Imperial Conference
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Prince Albert stockyards, 2779

Prince Edward Island. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Agricultural conditions, 2763, 2972
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Emigration from, 1404
Experimental farms, 460
Fox industry, 2763
Harbours and rivers, 945, 4586
Highways, 3184. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration and, 1200
Land settlement policy, 1406
Potato-growing, 131, 2763
Public buildings, 4614
Railway employees' pensions, 3195
Railway facilities, 128
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682

Prince George-Peace River projected railway, 1434, 4701

Prince Rupert, 110, 115
Civic employees union, 2086
Development of port, 261, 2734
Dry dock, qu. 1664
Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company
Creditors, 4708
Guaranteed bonds, qu. 1138
Fishing industry, 2734

Printing. *See also* Government Publications; Printing Bureau
Combines, 1623
Contracts, 1974
Newspaper and printing companies, 2298, 2394, 2614
Copyright, 2140. *See also* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Government publications, 3266
Government, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Immigration publications, 1873
Interior dept. reports, 3443
King's Printer, audit of outside accounts, 1623
Parliamentary and departmental publications, 811
Postage stamps, 1818
Presses
Duty, 2653, 2858, 3486
French treaty, 1981
Railway department, 3197

Printing Bureau. *See also* Editorial Committee; Labour
Boilers, condition of, 1736-38
Canada Gazette, 1708
Depreciation, 1711
Draper, Mr. P. M., Director of Printing, 1668
Employees, 1623
Grievances, opportunity to present, 1654
Retiring allowances, former, 3949
Fire hazard, 1736
Govt. publications, distribution, 1712
Immigration publications, 1873
Improvements, 1022
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, appointment, 1668
Labour Gazette, 1621, 1712
Miscellaneous printing, 1716
New building, 1712, 1730
M. (Mr. Beland) to reduce 1730, agreed to, 1737
Ontario Factory Act, 1736
Outside printing, cost of, qu. 3131

Printing Bureau—*Con.*
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Post Office department, 1818, 1820
Publications and documents, distribution, 1712
Purchasing Commission, 1674
Reorganization, 1731, 1735
Stationery, embossed, 1716

Printing, Joint Committee, 53, 202
Reports
First, 1156, 1361
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4436, 4510

Prison Reform. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Agricultural conditions, 1842
Binder twine, price of, 4380
Budget, 2730. Speeches in Parliament; divergence of views as to policy; condition of agriculture; failure of fiscal policy; unemployment; wages and prices, 2730; farmer, unsatisfactory condition of; farm labour; markets; agricultural products, price of; the tariff; natural resources; agricultural production; national debt, 2731; burden upon the farmer; education, cost of; immigration policy; contrast between treatment of native-born and immigrant; farmers in Parliament, 2732; financial influence and class rule in politics; economy, 2733;
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4544
Hemp bounty bill, 4380
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743, 751
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Vocational loans, 689
Vocational training, 689

Pritchard, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Private Betting. *See* Race Track Betting

Private Bills, Committee
Reports, 936, 2204, 2417, 3323, 3887, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

Private Bills Discussed
Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company, 1834
Canadian Press Limited, 1464
Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation, 2281
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Woodmen of the World, 3982

Privilege. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeal from Railway Commission, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Combines, decisions. *See* Combines Bill

Producers' Dairy Company, Vancouver, 2526

Producers' Dairy Company, Ottawa, 2569

Production. *See also* Agriculture; Industries; Manufacturers; Textiles
Annual, statement of, 2720
Costs, 640, 2748, 2815, 2835, 2836. *See also* Labour; Manufacturers
Lower, 2748
Public debt, 640
Exceeding demand, 2957
Implements of, control, 2722
"Produce more, consume less," 4054
Production for use, 2727
Want and, 4053

Professional Men, charges and standard of living, 2813

Profiteering, 2578. *See also* Combines Bill

Progressive Party. *See also* Address; Budget; Forke; Immigration
Alberta, 2799, 2810
Attitude, extreme, 3065
Budget amendments
Forke, Mr., 2717-18, 2809
Opportunity to move, 2711
Constitution and policy, 2791, 2793
Criticism of, 3070
Crowsnest pass agreement and, 2971
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
"Concession forced by Progressives," explanation, Mr. Forke, 2971
Demands, alleged selfish, 3030
Economic, not political, group, 1863, 3003
Expenditures suggested, 3076
Farmers in Parliament, 2732, 2787
Farmers' movement, 2884
Free trade and, 1196, 2818, 3024, 3030
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1666, 1687
Hammell, Mr., 2884
Immigration policy, 1413. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Attitude of some Progressive members on, 2774
Leader of. *See also* Forke
Campaign of 1921, 1853
New, references to, 11, 17, 27
Liberal platform of 1919, opposition, 2925
Manitoba, 2799, 2810
Organization, 2815

Progressive Party—*Con.*
Platform, 2845
Tariff, 2777
Policy and action, 2935
For Western provinces only, 2817
Predicament, of, 2814
Proportional representation, 424
Right to move amendment, 1299-1307
"Stronger and more menacing enemy," 2976
Speeches, pessimistic, 2936
Tariff and, 1421, 2737, 2745
Concessions to, 2743
Reduction of, 3024
Taxation, 2837
Union government and big interests, 1853
Withdrawals from, 2976

Prohibited Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill; Liquor; Race Track Betting
British Columbia Association, control of liquor, 2409
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Plebiscite, cost of, 2495

Promissory Notes. *See* Taxation

Promotions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Proof, Onus of. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Proportional Representation, 171
Alternative vote in single member constituencies, 388, agreed to, 389
Effect on public ownership, 426
Multi-member constituencies, M. (Mr. Good) 389, neg. on div. 434
Single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Proprietary Medicines. *See* Health

Prorogation, 4736, 4755
Probable date of, 2166

Prosecutions. *See* Combines Bill

Protection. *See also* Bounties; speeches on Budget; Industries
Adequate, 2957
Agricultural depression and, 1837-64
Agricultural implement industries, 2975
Applications for, 3235
Basis of government policy, 2718
Budget and, 3077
Case for to be heard publicly, 2718, 3016
Class privilege, 3069

Protection—*Con.*
Conditions
Comparison before and after adoption, 2819
Solution for, 3013
" Dismal failure," 3018
Double standard of buying and selling, 2872
" Economically and fundamentally wrong," 2973
Free trade and, 2806, 2922. *See also that title*
Granted without investigation, 3492
Great Britain, 2752. *See also that title*
" Illogical absurdities of," 3014
Inequity of, 2792
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid on, 2872
" Legalized robbery," 3071
Minister of the Interior and, 2805
Money and moral cost of, 3070
Oleomargarine, 3534, 3546
Ontario, 2852, 2856
Political contributions, 3071
Principle of, 2792
Intact, 2990
Unsound, 2718, 2836
Protected industries and, 2957
" Protectionist budget," 3068, 3077
Quebec, 2852
Rigid adherence to by government, 2988
Sugar refiners, 2987
Suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Tariff stability, 2648
United States and, 2751
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Wheat Board, 3235
Woollen industry, 3458

Providence, R.I. *See* Canadian National Railways; Terminals

Provinces, federal representation. *See* Redistribution

Provincial Governments. *See also* Immigration
Conferences on source of revenue, 65
Extravagance, 2797
Senators, nomination of, 1377

Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* British North America Act; Disallowance; Jurisdiction

Provincial Legislation. *See* Legislation

Provincial Rights. *See also* Disallowance; Jurisdiction; Legislation
Anglo-Japanese treaty, restriction of, 1453
Bankruptcy, 3097
Senate and, 1377
Water Powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Public Accounts. *See* Board of Audit Bill

Public Archives, 3985
Building, addition to, 1730
Doughty, Dr. Arthur, Dominion Archivist, salary, 4673

Public Buildings. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 1023
Calgary post office, 1024
Armouries, fittings and alterations, 1024
British Columbia
Bamfield, 1024
Victoria, old post office, 1024
Charlottetown, 4614
Coal purchases, 496
Economy in. *See* Printing Bureau
Experimental farms, 4629
Generally, 1025
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Improvements, repairs, 1024
Installation of fuel-saving devices, 4629
Manitoba, 4628
Brandon, 4628
Emerson, 4628
Winnipeg, 4628
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal, qu. 4512
Maritime provinces generally, 1022, 4614
Military hospitals, 4629
Montreal ordnance stores, 1022
Moose Jaw, 1023
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario
Haileybury, 4615
Hamilton, 4628
Ottawa government workshops, 4616
Rideau hall, 4627
Royal Military college, 4628
Toronto, 4624
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621
Ottawa, 1716
Daly building purchase, 1023
Departmental buildings, 1729, 4617
Compensation to architects, 4633
M. (Mr. Beland) to strike out, 1729 agreed to, 1730
Dominion archives, 1730
Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also that title*
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Policing, 778
Power for running elevators, 1025
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Quebec, 4614
Terrebonne, 2690, 4615

Public Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, 1025
Rockhead hospital, Halifax, 4613
St. John quarantine building, 1021, 1457, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Saskatchewan, 1023, 4629
Souris, 4614
Sussex, N.B., 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Public Debt. *See also* Address; Budget; Debt; Finance; Immigration; Loans
Additions to, 2641, 2985, 3078. *See also under this title,* Increase
Budget, particulars of, 2898
Canadian National Railways, fixed charges, qu. 3323
Deficit, 3028
Increase of, 23, 91, 2814, 3072
From 1896-1922, 1173
From 1914—1923, 2842
Inheritance of present government, 2831
Interest, 2963, 2967, 3061
Magnitude of, 2963
Maturing obligations, 3822
Net debt and estimated additions, 2926
New York loan, 1922, 630, 649
Per capita debt, 2797, 2814, 2956, 2986
British Columbia, 2941
Problem of, 2784
Production cost and, 640
Reduction of, 2825, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Tariff reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 2964
War burden, 2967, 2985
Years 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914

Public Expenditure. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Estimates; Government, Economy
Administration, cost of, 2785
Apportionment of, 1072, 4560
Audit. *See* Board of Audit Bill
Civil government, cost of, 2968
Demand for, 3076
East and West, 3436
Economy. *See* Ministers, Salaries
Estimate for 1923-24, 2642
Expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Extravagance, 3043
Immigration, on, 1208
Increase, 1913-23, 2842
In excess of revenue, 1230
Profitable and productive, 3005
Public Works on, 2785
Railways, appropriation by Parliament, 4397

Public Expenditure—*Con.*
Reduction of, 2986, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Retrenchment, 2784
Special bills instead of estimates, 4304
Supplementary estimates, 4420
Taxation and, 3001
Total of $548,750,714, 4554
War, 2920
1914-1922, qu. 914

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours and Rivers

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands; School Lands

Public Libraries
Postal rates, 1809
Sales tax, 1870

Public Life
Integrity of,3021
Rewards of, *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Public Ownership, 4190. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways, 1614, 1618
Coal mines, 2727
Elevators, 2956
Proportional representation and, 426
Public utilities and large-scale industries, 2728
Railways, 1770, 2727, 2859, 2905, 2956, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190
Radial, 2475
Tariff taxation, 2905
Toronto street railways, 2475

Public Service. *See also* Civil Service
Militia pension to retired officers in. *See* Militia Pensions

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Extension of Calder Act for one year)
Res. 3323, 3402; 1r., 3403; 2r., com., 3r., 3977

Public Utilities. *See also* Public Ownership
Industrial disputes, 1703

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Applications for, 2830
Bridges. *See that title*
Commitments, 961, 962

Public Works—*Con.*
Department
Chief Architect's branch, qu. 2517
Engineering branch, salaries, 1017
Engineers' reports, 4571
Morrison claim, on, 4723
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 1716, 2671, 2684, 4554, 4594
House of Commons furniture, qu. 1138
Hunter, Mr. J. B., deputy minister, salary, 4671
Paymaster, qu. 1257
St. Laurent, Late Mr. A., appreciaton, 1006
Salaries, 2684
Sullivan, Mr. A. W., 381
Dredging, 1009, 4590
British Columbia, 1014
Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009, 4591
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Port Burwell, 1012
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Dry docks. *See also* Dry Dock Act Amdt. bill
Champlain, 2681
Esquimalt, 2671
Prince Rupert, qu. 1664
Vancouver, 2671
Expenditure, 3073, 3076
By provinces, qu. 3387
Graving docks, locks, etc., 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Local improvement taxes
Calgary, 1023
Kitchener, 1022
National gallery, 1018
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950
Roads and bridges, 1014. *See also* Bridges; Highways
Rugs for departmental offices, qu., 1486
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682, 4590. *See also that title*
Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers
St. John river, statement of Premier Veniot, qu. 1488
Wireless stations, 3337

Publication of Evidence. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Publications. *See* Government Publications

Publicity. *See also* Immigration; Press
Advertising, United States firms. *See* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Agent in London, Cranfield, Mr. W. T., 2927, 2983, 4707

Publicity—*Con.*
Racing information. *See* Race Track Betting

Publishers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Pugsley, Hon. William
Alien enemy property, 3823
Appointment, under Inquiries Act, qu. 1486, qu. 1993, 2498, 2494, 2710, 3043
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., and, exchange of compliments, 2503
Reparation claims, investigation, qu. 4753
Salary, 3043

Pulp and Paper. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lake of the Woods bill; Labour; Lumber; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken); Natural Resources; Timber
Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2572
Gaspe, 1242
Hudson Bay region, possibilities, 1072
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Newsprint. *See also under this title,* Paper
Exemption from sales tax, 2979, 2999, 3046
Ten per cent duty proposed, 1267
Paper
Book paper, price in Canada and United States, 829
Control, 2572
Cost and sales tax, 2888
Magazine paper, prices, Canada and United States, 829
Manufacturers, payment of sales tax, 4415
Products, French treaty, 1981, 1987
Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 2886
Pulpwood
Destruction by spruce bud worm, 818
Export of, 2711, 2950
Duty on, 2828
Freight rates, 3036
Permit to cut, 4206
Prices, 3036, 4345
Prohibition of export, 2648, 2750, 3416, 4012
See also Export Act Amdt. Bill
Royal commission to inquire into, 2648, 2711, 2948, 2950, 3412, 3413, 4709
Settlers and farmers, 4513
Riordan Company, business profits tax, qu. 1974, 4490

Pulpwood. *See this title* under Pulp and Paper

Purchasing Commission, 114, qu. 1385, 1674
Authority for, qu. 2699
Beer, Mr. L. H., 4704
La Fleche, Col. L. R., 4001
Salary, 3950
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Supervision, government purchases and sales, 3950, 4001

Purchasing Power, 629, 637, 2928. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Combines; Credits; Imperial Economic Conference; Money: Prices
Dollar, 3024
Europe, depreciation of, 1859
Farmers, 1408, 1851
Lack of, 4053
Limitation of, 2716
Money, 1168, 4067, 4666
Reduced, 2737, 2812
Tariff and, 2737
Unemployment and, 2725
Work and saving, necessary to increase, 2743

Pure-Bred Cattle. *See* Live Stock, accredited herds

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, mover, 9. Visit of their Excellencies to West; deceased members, 10; beauty and history of Maritime provinces, 10-11; natural resources; new leader of Progressive party, 11; Vimy Ridge site donated by France; trade relations with France and Italy; Near East crisis, 12-13; Canadian National Railways, new board of directors; Moncton Intercolonial headquarters, 13; Sir Henry Thornton, 13-14; pension rights of Grand Trunk employees; Great lakes shipping investigation, 14; cattle embargo; diminution of unemployment; improved economic conditions; member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rheaume) 15
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4061
British preference, attitude of Mr. Senn, 2959
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3440
Canadian National Railways
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal, 1769
New board of directors, 13
Cheque tax, 3034
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 525
Civil Service appointments, 376

Putnam, Mr. Harold—*Con.*
Combines bill, 2597, 2618, 2626
Registrar, inquiry, 2626
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Farmers' earnings, 2813
French treaty bill, 2248
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 242
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2437, 2445, 2457, 2463
Judges, 2464
Nationality, dual, 2445
Secretary of State
Administration, 2464
Power of, 2457
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3515, 3569
Patents of Invention bill, 2071
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2918
Renovated butter, 4268
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Trade commissioners, 856
Truro
Park, 3440
Subway, 4454

Quarantine. *See* Health

Quebec (city)
Arsenal, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Champlain market station, 4446
Civil Service employes, 387
Demers, Mr. A., mail contractor, qu. 1868
Immigrants, supplies, 496
Immigration dept. employees, qu., 2517, qu. 3141, qu., 3144, qu., 4302, qu.,4752
Quebec battlefields commission, 3432
Historic sites, 3406
Riots, 893

Quebec (port)
Cattle shipments, 2807
Champlain graving dock, 2675, 2682
Cold storage, 2055
Grain
Congestion, 3765
Diversion to, 3765
Elevator, 3768
Shipment, 4233
Wheat, qu. 3820
Harbour commissioners, names and salaries, qu. 1136
Lorne graving dock, 2682
St. Charles river improvement works, 4446
Transcontinental railway and, 3681

Quebec (province)
Agricultural conditions, 1908, 2764
Bankruptcy. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Civil Code. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Community of property, 2880
Dairying industry, cold storage, 2764
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Emigration to United States, 1404, 2834
Experimental farms, 459
Harbours and rivers, 950, 1008, 4588. *See also that title*
Highways, 814, 2341, 3180. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1085, 1104, 1198, 1200
Indians, 2124
Labelle county development, 4199
Legislature , Bankruptcy Act, 3091
Northern, conditions, 3037
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public buildings, 4614
Railways, 4189
Repatriation of Canadians, 1085

Quebec Conference, 2348

Quebec-North Shore St. Lawrence steamship service, 2175

Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4405

Quebec Savings Bank Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 4183; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Queen Charlotte Islands, 150

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Agriculture dept. officials attending fairs (Mr. Leader) 285
Arctic expedition (Mr. Parent) 4012
Bacon imports and exports (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 938
Canada Temperence Act, correspondence (Mr. Stevens) 1032
Canadian National Railways
Coal purchases (Mr. Hanson) 4303
Doctors, employment (Mr. d'Anjou) 814
Dorchester employees (Mr. Cannon) 2088
Fixed charges (Mr. Euler) 708
Hotels, (Mr. Coote) 938
Mileage (Mr. Tobin) 914
Statistics, (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Canadian Pacific Railway, (Mr. Kellner) 626; (Mr. Lucas) 625, 3704
Civil Service
Inside and outside (Mr. McQuarrie) 3264

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Quebec city and district, (Mr. Cannon), 387
Returned soldiers (Mr. McKillop) 386
Statistics (Mr. Crerar) 207
Temporary employees, (Mr. Archambault) 1385
Made permanent (Mr. Archambault) 814
Customs and excise duties (Mr. Black, Huron) 814
Customs officials, Halton county (Mr. Anderson) 914
Dominion lands, pre-emption area (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Dorchester penitentiary, (Mr. Michaud) 494
Exports and products, agricultural (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 814
Fuel
Joint Peat Com. (Mr. Irvine) 387
Lignite Utilization board (Mr. Irvine) 387
Grain and grain trade
Elevator overages (Mr. Millar) 494
Terminal elevators (Mr. Stevens) 3821
Highways
Dundas street (Mr. Anderson) 708
Projected, Ontario (Mr. Wilson) 624
Quebec, (Mr. Prevost) 814
Immigration, staff transfer, (Mr. Lavigueur) 2517
Income tax collections (Mr. Black, Huron) 733
Indian reserves, grain production (Mr. Evans) 1139
Levis
Dry dock, (Mr. Archambault) 1261
Postmasters (Mr. Bourassa) 519
Montreal, grain shipments, (Mr. Coote) 1974
National Defence, payments (Mr. Boys) 386
Oleomargarine, butter and (Mr. Sutherland) 386
Purchasing Commission, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1385
Railway grades, etc. (Mr. McBride) 625
Railway statistics (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Sales tax exemptions (Sir Henry Drayton) 708
School lands (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Soldiers' Settlement Board, Edmonton, (Mr. Boys) 3506
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome (Mr. Kay) 4012
Valcartier camp grounds (Mr. Delisle) 2298

Race Equality. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Naturalization

Race Track Betting, 3059. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.
M. (Mr. Good) 494, 709-764, neg. on div. 766

Radial Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Radiotelegraphy, 3337. *See also* Telegraphs and Telephones; Wireless
Licenses, 3338
Revenue, 3337
Manitoba, arrangement with, 3338
Military signal service, 3338
Post office and, 1780
Radio-direction finding, qu. 3820
Radiotelegraph regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Wireless service, etc., 3374

Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. Bill (License fees)
Res. 2086, 2284; 1r., 2287; 2r., 2467; com., 2468; 3r., 2468
Sections and substitutes discussed:
Apportionment of fees, 2468
Broadcasting stations, 2468
Licenses, 2467

Railway Act 1919 Amdt. Bills
1. Freight rates, discrimination (Mr. Stevens) 1r., 54
2. Return tickets (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
3. Rates, equalization of; grain movement. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton), 1r., 730

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
Appeal from to Privy Council, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Branch lines, approval of, 4327
Canadian National Railways, and, 666
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Appeal to Privy Council, 1912
Calgary speech, 3191
Letter to boards of trade, British Columbia, 1915, 1945
Letter from Vancouver Board of Trade, 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 3188
Removal of, 3188
Commissioners
Addresses and occupations previous to appointment, qu. 1973
Names, salaries, etc., qu. 1260
Establishment of board in 1903, 1929
Estimates, 3188
Judgment, June 30th, 1922, 1914
Lake grain rates, 4218. *See also that title*

Railway Commissioners—*Con.*
Langley, Hon. Mr., statement, 3190
Maclean, Mr. S. J., pamphlet, 3194
Manitoba—Canadian Northern agreement, 1932
Parliamentary interference with, 1762
Rates, fixing, 1761
Report, eighteenth annual, 1659
Rutherford, the late Dr., 3192
Shipping rates, control of, qu. 2611
Subsidized steamboats, rates, 2174, 4003
Western Canada, representation, 3192

Railway Mail Service. *See* Post Office

Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway
Accidents, 3957
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 1558
Appropriations, statement, 2926
Baltimore and Ohio, promotion, 2828
Branch lines, 1568, 1735, 3006. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4339, 4344
Gaspe, 1243
Calgary & Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Caraquet and Gulf Shore, purchase, qu. 1258, 2938, 2939
Construction, 1440
Co-operation of, 1965
Deficits, 2747
Department. *See* Railways and Canals
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Earnings, flour transportation, Buffalo-New York, 2960
Electrification, 3422
Excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Express charges, 2876
Freight rates. *See that title*
Gaspe-Edmundston, 1243
Gaspe peninsula, 4186
Grades, rates, qu. 625, 1917
Grain shipments, diversion, 2898. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, 1618
Highways and motors, 1619
Immigration and land settlement, 1180, 1193, 2801, 1337
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
James Bay railway, 1036-49, 1073, 1402
Labour, organized, 126, 1426. *See also* Labour
Land grants to, 1353
Lands, purchases, sales, 1739
Late Minister of. *See* Kennedy, Hon. W. C.

Railways—*Con.*
Maritime provinces, 4186
Michigan Central bridge, Niagara Falls, qu. 1864
Minister of, appointment, Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
New York Central, promotions, 2828
Pacific-Great Eastern, 4700
Peace River district, 1433, 3006. *See also that title*
Pennsylvania, promotions, 2828
Pools and running rights, 3058
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Problems of, 1880. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Public ownership, 2956. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Radial, 3056
Railway labour, wages, 2876, 3190
Railway mail service, 4529. *See also* Post Office
Payments for, qu. 3143
Railway rates, equalization. *See* Freight Rates
Railway subsidies, 2902, 4303
St. John valley railway, 4311
Settlement, western provinces, 2833
Settlements far removed from, 3431
Shipping facilities. *See* St. John; Vancouver
Statistics, 207
Strikes. *See* Labour
Surveys and inspections, 4691, 4698
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario, 1071, 3056
Ties
Freight rates, 3036
Prices, 3036
Transfer charges, 2876
United States, 1618. *See also that title*
Company-owned, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix across Maine, 2902

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals; Railways
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canals. *See that title*
Department
Bell, Major Graham A., deputy minister, salary, 3195, 4557
Canada Highways Commission, 2489. *See also* Highways
Contingencies, further amount, 3377
Estimates, 1619, 2489, 3173, 3188, 3195, 3376, 3650, 3610, 3676, 3760

Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed minister, 2295
Intercolonial-Prince Edward Island pensions, 3195
Minister, appointment of, 519, 2295
Inquiry, 1081
Printing and stationary, outside service, 3197
Railway surveys and inspections, 3648
Salaries, 3195
Water powers, 3421
Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697
Expenditure by provinces, qu. 3887

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee
Change in personnel, 2252
Report, 2252

Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Raisins and Dried Currants. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff; Fruit

Ralph Connor, writings, immigration, 1181

Ralston Commission. *See* Pensions, Royal Commission

Ralston, Col. J. L. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Raney, Hon. W. E. *See* Ontario

Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Raw Materials, free trade in, 2858

Rawding, Mr., Clementsport, N.S., postmaster, 1795

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 160. Conditions in West as portrayed by western members, 160; congratulations to Mr. Forke; tariff for revenue, 161; the amendments; redistribution; Near East crisis, 162; attitude of Prime Minister, 163-164; status of Canada and foreign policy of Great Britain, 165; Canada's participation in wars of 1763 and 1812, 165-166
Budget, 2741. Cheerful sentiments of member for Skeena; tribute to Minister of Finance; budget acceptable to country; "standing pat"; "tariff stability" 2741; British preference; sales tax; beet sugar tax; wines; criticism of Sir Henry Drayton; French treaty; comparison of Canadian and United States catalogue prices, 2742; emigration to

Raymond, Mr. W. G.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
United States; cost of living; Canadians coming back; election of 1921; tariff issue; tariff concessions to Progressive party; an unresponsive attitude; wealth, levy upon; national debt; banks; widows and orphans; stockholders; capital and labour, 2743; purchasing power; natural resources, valuable only when developed; capital and capitalists, antagonism to; communists, socialists, anarchists, Bolshevists; property, protection of; Russia, example of; sugar, reduction of duty; postal war tax; postal rates, comparison Canada with United States, 2744; tariff, more important questions than, 2745; grain and grain trade; transportation; immigration and tariff go hand in hand; revenue proposals of Progressive party; income tax, proposal to increase; luxuries, taxation of; land tax; free trade, 2745; United States, trade with; tariff not a theoretical question; no surrender of Canadian market, 2746
French treaty bill, 2245
Agricultural implements, 2246
Agricultural products, 2247
Luxuries, 2742
Postage, war tax, 2744
References to speech on budget, 2747, 2756, 2787
Secession, 2244

Raymond and Talbot, Messrs., Rimouski harbour claim, 4588

Readjustment of Representation. *See* Redistribution Bill

Rebellion of 1837, 1365

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Reciprocity with United States, 85, 1196, 1223, 1246, 2243, 2810, 2948, 2966, 3049. *See also* speeches on Budget; Markets; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty; United States
Agricultural implements, 3017
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3016
Authority to negotiate, 3016
Blaine, late Hon. James G., statement, 2922
Boots and shoes, 3016, 3499
Building brick, 3017
Cattle industry and, 3082. *See also Live* Stock; Markets

Reciprocity with United States—*Con.*
"Clear-cut" issue, 3081
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493
Commercial union, 3906,3907, 3911
Commission of 1897, 3014
Fetish of, 2952
Fishing interests and, 2906, 3082, 3906
Goods on free list, 3017
Great Britain-France, 3050. *See also Treaties,* French Treaty
Herschell, Lord, 3014
History of, 2842
Leather, 3017
Markets for manufactured products, 2856
Natural and manufactured products, 2910
Natural resources, interchange, 2910
"Noble Eighteen," 2908
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2838, 2843, 2847, 2854, 2909, 2910, 2917, 2922, 2934, 2937, 2958, 2972, 2977, 2992, 3011, 3013, 3016, 3060, 3078, 3454, 3473, 3901, 3905
Fruits and vegetables, 2977
New York Times, 2968
Permanency, 3017, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2842, 2910, 2918, 3013
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718, 2778, 2832, 2931
Campaign, 2734, 3014
Defeat of, 1233, 2851, 2922, 2924, 2931
Conservative alliance with Nationalists, 2924
Evidence of attitude, Liberal party, 3010
Herring drawn across trail, 3013
Letter, Hon. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, 3081
Liberals who opposed, 2851
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3015, 3075, 3080
Omissions from proposed agreement, 3902
Western provinces, opposition to, 2854
Screen for failure to implement tariff pledges, 2951
Sentiment towards, 3082
Standing offer by Canada and United States, 3016
Termination of recent arrangement, 2993
Treaty of 1818 weapon in dealing with United States, 2906
Use of Canadian ports by fishing vessels, 2906

Reclamation. *See* Dominion Lands; Interior; Lands

Reconstruction in Europe, 3003. *See also* Germany, Reparations

Recreation Grounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; National Parks and Reservations

Red Cross Society
Grant to, 2169
Vetcraft shops, 694

Red Deer
Hebridean immigrants, 3584. *See also* Imgration
Valley, Coal Operators' Association, 1275

Red River, Manitoba, wharf, 1000

Redistribution, 27, 40, 162. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution Bill
Delay, 2400
Electoral reforms. *See* Proportional Representation
Intention of government, inquiry, 4250
Ivel, Mr. W. M., reported employment, 733
Marshall, Mr. Duncan and, 3313
Nova Scotia, and, 73
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Welland, Lincoln, Haldimand counties, 667

Redistribution Bill (Readjustment of representation in the House of Commons)
1r., 250-254; 2r., 436; ref. to Special Com., 487, 572-574
Special Committee, 2979
Leave to report, 857, 937
Number of members, 488-9
Privilege, Mr. Sutherland, 1660
Reference to, 487, 572-4
Reports, qu. 2612
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4593, concurred in, 4736-42

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Budget, 2830. Tribute to Ministers of Finance and Railways; rural mail system; immigration; public works; Canadian National Railways; public debt; national problems; natural resources; oriental immigration, 2830; western provinces, conditions Ontario and Quebec, industrial development and agricultural depression; Maritime provinces, commercial disadvantage due to remoteness of market; equitable treatment of all provinces; educational opportunities, 2831

Re-Establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reforestation. *See* Forests and Forestry

Reform of Senate. *See* Senate

Regimental Funds. *See* National Defence

Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518

Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.; Bankruptcy Act

Reid, Capt. John, Hudson Bay railway, 1046

Reindeer in "Barren Lands", Mr. Stefansson's statement, 1073

Rejected Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456

Relief Work. *See* Unemployment

Renfrew postmastership, qu. 205

Renovated Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Rents. *See* Cost of Living; Public Buildings

Reparations, 2498, 4653. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Pugsley; War Claims

Repatriation. *See* Immigration; Naturalization Act

Repentigny, Que. wharf, 977

Reports Tabled, 3, 8-9, 33, 54, 74, 99, 122, 202, 250, 331, 574, 812, 767, 911, 936, 986, 1080, 1156, 1307, 1361, 1384, 1539, 1631, 1659, 1686, 1910, 2204, 2252 2611, 2837, 2885, 2926, 4075, 4510

Representation. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Readjustment of. *See* Redistribution

Research. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Central research institute, 788
Helium, discoveries in, 703, 4439
Medical discoveries, 1287. *See also* Banting, Reward for. *See titles,* M. (Mr. Ladner)
Scientific and industrial research
Discoveries, 4439
Honorary advisory council
Expenditure, qu. 731
Oil shale deposits, 2514
Patents of invention, 2082

Reservations. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Reserves. *See* Indians

Resignation of Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Resolutions, The Ninety-Two. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis)

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Responsible Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Restaurants, profiteering, 2586

Retail Merchants' Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, 3551

Retired Officers. *See also* Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill
Indian Army officers, settlement in British Columbia, 1096

Retirement Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service

Returned Soldiers. *See* Civil Service; Labour, Unemployment; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill,
(Application in force though applicant died before delivery of policy; decision to be reviewed)
Res. 3582, 3743; 1r., 3745; 2r., com., 3r., 3892; Senate amdts. 4734, 4750

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Reuters' News Service, 4712

Revenue. *See also* speeches on Budget; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; Revenue Bills; Taxation; Trade
Amdt. (Mr. Forke), 3016
Collected during war, 2985
Direct taxation, 2836
Estimate of, 3074
1923-24, 2642
Expenditure and, 3064
French treaty and, 1983. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Income tax, 2858
Unearned income, 3026
Luxuries, tax on, 2858
Methods of raising, 2784, 3016. *See also* Taxation
New sources, 2828, 2909
Progressive policy and, 2817
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913
Tariff, 2745, 3025
Reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 3301
Unearned income, 2954, 3026

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
2. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4505
3. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; com., 4392; 3r., 4393
4. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2656, 3922, 4181, amended, 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Revenue Stamps. *See* Post Office

Revised Statutes, procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974

Rheaume, Mr. J. T. (Jacques Cartier)
Address, in reply, seconder, 16; late Mr. Lafortune, 16; Canada's financial condition; marked progress in industry; necessity for increased immigration, 17
Introduced, 3

Rhineland. *See* Germany

Rice, freight rates, 1915

Richmond and Wolfe Counties
Accredited herds, qu., 813
Soldier settlement, 913

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, expenditure, 4627

Right of Appeal. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.

Right, Petition of. *See* Petition of Right

Riley, Mr. E. T., 60

Riley's Army, transportation, 3042

Rimouski Harbour
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Wharf, 977

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4145
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4195
Canadian Press, Limited, 2587
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2587
Copyright Act, 2343
M. for amendment of, 495
Deputy Ministers, French language, 1805-08
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1805

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand—*Con.*
Emigration to the United States, 1173
Farm labour, 1174
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Empire settlement scheme, 1175
Policy, 1172
Restriction of, 1174
Newspaper postage, 4535
Population, net increase, 1173
Post offices, number in Montreal, qu. 3135
Public debt, increase, 1896-1922, 1173
Public ownership of railways, 4195
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 720
Royal Academy of Arts bill, 281
Rural depopulation, 1174
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4185
Wine and beer excise taxes, qu. 518

Riordon Pulp and Paper Company
Business profits tax, 4490
Arrears, qu. 1974

Riots, Aid of militia in. *See* National Defence; Troops

Rivière du Lièvre wharf, 978

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Agricultural conditions, 1837, 1846
Agricultural implements, standardization, 796
Australia
Trade treaty with, 1848, 3475, 3476
Visit to, 1848-49, 2815, 3017, 3474, 3475
Belgian exposition, 496
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3457
Woollen goods, 3459
Business conditions, review of, 1837, 1846
Canada-West Indies treaty, 3378
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, 3385
Canadian travelling exhibition in France, 4712
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 4290
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 487, 2139, 2287, 2343, 2436, 3154
Amdt. clause 2, 2291
Cost of living, 1812
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine), 651
Dairying industry, 1839
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 663
Farm mortgages, 1839
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4549
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
French treaty bill, 2239
Balance of trade, 2239
Boots and shoes, 2240
Bronze powder, 2017
Favoured nation, 2242
Fuel supply, 796
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 811
Government publications, 811
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of grain at United States ports, 3649, 3961
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 4709
Litigation, 2045
Validity, 782
Dockage, 783
Elevators
Edmonton, 4718
Government
Grain passing through, 2037
Value, 2037
Halifax, 4714
Lethbridge, 4718
Mixing, 2036
Montreal, short weights, complaint, 2037
Ontario, 2037, 2039
Quebec, grain shipment, 4233
Screenings, 2039, 2041, 2254
Vancouver improvements, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commissioners, board of, 2036
Salaries, 4709
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1764, 4710, 4711
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1210
Rates, 4290
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Screenings, 2254
Shipments, congestion, 3767
Transportation, insurance, 3764
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 4587
Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 3960, 4218-35, 4276, 4285, 4290
Lake grain rates, royal commission, 4710
Report, 2885, 3045
London Corn Exchange, complaint, 3649
Oil bounty, Alberta, 2510
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Oil, fuel and lubricating, standardizing, 809
Oriental immigration, 507
Patents of Invention bill, 331, 2064, 2083, 2087, 3154

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Patents of Invention—*Con.*
Appeal to Exchequer court, 2080
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2065, 2128
Domicile, election of, 2070
Foreign patents, 2068
Petroleum bounties, 780
Raisins and dried currants, 3476. *See also under this title,* Australia
Russian trade mission, 987
Shipping combines, prosecution, 4228
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4701
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3377
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3385
Contracts, 2172
Inspection, 2178
Mackenzie river, 2176
Magdalen islands, 2174
Mediterranean, proposed, 1637
Northern Alberta, 2176
Pictou-Magdalen islands, 2174
Railway Commission and, 4004
Rates, control of, 2174
Subventions, 2171
Victoria-West Coast-Vancouver island, 4003
Toronto seed branch building, 4625
Trade. *See also under this title,* Australia, French Treaty
Annual report, 1910
Commissioners, 1837
Exports, 1838
Oriental, 507
West Indies-Col. Amery, 3392
Trade and Commerce dept.
Canada Grain Act, 2035
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 2033, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701
Patents and Copyright branch, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade Marks and Designs bill, 331, 2063, 2293
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Wheat board legislation, 2696
Extension by order in council, 3045
Woollen industry, protection, 930

Roberge, Mr. Eusèbe (Megantic)
Introduced, 3

Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Roberts, Hon. W. F., secession, 3145

Roberval, Que. wharf, 978

Robichaud, Mr. J. G. (Gloucester)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4120
Budget, 2935. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Progressive party; policy futile and action ill-advised, 2935; economic conditions and remedies; "blue ruin" speeches; confidence in future; remedy proposed worse than disease; conditions prior to 1896; return of Liberal party under Sir Wilfrid Laurier; revival of business; depression following war; country again on road to prosperity; trade revival shown by import and export figures, 2936; Banking and Commerce committee, inquiry; British preference, increase of; direct importation; reciprocity with United States; Canadian seaports, 2937; Bay of Fundy; Shippegan; Hudson Bay railway; wheat shipment, facilities of eastern ports; Sir Sandford Fleming, report, 2938; Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway; comparative mileages, 2939; National railway policy; fishing industry; disabilities under United States tariff; legislation; modus vivendi; secession talk, 2940
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3394
Coastal regulations, suspension of, 2960
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3365
Fish, express rates on, 3365
Introduction, 3
Pensions, 3710
Vimy Ridge memorial, 184
Wharves, revenue, 976

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (King's, N.S.)
Address in reply, 72; redistribution, effect on Nova Scotia; immigration campaign; condition of European markets, 73
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 879
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 834

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Montreal post office, daylight saving, qu. 3143

Robson, Judge. *See* Combines

Roche, Hon. W. J., 354-5. *See also* Civil Service Commission

Rockefeller Foundation, hospital standardization, 2934

Rocky Mountain Park. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Rodin's Statue of France, 2832

Rods. *See* Copper Bars or Rods; Steel

Roentgen, discoverer of X-rays, 1287

Rogers, Hon. Robert, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Rondeau, Ont. pier, 983

Root Vegetables. *See* Vegetables

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection, Bill (Inspection certificate evidence of grade and condition). Mr. Caldwell. 1r., 937

Rosoman, Mr. Cyril E., postmaster, Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Ross, Mr. George. *See* Post Office

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Annual drill, 4636
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Breakwaters, appropriations for, 4563
British preference, woollen industry, 3462
Budget, 2932. Amendment; Finance Minister's statement unsatisfactory; Liberal platform of 1919; European unrest and dissatisfaction; British navy best guarantee of peace; exodus; reasons for the movement; preference of British immigrants for Australia and New Zealand, 2932; proposals to disband mounted police, discontinue miltary training and curtain naval service; pre-election promises and pledges; food prices not going down; tuberculin test; special delivery letters, cost of; military training expenditure and results; cabinet ministers—are they required?; income tax, widows' exemption; reciprocity; domination of United States; educational system; medical course; standardization of hospitals;political and social system; weighing and measuring babies; moral influence; Canada's favourable position; not advisable to open door to United States, 2934; chief reliance upon British stock; confidence in courage and bravery of French-Canadian race, 2935
Cadet services, 879
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Certified milk, 3300
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 540
Grant, Dr., civil service, 541

Ross, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3594
Hector celebration, 4636
Immigrants rejected, 706, qu. 1992
Medical advisory boards, 697
Military hospitals, qu. 282, 669, 673
Maintenace cost, qu. 812
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Milk pasteurization, 3300
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3724
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743
Portsmouth postmaster, 1832
Shipping rates, 3783
Soldiers' Civil Re-establshment
Hospitals. *See under this title,* Military hospitals
Salaries, 669
Soldier settlement, 2030
Board, qu. 2180
Ontario, qu. 492
Salaries, 2017
Tuberculin test, 2933, 3284, 3300
Welland canal construction, 3782

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Collingwood harbour dredging, 4578
Feeding Stuffs Act, conference, 606
Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, qu. 707
Millfeeds conference, 606
Postal appointments, 1801
Rural mail carriers
Compensation for loss, 1833
Remuneration, 1792

Roumanian Loan, qu. 623, 2010

Rowell, Hon. N. W., 318

Royal Academy of Arts, Bill respecting, (Mr. Rinfret) 1r., 281

Royal Assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 866. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Naturalization
Cape Sabine, post, 3944
Cost and estimates, 1148
Duties, seven day week, 4514
Enforcement of federal statutes, 699, 777
Espionage, 1142
Estimates, 774, 1163
Fitzpatrick, Mr. F. J. E., article in Maple Leaf, 1140
Force and officers, 1141

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—*Con.*
Investigations and convictions by, 1144-5
Legal adviser, Mr. Donald Downie, 777
Motions for disbandment of, 2933
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 816, 1139, neg. on div, 1152
Naturalization, 779. *See also that title*
Nelson district withdrawal from, 2943
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, enforcement, 697
Ottawa departmental buildings, policing, 778
Pay, 777
Pensions, 774, qu. 1362
Reorganization, 776
Scrip, qu. 1362
Seizure of books and property, 1142
Strength and work of force, 1144

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Royal Commissions. For individual commissions, *see their titles*
Appointments to, 2710. *See also* Judges Act Amdt.
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1209-1212
Judges and, 3604
Lake grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. *See* Steamship Services

Royal Military College, 4628

Royal Naval College. *See* Esquimalt

Royal Northwest Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Rugs, for departmental offices, qu. 1486

Ruhr District, invasion. *See* Germany, Reparations

Rules of the House. *See* House of Commons

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Marcil; Speaker

Rural Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Rural Credits. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits

Rural Depopulation, 35, 1126, 1165, 1174, 1182, 1189, 1234, 1394, 1406, 1432, 1844, 1860, 1906. *See also* Emigration; Farmers; Labour; Population
Causes of, 1133
Economic conditions, 1856

Rural Depopulation—*Con.*
Great Britain in, 1854
United States, 2829
Wealth, production of, 1856

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Post Office, Postmasters

Rush-Bagot Treaty. *See* Treaties

Russell, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868

Russia
Bolshevism, 2744
Immigration, 1340, 2845
Relations with, 44-45, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986, 987

Rutherford Commission. *See* Race Track Betting

Ryckman, Mr. E. B. (East Toronto)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Budget, 2912. Budget disappointing; accounts not balanced, currency depreciated, exchange unfavourable; trying to satisfy too many factions; incidence of taxation; summer trade; stability not finality; sales tax; pyramiding; passing on to farmer, housewife and labourer, 2912; cigarette tax; income tax; production and revenue lessened; based on fallacy that taxation of rich relieves poor; Mr. Otto H. Kahn; income tax reduction in United Kingdom and United States, 2913; capital diverted from industry to tax free bonds; immigration and investment discouraged; graduated income tax; alternative between new taxation or economy, 2914; ministers' salaries and members' indemnities; aristocracy of spending; civil service; finances complicated; ordinary and war expenses should be specially provided for, 2915; substitution of turnover for sales tax; farmers and the tariff; price comparison between Canada and United States; William Henry Seward on United States tariff, 2916; not enough protection; reciprocity in tariff taxation; imports of agricultural products; farmers' national policy; reciprocity proposals, 2917; reciprocity agreement of 1911; United States out for themselves; war debts; United States would "crash through any agreement"; 2918; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2919

Ryckman, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Canadian National Railways
New positions and salaries, 2701
Paris offices, 3631, 3680
Cheque tax, 3933
Combines bill, 2630
Appointments, 2665
Technicalities, 2665
Government elevators, value, 2037
Labour dept., economies, 1624
Masters and mates, 2668
Patents of Invention bill, 2070
Domicile, election of, 2072
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3864, 3881
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2468
Toronto harbour improvements, 984, 2678, 4578

St. Alexis wharf, 980

St. Andrew's Dam fishway, 1000

St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

St. Andrew's lock, 2682

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière
Experimental farm, 460, qu. 1028

Ste. Anne des Monts wharf, 979

Ste. Anne's lock, Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph line, qu. 3138, qu. 3262

St. Barnabe Nord postmaster, 1830

St. Bruno postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3140

St. Charles wharf, 980

Ste. Claire postmaster, qu. 1031

St. Croix
Harbour, 2899, 2938
River, bridges, 2342

St. David postmistress, 1489

St. Jean d'Evangeliste, postmaster, qu. 2698

St. Jean d'Orleans wharf, 980

St. John, N.B. (city)
Employment office, 3453
Immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Martello tower, 3444
Members of Parliament, visit to, 2503
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Water supply, 1022
Station, 2481, 3188, 3645, 4310, 4445
Terminals, train shed, 3188, 3645
Warehouse facilities, 308

St. John, N.B. (port), 2676
Canadian National Railways, 1767
Grain shipments, 261, qu. 1484
Harbour commissioners, qu. 911
Importation through. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Improvements, 109, 4610
Courtenay bay, 109, 2676
Pilots, 3358
Wharfage tolls, 975

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill
(Extension of time)
Res. 3145, 3403; 1r., 2r., com., 3405; 3r., 3406

St. John-Bay of Fundy steamship service, 2176

St. John-Bear River steamship service, 2176

St. John-Digby steamship service, 2176

St. John River
Bridges, 2342
Sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Wharves, taking over of, qu. 1488

St. Joseph d'Alma postmaster, qu. 3140

St. Laurent, late Mr. Arthur. *See* Public Works

St. Lawrence Ship Canal, surveys, 3647
Hydrographic, 3336

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 3339
Dredge No. 12, Capt. Bilodeau, qu. 1487
Maintenance and dredging, 3375, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374. *See also* Sorel

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 2979. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Hudson Bay railway; Lake Grain Rates; Vancouver Harbour bill; Water Powers; Welland canal
Aerial survey, 1776
Expenditure, 3076
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 665
International Joint Commission, 3427
Parliamentary discussion of project, 2807
Power
Development, qu. 490, 2682
Dominion Power Board, investigation, 3427
Exportation, 658
Power canal, qu. 204
Water powers, 3782
Shipping rates. *See also* **Freight Rates,** Shipping
Grain, 3343
United States
Agreement with, 3705, 3762
Negotiations with, 665, 3208, 4513

Ste. Marie, Mr. L. T., appointment, qu. 1028

St. Mary's Cape, N.S., breakwater, 941

St. Michel de Bellechasse wharf, 980

St. Moïse, Que., agent, 1489

St. Omer, Que., wharf, 980

St. Père, Mr. E. C. (Hochelaga)
Civil Service Commission, 1188
Emigration to United States, 1188
Immigration
Agents, appointment, 1188
Farmers and farm labourers, 1188
Labour, attitude, 1186, 1187
Policy, 1186
Labour, unemployment, 1187
Repatriation, 1188

St. Peter's, N.S. postmaster, qu. 1488, 1795

Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588

St. Stephen, N.B. industrial centre, 2901

Saar Valley. *See also* League of Nations
Administration, 3995, 4000
Commission, 4653

Sackville public building, 4613

Safety League. *See* Canadian National

Sailors. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine
Institutions for assisting, 2167

Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers Bill
Res. 193; 1r., 195; 2r., 277; ref. to Agriculture Com. 277; com. 2105; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts. 3150

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Agricultural conditions, 1841
Binder twine, price, 4386
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549, 4550
Government telegraphs, qu. 383
Grain
Dockage and screenings, 786
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225-34
Marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 304
Hudson Bay railway, 3647
Labour, hours, 1841
Penitentiaries, 773
Railway department, printing, 3197
Saskatchewan Co-operative creamery, 185

Sales, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 269
Vancouver terminal elevator, qu. 517
Addition to, cost, qu. 621
Yorkton income tax office, qu. 384

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Bill; Taxation

Saline Lake Deposits, Western Canada, 3198

Salmon Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Salvage Cases. *See* Soldier Settlement

Salvation Army
Immigration, 1430, 1476, 1480-1
Canada Colonization Association, 1093
Child, 1470

Sample Market. *See* Grain, Marketing of

Sanctuaries, Birds and Wild Animals. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Sardine Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Saskatchewan. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2766
Automobiles in, 82, 148. *See also* Automobiles
Canadian Air Force, 1748-51
Co-operative creameries, 2779
Co-operative Elevator Company, 2779
Dairying industry, production, 1921, 2744
Debentures, sale of, 2770
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061, 3942
Dredging, 1012
Dunning, Premier, statement regarding budget, 2770-1
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Hail Insurance Commission, 2770
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Highways, 3185. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, domestic servants, 1099, 1476
Indians, 2145
Lands
Reclamation, 1065
Southwestern, 1353
Mennonites, 1229
Mixed farming, 2773
Public buildings, 1023, 4629
Resources, report of Mr. Crean, 1060
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, Calcutta trade commissioner, 1840
Settlers' relief, 3447
Sunset lake postmaster, claim, 1832

Saskatchewan—*Con.*
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Wheat board, res. of legislature, 3045

Saskatoon post office, 1785

Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa, Hindu franchise, 508, 4641-65. *See also* Hindus

Saturday Night, statement, labour shortage, 1125

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sayabec postmistress, dismissal. *See* Post Office; Boulay

Scandals. *See* War

Scandinavia, immigration from, 1085

Scarfe Varnish Works, qu. 1485

Schofield, Rev. Dr., res. Pension Board, 3399

Scholarships. *See* Students

Schools. *See also* Education
Attendance age, 1179
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Closed for lack of money, 1202, 1342, 1388, 2836
Lack of in the West, 1390
Lands, 3398. *See also* Dominion Lands
Reversion of, 3445
Sections reserved for. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 1385, 3982, 4202
New, opening of, 1889
Oriental children, 2326, 2485
Segregation, 1896
School homes for immigrants, 1227
Taxes, unpaid, 3256

Scientific and Industrial Research. *See* Research

Scientific Men, neglect of, 1294. *See also* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scotland, immigration from, 1876. *See also* Immigration, Hebrideans

Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, Grain Inquiry Commission, 4711

Scott, Mr. Frank. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Scottish Aid Society, immigration, 1876

Scottish Pioneer Association, Hector celebration, 4705

Screenings. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Seamen
Desertion of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference; Treaties; Ports

Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, price comparison, 2737, 2742

Secession, 2940. *See also* Maritime Provinces; Nova Scotia; Western Provinces
British Empire from, 2244
Nova Scotia; 2057, 2177, 2243-4, 2977
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement of, 3145
Talk of, 2977, 3067
Western provinces, 2808, 2814

Second Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill

Secondary Amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secret Agreement, Japanese immigration, 1448

Secret Treaties. *See* Near East Crisis

Secretary of State
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, alien enemy property, custodian, 3823, 4671
Salaries and contingencies, 2392, 2494
Naturalization. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Correspondence, Vancouver judges, 2199
Certificates, issue, 2182. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Naturalization Acts, expenses under, 2495
Public archives, 3985
War claims adjustment, 2495. *See also* Aliens; War

Securities, Issue of. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

Sedition. *See also* Criminal Code Act Amdt. Bill; Immigration Act Amdt. Bill;
Royal Canadian Mounted Police and, 1142

Seed. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Fairs, 599, 600
French treaty, 1984
Purchasing Commission, qu. 279, 599, 601
Seed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444

Seed Testing and Inspection, Bill
(Grading and qualities of seed)
Res. 195; 1r., 198; 2r., and ref. to Agriculture Com. 277-8; com.. 2304; 3r., 2308
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agricultural or garden vegetable seeds or plants, 2307
Clark, Mr. George H., 2304
New varieties, registration of, 2307
Noxious weeds, 2305
Primary, 2305
Plant, definition of, 2304
Registration through Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Sale of seeds for export, 2307
Samples to be taken in presence of witness, 2308
Seed commission, 2304
Time limit for complaint, 2308

Seeds, Noxious, 2305, 4378. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill

Seizures. *See* Customs and Excise; Fish and Fisheries

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selkirk, Man. wharf, 1000

Senate
Abolition of, 1376
Amendments concurred in:
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 4201
Board of Audit Act, 4733
Canadian National Railways (Securities) bill, 4754
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 4536
Combines bill, 3504
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4736
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 4733
Fruit Containers bill, 3150
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 3149

Senate—*Con.*
Amendments concurred in—*Con.*
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 2050
Patents of Invention bill, 3154
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744-50
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4734, 4750
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4734
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 4750
Amendments, non-concurrence
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4357, 4592
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., Joint committee, 730
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4688, 4689, 4694
Rejection of, 4753
Divorce proceedings, publicity. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Elective, 2908
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1364
Estimates, salaries and contingencies, 2694, 3949
Fowler, Hon. Senator, remarks on immigration bill, 3032
Grain-carrying trade, committee report, 2899
Hudson Bay railway report. *See* Hudson Bay Railway, M. (Mr. Knox)
Joint committee. *See* Senate and House of Commons
Lougheed, Senator, remarks on Immigration bill, 3032
Members of House of Commons appointed to, 2710
Progressive party and, 1378
Reform, 2908
Senators
Age limit, 1376
Attendance, 4007, 4008
Indemnity, 4008
M. (Mr. Leader) for reduction of, 1153
Pensions, 1376
Vested right of, 1376

Senate and House of Commons
Joint Committee on matters of common interest, 4007
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Indemnity; attendance)
Res. 4184; 1r., 2r., com., 4185, 4236; amdt. (Mr. Gardiner) six months' hoist, neg. 4246; amdt. (Miss Macphail) to refer back, neg. 4247; 3r., 4247; Senate amdts. 4734

Senate and House of Commons—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Attendance of senators and members, 4007
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Personal explanation—Mr. Gervais, 4249
Sessional allowance, 4185, 4236
Amdt. (Miss Macphail) to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Accredited herd system, qu. 492
Agricultural Instruction Act, renewal of, qu. 490
Budget, 2957. Protection, adequate; tariff proposals and Liberal pre-election pledges; need of profitable markets; British preferential tariff, 2957; mistake to penalize Canadian industry; woollen industry affected by increased preference; competition from other countries; artificial silk duty; knitting factories threatened with ruin; petition against increase of British preference and alteration of sales tax; copper and hemp bounties; reciprocity; Canadian and United States duties on agricultural products, 2958; imports; home market for manufactured and agricultural products; unbalanced budget; economy; high standard of living, 2959
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Seed inspection, 198
Six Nation Indians, 1307

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Sessional Indemnity. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act

Settlement. *See* Immigration; Soldier Settlement

Settlers. *See also* Soldier Settlement
Land for. *See* Immigration
Relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Transportation facilities, 2172

Sevres Treaty. *See* Near East Crisis

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Budget, 2784. National debt, revenue; methods of raising; deficits; taxation; increase in national business; expenditure; retrenchment; immigration 2784; natural resources; retrenchment, public works, civil service, superannuation; taxation and extravagance, 2785; taxes—income, business, consumers, sales; national policy based on special privilege; tariff, downward revision;

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
labour unions; strikes; high cost of living; prices, control of; agriculture, condition of; farmers in Parliament; partisan politics, cost of; prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 2787; combines; spread between producer and consumer; disappointing budget; protective feature of tariff; the amendment
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743

Seymour Narrows, obstruction, 3333

Shale Deposits. *See* Oil

Shareholders. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (Calgary West)
Address in reply, 66. Gift from France of Vimy Ridge, 66; Parliament and economy; administration of national parks; four cardinal principles of taxation, 66-67; agriculture essential industry of Canada, 67; financial and economic depression in farming industry, 67-68; cost of grain production, 68; high transportation and insurance rates, 68-69; western grain route, 69; cattle industry and embargo; co-ordination of branches of Agriculture department; revision of Bank Act, 70; government immigration policy, 70-71; Near East crisis, government's action, 71; General Smuts at Imperial Conference of 1921; personal standing and obligation to constituents, amdt. to amdt., 72
Annual training, 864
Banff national park
Electric plant, 3436
Power rights, 496, 3750
Calgary Power Company, 3938
Springs and cave, 496
Water powers, 3420
Banff-Windermere highway, 3437
Bank Act, revision, res. Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4089-4105; 4134-4160; 4509
Bank mergers, 4134, 4150
Interest at 7 per cent, 4103
Maximum rate, amdt. 4148, neg. 4148
Shareholders' audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4089
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1505

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
Business of the House
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1302
Supply, amdt. to amdt., 1302
Business profits tax, 4491
Cadet services, 877
Calgary
Power Company, privileges, 3750
Unemployment relief, 1681-3
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 4709
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3377, 3389, 3397
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3410-13
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, combine, 1395
Canadian national parks, automobile admission fee, 3943
Canadian National Railways
Coal, purchase of, qu. 4437
Alberta, qu. 1363. 4752
Employees' pensions, 288
Paris offices, 3650-74
Transportation combine, 1395
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Canadian Press, Limited, 4712
Subsidy, 4728
Canadian representation in United States, 4664
Cheque tax, 3934
Chilled beef, 464
Civil Service Act
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253
Homestead inspectors, 3252
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 363, 382, 519
Special committee, 937
Civil Service bonus, 1664
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Civil Service Commission, 346
Combines
Bill, appointments, 2665
Transportation, 1395
Cost of living. *See also* Civil Service bonus
Freight rates and, 1958
Reduction, 1394
Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Betting information, 2282
Guessing competitions, 2282, 2283
Customs and excise, salaries, 3276
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4253
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4668
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2360
Dominion lands and parks.
Automobile admission fee, National parks, 3943
Salaries, 3250

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Egypt, British policy, 4662
Emigration to United States, 1393
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Grant, 3413
Experimental farms, 464
Freight rates, 1394
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1958
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1956
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Halibut treaty, 4132
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1690
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4645, 4664
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3130, 4442
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4690
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1396
Advances to, qu. 517
Results, 1105
Child, 1472
Estimates, 1387
Policy, 1392
Imperial Conference, 4645-63
Constitutional changes, 4664
Policy, 4662
Publicity, 4665
Indemnity of members, 4009, 4247
International Labour Conference, 1645-6
Interest rate. *See under this title,* Bank Act
Labour
Coal miners' strike, district 18, 1629
Industrial disputes investigation, 1629
Labour Gazette, 1622
Lack of Confidence vote, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 213
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225
Land speculation, 1395
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Merchants' Bank failure, 4150
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrison claim, Little Anse, 4724
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2123
Northwest Territories Act, procedure, qu. 1974
Oil-well drilling machinery, duty, 3917
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions
Appeal boards, 683
European war and active militia, 2167, 3723
Legislation, 2519
Officials, conduct of, 4703

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1649
Royal commission reports
Interim, 2167
Printing, 3401
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401
Permanent force, 892
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3130
Physical training, 877
Political patronage, 3347
Postal rates, public libraries, 1809
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4679
Privilege—Grain Growers Guide, 987
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 4629
Public expenditure, East and West, 3436
Purchasing Commission, 3950
Authority for, qu. 2699
Railway rates
Attorney General, B.C. vs. C.P.R., 1917
Railway commission judgment, 1917
Redistribution, 4741
Renovated butter, 4253
Rideau canal, 4691
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, taxes, qu. 1974
Rocky Mountain park
Hudson Bay Company claim, qu. 2418
Stipendary magistrate, 1739
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778
Rural depopulation, 1394
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, public libraries, 1870
Scholarships, international, provision for, 878
Screenings, purchase of, 785
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4185, 4238-4247
Soldiers Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747, 3894
Soldier Settlement Board, extension, 1128
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3346
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4077
Tariff, high protection cost, 1394
Taxation, burden of, 1394
Tourist traffic, 3437
War, Canada's participation, 4663
Water powers, 3420. *See also under this title* Banff
Western provinces, conditions, 1396
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, Standard Shipping Company, 1704
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Grain dockage, qu. 3505
Port Arthur elevator, qu. 2612
Renfrew postmastership, qu. 204
Toronto harbour dredging, 1011

Sheep-Raising Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock; Wool

Shells. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Sherwood, Mr. H. Crossley, letter, 519

Shippigan, port, 2938

Ships. *See* Vessels

Shipping and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Freight Rates, Shipping; Harbours and Rivers; Marine; Naval Service; Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Vessels
All-Canadian routes between East and West, 3273
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. *See also that title.*
Shipping combine, 4278
War claims, qu. 3142
Canadian shipyards, closing, 1338
Cattle boats. *See also* Live Stock
Alleged unsanitary condition, 2613
Space, 2133
Certificates
Certificated masters on coasting vessels, 3971
Steamship. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Dollar Shipping Company, 3273
Great Britain, 3072
Great Lake Transportation Company, lease of freighters, 3848
Harling, Thomas & Son, shipments via Panama canal, 3273
Hirtle, Schooner Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Kirkwood line, 2175, 3846
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
London Guarantee & Accident Company, qu. 1138
Ocean ports, 2898. *See also* Ports
Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Immigration
Tramp steamers, 2127
Registrar. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343

Shipping and Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Shipping associations. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Shipping combines, 3845. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Ships purchased from foreigners, 3972
Standard Shipping Company, 4278
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Steamship services. *See that title*
Strikes. *See* Labour

Shire Horses, gift to Canada, 2207, 2253

Shortages. *See* Grain

Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Sick Mariners' Dues. *See* Health

Sifton, Sir Clifford
Coal supply, 1265
Clyde, the, mechanics from, 1204
Fuel supply, 788
Hudson Bay railway, 1047
Immigration, 1181-3
Importation of British workmen, 1186
"Man with sheepskin coat" 1204
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Lake grain rates, 4285
Standard of living, 1168

Silesia, partition of, 3995

Silks. *See* Custom Tariff; Treaties, French Treaty; Textiles

Siloam, schooner. *See* Vessels

Silver. *See* Mines and Minerals

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3356
Navigation, safeguards, qu. 812

Sinclair, Mr. John A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
References to, 2996, 3012

Sinclair, Upton, press, capitalistic control, 2726

Singapore Naval Base, 2469, qu. 3506, qu. 3820, 3822, 4654

Single Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Single Tax. *See* Land; Taxation

Single Transferable Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Six Nations. *See* Indians

Skeena River. *See* British Columbia, Fishing Licenses

Sloan, Hon. William, Asiatic immigration, 1901

Smart, Mr. Bogue. *See* Immigration

Smith, Mr. A. H. *See* Drayton-Acworth Commission

Smith, Goldwin, protection, 3071

Smuggling. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Taxation

Smuts, General, 31, 72. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Imperial Conference

Snider, Judge, report, 1714

Snowden, Mr. Philip, British labour party, 2722

Social Agencies. *See* Labour, Unemployment

Social Service Council. *See* Race-Track Betting

Social Standards, work, popular attitude, 1189

Socialism, 123, 631, 2727. *See also* Labour
Macolm island Finnish settlement 1247

Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Soft Drinks, tax on. *See* Confectionery and Beverages; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Soldier Advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Bill

Soldier Settlement. *See also* Soldier Settlement Board
Carleton county, farms sold, qu. 1013
Fire insurance, 496
Lands
Reversion of, 3257
Taxation, 3256, 3260
Loans
Black, Mr. W. J., 2019
Expenditures and, qu. 2207
Missisquoi and Brome counties, 4012
Ontario, qu. 492
Questionaire sent out by Miss Macphail, 1845
Richmond county, farms sold, qu. 913
Wolfe county, farms sold, qu. 913

Soldier Settlement Board, 51. *See also* Immigration
Advances under act and cost, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Amounts due Dominion government, qu. 814

Soldier Settlement Board—*Con.*
Advice and assistance to immigrants, 1126
Edmonton, insurance, 3506
Estimates, 1910, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2986
Field supervisors, location of immigrants, 1089
Hebridean immigrants, 3252, 3596
Immigration, 170, 1179, 1255, 1406
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Land sales, alleged attempt to bribe supervisors, 1091
Legal expenses, 2018
Loans, 2018
Members, salaries and expenses, qu. 2180
Moss, Mr. H. H., illegal arrest, 2030
Peace river district, 1185
Salaries, 1910, 2017
Salvage cases, qu. 206, 2018
Staff, 2018

Soldiers. *See also* National Defence; Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
British soldier, deportation, 2254
Burial of destitute, 693, 695
Hospitals, 669. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Imperial and foreign, treatment of, 691
In distressed circumstances abroad, 1456
National monument, Ottawa, 2685
Official advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Returned soldiers
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Branch banks and, 4122
Canadian legion, Victoria, B.C., res. 2942
Civil service. *See also that title*
Appointments, 1795
Dismissals, 1772
Employment, 1772
Clearing land, 1185
Deaths from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Naturalization, 1379
Pensions, 2942. *See also* Pensions
Postmasterships and, 1799
Sheltered employment, 694
Vetcraft shops, 694
Treatment of, 2942
Unemployment, 2168
Relief, 689, 1679, 1681, 2168
Vocational training, 686

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment
Department of, 113, qu. 282, 3893, 4075. *See also* National Defence; Pensions

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Amalgamation with National Defence, 3893
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Estimates, 668
Expenditure, 2967, 3893
Reduction of, 23, 2032, 2987
Hospitals, 668, qu. 812. *See also that title*
Brant, closing, 1995, 4075, 4303
Euclid Hall, Toronto, closing, 4075, 4303
Imperial and foreign soldiers, treatment, 691
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Joint industrial council, 1654
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 677, 696
Medical treatment and examination, 670, 687
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 670, 708, 2013
North Essex election, 2013
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pay and allowances, 687
Pensions, 3707. *See also that title*
European war and active militia, 2166. *See also* Pensions; Returned Soldiers
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Toronto Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Mrs. Van Koughnet, 4726
Training, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 1681, 2168
Vancouver office, appointments and dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Vocational loans, 687

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department Act Amdt. Bill
(Review and appeal tribunals; official soldier advisers; evidence on oath)
Res. 3648, 3745; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3892; 3r., 3895; Senate amendments, 4750
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, review and appeal tribunals, 3892
Official soldier advisers, 3894
Power to take evidence on oath, 3895
Regulations, medical and appeal boards, 3892

Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, qu. 3506, 3507, 4725

Solicitor General. *See* Justice

Sorel
Postmaster, appointment of, qu. 1487

Sorel—*Con.*
Shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344, 3374
Maintenance and operation, 3374

Souris, Man., public building, 4614

South Africa
Immigration policy, 1474, 1882
Senate, constitution, 1370

South America
Senates, constitution, 1373
Steamship service, 3377

Southampton, Ont. breakwater, 984

Soviet. *See* Russia

Spain
Senate, constitution, 1373
Trade with, 2397
Treaty with France, 2219

Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial forest patrol, 1776

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of:
Acoustics of chamber, 4594
Adjournment
To await action of Senate, 4754
To discuss, etc., 1540, 2886
Against rule, unless urgent, 3589-90, 4441
Debate to be confined to matter at issue, 3599, 3601
Must not revive former discussion, 4296
No right of reply, 3595, 3603
Except by consent, 2896
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Baker memorial, Joint commttee, 730
Bills
Drafting by law officers of House 494
First reading, explanation brief, 487
Not alterable except by authority of House, 3326
Reference to Private Bills Com. 4308
Second reading
More elaborate explanation, 487
Notice in writing, 3399
Principle only to be discussed, 3091
Third reading by consent, 4141
Time fixed for consideration, 4236
To be preceded by res. 4248
Trade, 331
Urgent and pressing, 4392

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Business of the House, to-morrow, 3750
Chair to be addressed, 2921
Committees
Discussion of questions not referred, 3267, 3270
M. for not debatable, 4013
M. to print proceedings, 3399
Notice of motion to go into, 3582-3
Reference in anticipation of report, 3574-6
Reports, concurrence by unanimous consent, 1739, 1991
Special
Appointment, two days notice necessary, 572
Membership limited to fifteen, 937
Redistribution bill, reference, 488
Consent, unanimous, 3326
Conversation, 1872
Debate
Anticipated or repeated, 1271, 3326-30
Closed if mover answers question, 2523
Decorum, 406
Irregular, 1668
Matters under consideration by committees, 2930
Member
May not speak without consent after mover has closed, 1080
Must address Chair, 2921
Mover closes, 393, 421, 568, 1210, 2523, 4474
Notice of M. to go into com. 3582, 3583
Peace and tranquillity, 3557
Previous, references to, 1687
Reference should be in third person, 2921
Relevancy, 3327
Debates, official report of, bulky returns, 940
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338
Industrial group of Great Britain, message, 4436
Interruptions, 323, 406, 3557
Only by consent, member speaking, 3518, 3587
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Staff, 2691
Organization, 4592
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., letter from Mrs. Kennedy acknowledging sympathy, 281
King, His Majesty the, introduction of name in debate, 728

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281
Language
"False" 3269
"Unmannerly" 3269
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation, anticipating, 667
Letters, reading, 2181
Library of Parliament, 2693
Members
May ask further question on orders of day by leave, 287
May not anticipate report of com, 3574-6
May speak only once, 2r. of bill, 273, 277
Moving res. exhausts right to speak, 1210
Must address Chair, 2921
Must not impute motives, 2573
New, introduced, 2837
Recognition of by Speaker, 1159
Referring to another, must use third person, 2921
Right of reply, 2896
Right to speak, 3589
Sitting may not interrupt without consent, 1546-9, 1996
To be fair to member speaking, 1155
Minister of National Defence, correct title, 495
Moose Jaw controverted election, 515, 615
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Motions
Adjournment to discuss. *See under this title,* Adjournment
Amendments
Expanded negative, 3521
To be consistent with principle involved, 643
Anticipatory, 3267, 3326, 3870
Changing membership, special com., 2417
Debate closed, member may not speak without consent, 1080
Dropped, 3264
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 341-42
Mover
Closes debate, 277, 393. *See also under this title,* Debate
Has no right to amend, 1528
Leave to withdraw, 1911
Right to speak exhausted, 1210
Non-debatable
For Com. of Whole, 4013, 4185
That Speaker leave chair, 3185, 4013, 4076

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Motions—*Con.*
Non-debatable—*Con.*
That com., rise, 4185
When made by consent, 3326
Notice, 4295
In writing, 3399
Not given, M. must stand, 3084
Not in writing, put by consent, 1538
Not substantive, no right of reply, 3595
Objection, too late, 3981
Questions sub judice, not debatable, 1284, 1307, 1912
Redrafting, 816
Seconder, 1308
Special order, 3271
Sub-amendments, 3573
Substantive, right to reply, 2896, 3595, 3603
Unanimous consent, 345, 435, 572, 1739, 2047, 2639
When vote is taken, Speaker bound to read, 3580
Newspaper articles
Irrelevant, 4143
Reflecting on House, 4142
Orders of the day
Debate not permissable, 859, 3650, 4441
Members speaking twice, 3401
Press statements not to be quoted but synopsized, 667
Questions permissible but not debate, 734, 1309, 1925, 2898, 3400-01
Order paper
Errors, 487, 519, 4437, 4457
Not available on account of long sitting, 4744
Petitions
Irregular, 2885
Presentation by unanimous consent, 4525
Point of order, member speaking to, 322
Privilege, questions of
Committees, discussion of questions not referred, 3267
Contradiction of members' statements from outside, 3649
Matter properly before House, 3268
Remarks out of order, 709
Statement by consent only, 708
Questions
Allowed only by consent of member having floor, 212
Already answered, 2419, 2795
Answered by member speaking, 2523
Answered verbally to be preceded by asterisk, 3506

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Questions—*Con.*
Asking, does not exhaust members' right to speak, 3589
Cost of living (Mr. Church) out of order, 3704
Excessive length, 622
Oral, without notice, 734
Orders of the day on, 734
Passed as orders for returns, 344, 939, 1139, 1386
Sub-judice, 1912
To be asked in third person, 3589
Railway Commission, appeal from, 1284, 1912
Relevancy, 309, 427, 1553, 3557
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Every member entitled to copy of, 940
Royal assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755
Rules of the House, 3330
Rule 17A, debatable motions, 3583, 4014
Rule 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Rule 115, urgent and pressing, 4308, 4392
Special com. on, 1299
Rulings
Appeals from, 4076
Senate amendments, 4592
Senate and House of Commons Joint Com. 2611
Sitting
Hour of, opening day of session, 1
Wednesday, unanimous consent, 99
Statements, indirect presentation of, 3649
Stewart, late Hon. J. A., letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435
Supply, M. for, Rule 17C, 2640
Vacancies, 1763. *See also under this title,* Moose Jaw
Nicolet, 2178
Vimy Ridge Memorial
Letter from President of French Republic, 1538
Message from Governor General, 1631
Vote
May be taken if wish of House that Speaker do now leave chair, 4014
Method of taking, 434
Ways and Means Com., rule 17C, 2640

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Agricultural Conditions Com., report, printing, 2181
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4017
Charters, extension for one year, amdt. 4014

Speakman, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Business of the House
M. to adjourn, 3584
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com. 1302
Calgary customs warehouse, 1023
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 639
Credits
Rural, 639
System, 1252
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Economic conditions, 1250
Emigration to United States, 1253
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Hebridean immigrants, 3252
Treatment of, M. 3584
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Immigration
Hebridean, 3252, 3584
Policy, 1250
Selected, 1254
Soldier Settlement Board, 1255
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Institutionalism, excessive, 1251
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Party system of government, 1254
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703
Protection, suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Public buildings and local improvement taxes, 1022-3
Railway mail service, 1804
Railway rates, equalization, 1252
M. (Mr. Clark) 1966
Redistributon, 4741
Roads and bridges, 1014
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
St. John quarantine building, 4614
Sales tax, consumer and, 4423
School lands, purchase price, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed, purity of, 601
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, 2022-25
Steamship services, 2173
Tariff, more equitable to producers, 1252
Western provinces, conditions in, 1250
Winter trips, California, 1252

Special Delivery Letters. *See* Post Office

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Res. 2656, 3181, 3922, amended 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Books, failure or refusal to keep, 4434
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 2656, 3938
Cheque tax, 2656, 4363, 4409
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 3933; neg. 3934
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3934, ruled out of order, 3935
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 3935, ruled out of order, 3936
Limitation of maximum, 3922
Confectionery and beverages, 2656, 3046, 3938
Duty paid value, definition, 4425
Excise stamp taxes, payment with postage stamps, 3938, 4435
Receipt tax, 2656, 4409
Exemption, 4423
Sales tax, 4181, 4409, 4425
Collection at source, 2656, 3938, 4411
Exports, 4364, 4418
Government or provincial sales, 4435
Imports, 4409, 4417
Licensed manufacturer, 4410
Producer or, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4414-21
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 245, 915
Refund
Goods sold to provinces, 4435
To licensed manufacturers, 4418
Tinplate, 4418
Wholesale or jobber, 4410
Wines, excise tax on, 2656, 3937, 4425

Spectacle and Eyeglass Frames, 2653

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address; Governor General

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Audibility of debate,4572
Budget, 2976. Erratic and wasteful discussions; a business man's standpoint; amendment, 2976; tariff reduction and free trade; reciprocity; protection for tiller of the soil; oleomargarine duty; western conditions; "calamity howling"; secession talk, 2977; comparison of present and past conditions; improvement in agricultural position; cold storage, federal and provincial encouragement and assistance, 2978; St. Lawrence river waterway; water transportation; Welland canal; government by committee; avoidance of responsibility; committees of the

Spence, Mr. David—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
House, cost of; redistribution; soft drinks, tax on; cigarette duty; income tax penalties; Post Office department; postage stamps, use for special war revenue purposes; cheque tax; sales tax; newsprint; duty-free goods; banana trust; fruit, competition of foreign fruits; importation of, 2979; tariff commission; potato duty, 2980
Canadian National Railways, hotels, manager, qu. 1257
Cold storage, 187, 2978
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 275-6
Experimental farms, 472, 473
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2200
Mediterranean steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636
Military expenditure, 876
Nova Scotia wharves, expenditure, 4572
Toronto
Customs house, 3282
Harbour improvements, 986
Viaduct and union station, 4449

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Alberta
Destitution, 1440
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
United Farmers of, 1440
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4057, 4083-4102
Bankruptcy Act administration, 780
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Canada Grain Act, administration, 782
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Central experimental farm, building, 4631
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 634, 635
Amdt. to extend bank charters for twelve months, 638
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4199, 4323
Toronto office building, qu. 814
Davidson commission, war contracts, qu. 812
Emigration to United States, 1439
Freight rates and, 1440
Flax, cultivation of, 4378
Hebridean immigrants, 4706
Hector celebration, 4706
Immigration
Advertising, 1084
Canada Colonization Association, 1439
Grant, 1092
Estimates, amdt. to reduce, 1441

Spencer, Mr. Henry E.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Organizations asking for increased, 1111
Policy, 1438
Population, loss of, 1439
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Income tax collections, western provinces, qu. 2206
Industrial disputes, settlement of, 1705
Interest rates in West, 1440
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Justice, administration of, 4674
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003
Live stock condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Mixed farming, 2773
Naturalization, mounted police and, 779
Old age pensions, 1649
Oliver-St. Paul branch railway, 4323
Opium and narcotic drugs, 700
Peace river district, railways, 1440
Public works, surveys, 1020
Railway construction, 1440
Rural mail, western provinces, 1802
Scales, inspection of, 810
Taxation, indirect, 1440, 3027
Toronto seed branch building, 4627
Vermilion town lots
Purchase, qu. 489, 1307
Rental, qu. 2417
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 656
Western provinces, conditions, 1439
Wrecks, investigation, 3160

Spirituous Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Sponagle, Col. J. A., port physician, Margaretville, N. S. qu. 2697

Sporting Mountain mail service. *See* Post Office

Spray Lakes lease. *See* Calgary Power Company

Spruce Bud Worm. *See* Forests and Forestry

Stability. *See* Tariff

Stamps. *See* Post Office; Taxation

Standard Shipping Company. *See* Freight Rates

Standard of Living, 1168. *See also* Cost of Living; Immigration

Standard Oil Company
Dividends, 2601

Standard Oil Company—*Con.*
Prosecution and fines, 2585

Standardization. *See* Agricultural Implements

Standards
Bureau of, 788
Canadian Engineering Association, 788

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Agricultural conditions, 1846, 3064
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Budget, 3062. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3062; sales tax, exemption drain tiles; cheque tax; stamp tax, notes and cheques; tariff policy of Conservative party; "out-Heroding Herod"; stability; definition of protection tariff and tariff for revenue, 3063; new Liberal doctrines; source in Montreal; failure of budget to balance; expenditure, increase of; expenditure and debt reduction; agriculture; condition of; speech of Minister of Agriculture; accredited herd system, 3064; tuberculin test; agriculture, needs of; sympathetic consideration of other interests; extreme attitude of Progressives; spirit of compromise; sacrifice, 3065; farmers and the tariff; provision for long-term loans; market facilities; Liberal party and tariff; failure to implement pledges; tariff reduction offset by increase in sales tax, 3066; disappointment of Progressive party; National Policy; problems of East and West, 3067
Cadet services, 878
Dairying industry, 1846
Emigration to United States, 1414
Farm mortgages, 1846
Immigration
Policy, 1412
Progressive party and, 1413
Ministers' and officials' travels, qu. 283, qu. 343
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3558
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1787
Sales tax, drain tiles, 3046, 3063
Tariff, immigration and, 1413
Western provinces, conditions in, 1415

Stationery. *See* Printing Bureau

Statistics. *See also* Immigration; Population; Trade

Statistics—*Con.*
Census figures, 43
Dominion bureau of, 788, 2032, 2034
Annual report tabled, 1539
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Staff
Temporary employees, qu, 938
Transfer from Labour dept, 1671, 2032
International labour office, 1631
Production, statement of, 2720
Wealth of Canada, estimated, 2719

Statutes, Quebec provincial, 1660

Steamship Combines. *See* Agricultural Conditions Com. report; Combines; Freight Rates, Shipping

Steamship Companies. *See also* Steamship Services
Immigration, 1201, 1462

Steamship Services, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Trade and Commerce
Advertisement for tenders, 3382-3
Canada-Great Britain, qu. 937
Canada-Newfoundland, 2171, 3377
Canada-West Indies, qu. 937, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Charlottetown-Pictou, 2171
Extension to Great Lakes suggested, 2175
Freight rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping
Control of, 2174
Railway commission and, 4003
Grand Manan and mainland, 2172
Halifax-Louisburg-St. Lawrence, 4701
Halifax-Newfoundland, 2173
Halifax-West Coast-Cape Breton, 2173
Inspection of, 2178
Mail carriage, 2172
Mainland and islands of Miscou-Shippegan, 2173
Mediterranean to, qu. 1488, 1636
Mulgrave-Canso, 2173
Mulgrave-Guysboro, 2173
Pelee island and mainland, 2174
Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish, 2174
Pictou-Souris-Magdalen islands, 2174
Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or ports, 2174
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Quebec or Montreal and Gaspe, 2176
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 2176, 4004
St. John-Bear River, 2176
St. John-Digby, 2176
St. John-Westport-Yarmouth, 2176

Steamship Services—*Con.*
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2178
Tariff and, 2923
Vancouver ports on Howe island, 4003
Vancouver-Northern ports British Columbia, 4003
Victoria-West coast Vancouver island, 4003

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2835. Congratulations to Finance Minister; protective tariff, little relief; protected interests, nothing to fear; disappointment and discontent in West; agricultural conditions; cost of living and production; prices of farm products; lack of purchasing power; cost of transportation and distribution, 2835; Crowsnest pass agreement; Wheat Board; Manitoba legislature, attitude of; royal commission on freight rates and grain trade; rural credits and farm loans; natural resources; municipal taxation, prices in Canada and United States; tariff and prices; agricultural implements; protection unsound; revenue; direct taxation, 2836; inheritance tax; graduated income tax; amendment
Experimental farms, 469
Lake Killarney improvement, 999
Live stock industry, 468
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1146
Seed inspection, 198
Taxation, direct, 2836
Turtle Mountain reserve, reforestation, 3413

Steel, the L. R. Company, Limited, qu. 1994

Steel. *See* Iron and Steel

Stefansson, Mr. Vilhjammer
Coal resources of Hudson bay, 1073
Reindeer and muskox in Barren Lands, 1073

Stenographers, members' qu. 518

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Australia, trade treaty with, 1848
Bank Act, reference to speech on, 4031-4
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4032, 4081, 4089, 4099, 4125
Bank of Vancouver, qu. 4011
Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, 816
British Columbia
Claims against federal government, 708
Liquor. *See under this title* Canada Temperance; Liquor
Oil companies, 2505

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3454
Goods imported via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454
Bureau of Standards, 788
Business of the House, private bills, posting, 4248
Canada Highways bill, 2338
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, coasting regulations, 4235
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2407-13, 2424. *See also under this title,* Liquor Act of 1922, 2407
Correspondence with Attorney General, British Columbia, 1032-38
Exceptions, 2409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Expenditure and earnings, 1868
Vessels, earnings, 3324, 3399
Canadian National Railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3610
M. to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4341
Appropriations, 4342
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Management, responsibility and powers, 3628
Paris offices, 3618, 3627, 3681
Amdt. that item stand, 3664; ruled out of order, 3667
Ruling, reference to, 3670
Securities, 4525
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2308-37, 4537
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 204
Combines bill, 2524
Combines Investigation Act, 1910, prosecutions, 2575
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4208-4217
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Corruption-liquor purchases, 2410
Customs duty, goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 3272
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4265, 4344
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Homesteads, 4201
Pulpwood, permission to cut, 4206
Estimates, civil government, form of, 612, 780

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Exchequer court judgeship, 2500
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4541
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
Freight rates
Railway Act Amdt bill, 54
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1940
French treaty
Canned salmon, Japanese packed, 453
Favoured nation, 448
Fuel supply, 793
Geological survey, 2504
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 322
Grain and grain trade, 3821
Elevators
Dockages, qu. 1484, qu. 1661
Earnings, 2042
Overages, 2043
Screenings, 2041, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Revenue from, 2042
Grain Act, licenses, 2299
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 293, 304, 305
Shipment and handling, 2044
Granville island, taxation, qu. 1485
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Nova Scotia, 941
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Quebec, 950
Highway construction grants, 623
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 513
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1315
Endorsation of Imperial government and railways, 1328
Chinese, 2311-12. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
Lands
Orientals to, 511
Thirty-two year agreements for sale, 1317
Policy, 1315
Taxation and emigration, 1319
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 511, 857
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495-98
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians, 2124-5
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Interest rate, 4110
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2138

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con.*
Iron ore deposits, British Columbia, 2505
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4281
Lake of the Woods
Control board, expenses, 4001
Regulation bill, 4173-75
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia
Administration, 2410, 2424
Bootlegging
Attorney General and, 2407
Execution of murderers of policeman Lawson, 2407
Export, 2407
Warehouses, 3144
National railways, transportation on, 3324
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3256
Marine hospitals, 701
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, trip to Great Britain, 3290
Masters and mates, 2610
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2114-23
National Defence, pay of staff, 891
New York, appointment Canadian customs officer, 3272
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4484
Officers, military, retired, 891
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Ordnance lands, 3444
Ore-testing plants, 2506
Ostrea lake wharf, 943
Patents of Invention bill, 2066-77-87, 2131
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
Domicile, election of, 2070
Pensions
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 4248
Point Grey sandhead leases, 3671
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., report, 248
Prince Rupert civic employees, 2086
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 416
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 951
Public Works, estimates, explanation, 961
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2500-02
Purchasing Commission, 4002
Renovated butter, 4265 , 4344
Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Pensions, inadequacy, 774, qu. 1362
Scrip, qu. 1362
Sales tax, 4181, 4429, 4431
Drain tiles, 3183
Exemptions, 4431
M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Nursery stock, 4432
Tomato plants, 4432
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4241
Settlers' relief, 3448
Special War Revenue Act, M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Sponagle, Col. J. A., qu. 2697
Steamship services, 2171
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Terminal elevators and grain trade, 3821
Timber permits, qu. 203
Trade commissioners, 1847
Unemployment, order in council No. 220, 436
Vancouver harbour bill, 255-9
Vancouver harbour board, 387
Venereal diseases, 705
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
War claims, amdt. to reduce, 2502
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085

Stevenson, Mr. John A., article on immigration, 628

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Minister of Mines; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Agriculture, depressed condition, 1083
Alberta Liberal convention, 2995, 2797
Alpine Club grant, 3414
Arctic explorations, 3944
New ship for, 4702
Banff National park, water powers, 3420, 3939
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 3412
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509-12, 3206. *See also under this title,* Fuel
British Empire exhibition, 1910
Appropriation, 3950
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 4704
Budget, 2795. Tribute to Finance Minister, 2795; science of government; responsibilities and difficulties; promise and performance; tariff reduction; war debt, expenditure and taxation, 2796; inflation; agricultural conditions; depression of 1890-96; extravagance, ex-

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
penditure and debt; per capita debt; natural resources, 2797; protection of industries; artificial silk; business depression, 2798; changes of government in Alberta and Manitoba; tariff reduction not warranted; difficulties due to other causes; world competition; moving in direction of tariff reduction; tariff stability does not mean finality, 2799; immigration; freight rates; railway labour, wages; deflation; emigration; co-ordination of immigration work; land settlement; unemployment, 2800; labour; unemployment; co-operation of government with railway companies; agricultural conditions in United States; immigration from United States; taxation, apportionment of; taxation of capital, 2801; necessary to attract capital as well as labour; natural resources, development of; mineral wealth, conservation of; coal and oil production; inheritance tax; balanced budget; railway debt and deficits; revenue from coal and oil in Alberta, 2802; amendment; income tax; land tax; inheritance tax; agriculture, condition and prospects, 2803
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3435-39, 4702
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Calgary Power Company, application, 3939-40
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2413
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands
Automobile admission fee, 3942
Water powers, leases, 3420, 3442, 3939
Cattle embargo, effect of removal, 1101
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 768, 2308-2337, 2481, 4536. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Children, 2484
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Merchants, 2482
Students, 2317
Wives, 2484
Civil Service Commission, appointments, 1086
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Alberta
Freight rates on, 1269

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Alberta—*Con.*
Production and revenue, 2802
Shipments to Ontario, 1163
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Hudson's Hope, 3203
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Commodity and agricultural products, prices, 1083
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Deflation, inequality of, 1407
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks bill, 1256, 2060-86
Dominion lands
Contingencies, 3408
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, 1354
Reclamation by drainage, 3430
Dominion Lands Act, Amdt. bills
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Homesteads, 3982, 4201, 4364
Second, 3398
Dominion lands and parks, 3249. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Estimates, 3406
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion Power board, 3427
Emigration to United States, 1082-93, 1322-30
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Exhibitions, 1454
British Empire, 1910, 3950, 4704
Exhibits for, 1468-9
Expenditure, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Staff and salaries, 1455-65
United States in, 1465
Farmers' credits, 1088
Forest protection, 3409-20
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
Freight rates, 2799
Reduction of, 1101
Fuel Supply. *See also under this title,* Coal
Coal prices, control of, 3198
Coke ovens, 789
Fuel testing, 789
M. (Mr. Church) 1269-81
Peat experiments, 790, 3199, 3206
United States, 3203
Geodetic survey, estimates, 3245
Geological survey, estimates, 2504, 3197
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Grain, marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 309
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Grazing leases, 3426
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3591
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 503
Historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939
Fort Edward, 3432-5
Homesteads. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Improvements, 3251
Inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3227
Howat, Mr. Alex., detention at border, 2297, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3159
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4687
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3203
Immigration, 2800. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Advertising, 1103, 1218
Alleged campaign against, 332
British Columbia, 1327, 1096
Canada Colonization Association, 1089, 1386, 1479, 1877
Agreement, signing, 1976
Terms, 1102, 1320
Endorsation of Imperial Govt. and railways, 1328
History, 1102
Minister's statement, 1089
Further statement, 1320
Officers, 1172
Directors and, 1327
Proposals of, memo, 1877
Railway contributions, 3400
Reorganization, 3400
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1164, 1323, 1328, 1429
Child, 1099, 1469
Agencies, 1470
Domestic servants, conductresses, 1477-8
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 688, 1096, 1464, 1469, 1473, 1480
Grant, division of, 1475
European, 1170, 1316
Farm labourers, 1100
Winnipeg, 1976
Foster homes for children, 1099
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Great Britain, from, 1084, 1346
Officers in, 1879
Hebridean, 3591
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Interest rates on land purchases, 1088
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Leased land for American settlers, 1101
Literature, 1428
Maritime provinces, 1086

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Minister's statement, 1082
Movement of population to United States, 1082
New Brunswick, 1200
Nominative system, 1360, 1478
Norway and Sweden, from, 1192
Ontario, 1085
London office, 1428
Oriental
Chinese, 1443. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission of, 1446
Children, 1445
Estimates, 1443
Legislation, forecast of, 502
Japanese
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1454
Passages
Assisted, from Great Britain, 1100
Immigrant's family or friends, 1100
Loans, 1475
Prepaid, agreement with Imperial government, 2611
Policy, 1317, 1386
Propaganda embracing all Canada, 1098
Provincial government and, 1327
Publicity work, 1874
Quebec, 1085, 1104
Restriction of, 1170
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Agreement with Canadian Pacific, 1458
Scotland from, 1095
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Statistics, 1881-1922, 1094
Swedish representative, visit of, 1095, 1192
Ukrainians, 1397
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1093
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 502, 514
Immigration and Colonization dept.
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 1476, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1110, 1317, 1386
Details of, 1482
Ingram, Mr., appointment of, 2664
May, Mr., appointment of, 2663
Outside service, salaries, 1082
Salaries and contingencies, 1873, 1909
Indians, 2124
Agents, 2146
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, appointment of, 2151
New Brunswick, 2154

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
British Columbia, 2163
Cattle, beef production, 2159, 2162
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2126
Education, 2126
Appropriations for, 2164
Increased, 2145
Church organizations, work of, 2146
Edmonton school, 2149-2165
Morley reserve, 2150
Farming, 2156
Greater production, 2155
Indian Affairs, dept
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2153, 2165, 4702
Reorganization, 2162
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Medical service, 2160
Minister, statement of, 2145
Northern Ontario and Manitoba, hunting grounds, 2146
Nova Scotia, 4702
Potlatching, 2163
Reserves
Blackfeet, 2148-9
Caughnawaga, expulsion of halfbreeds, 2163
Grain production, 2156
Highways, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Hay, 2153
St. Lawrence river islands, 2164
Sioux, 2160
Treatment of, 2158
Tuberculosis, 2153
Interior, dept. of
Estimates, 1904, 3406, 3939, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, surveys, etc. 3246
Iron ore
Alberta, 2512
British Columbia, 2505, 2514
Reported discovery, lake Athabasca, 2513
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 1992, 2138, 2204, 2428-36, 2668-71, 3981
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Cheap, 1118
Delegates from United States, detention *See under this title,* Howat
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Labrador gold discovery, reported, 2611
Gold rush, 1995
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 238

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4172
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands; Immigration
American immigrants, for, 1093
Free, available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Speculation, 1395
Taxation of, 1105
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1213, 1309
Liberal platform of 1919, 2994
Lignite Utilization Board, 2515. *See also under this title,* Bienfait
Live stock prices in West, 1101
Mackenzie river district, halfbreed claims, 3409, 3444
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Maps, preparation of, 3443
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention, 2469. *See also under this title,* Howat
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Military hospitals, mental cases, 671
Mines department
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Salaries, 3207
Moose Mountain pleasure resort, 3408
National Parks and Reservations bill, 3131
Northwest territories
Administration, 3944, 4702
New ship, purchase and maintenance, 4702
Wireless telegraph system, 3944, 3948
Oil, 2802
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, 2508
Fuel, shale deposits, 2513
Oil companies, British Columbia, 2505
Southern Alberta, 2508
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Ore-testing
British Columbia, plants, 2506
Machinery, 2509
Shipment to Ottawa, 2505
Peat. *See under this title,* Fuel
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Promissory notes, tax, 3924
Publicity agent in London, 4707
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3406
Reforestation, Turtle mountain reserve, 3413
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3427
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
School lands. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4203
Seed grain advances, 3444, 4367

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board
Advances and salaries, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Estimates, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2018
Land sales, supervisors, alleged attempt to bribe, 1092
Legal expenses, 2018, 2020
Loans, 2028
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3245
Towers, 2512
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Water powers
Administration of, 3420
Banff National park, 3420, 3939
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Highwood river, 3427
Leases, 3422
Provincial jurisdiction, 3421
Publicity, 3421
Wheat, price of, 1101
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Mining fees, 1636

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Branch lines, construction bill, 4311-22
Cheque tax, 3934
Destructive insect pests, 597
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1060
Income tax, fines, remissions, 3507
Labour, department
Annuities branch, 1677
Staff, 1677
Merchants' Bank inquiry, 3990
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2459, 3984
Noxious weeds, 2305
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1834
Penitentiaries, 771
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833
Seed testing bill, 2305
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4311, 4315, 4322
Weights and measures, Peterborough, 810

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Address in reply, 169. Near East crisis, 169; increase in commerce; trade conventions; removal of cattle embargo; immigration; Bank Act revision, 170; shipping rates combine inquiry; re-

Stewart, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
distribution; proportional representation, 171; Mr. Hoey's reference to Mr. Meighen, 171-172; Conservative party not dead or sleeping, 172
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1527
Brockville rifle range, 889
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, lease of freighters, 3848
Canadian National railways, ties, qu. 516
Cornwall canal employees, qu. 3135
Hudson Bay railway, 4684
Immigration, medical inspection, 703
Income tax convictions, qu. 3582
Labour, jurisdiction, 1650
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrisburg-Waddington ferry, qu. 1029
Murray Stewart, steamer, qu. 386
National monument, Connaught place, 2685-88
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2439-40
Old age annuities, 1639
Peat experiments, 3206
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Rideau canal, water power leases, qu. 622
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Troops for Sydney strike, qu. 624

Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5, 7, 8, 166
Letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435

Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. Dan W., qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (Hamilton)
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976

Stipendiary Magistrates. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Rocky Mountain park, 1739

Stock. *See* Live Stock

Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stornoway. *See also* Hebridens
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speech, 2181

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 149. Skeena pioneer constituency, 149-50; Yukon telegraph lines; Queen Charlotte islands, 150; natural resources of Skeena; halibut fisheries;

Stork, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Address—***Con.***
Prince Rupert port, 151; railway traffic; visit of Montreal Board of Trade, 152; Grand Trunk Pacific, 153
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Budget, 2733. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity, reception of announcement in Canada and United States; Chicago Tribune, comment; sugar, 2733; sales tax; copper bounty; machinery for manufacture of fish offal; British preference; direct importation; Canadian ports; Prince Rupert; reciprocity campaign in 1911; Fordney tariff, 2734; fishing industry and United States markets; use of Canadian ports by United States fishermen; collection of duty on purchases in Canada; United States wharf on Canadian soil; Canadian representative at Washington, 2375
Labour, right to organize, 2888
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2460
Orientals, 2461
Powell River Paper Company, 2888

Strikes. *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour

Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Students. *See also* Schools; Universities
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Medical, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Federation of Canadian students, res. 2486

Stumping Machines. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Sub-Judice Questions. *See* Speaker

Subsidies. *See* Bounties; Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dry Dock Subsidies Act; Steamship Services

Suez Canal, Goods imported via Hong Kong 3454

Sugar. *See also* Budget; Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Beet, excise duty, abolition of, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393
British preference, 2651
British tax on, 2754
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Combine, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Women and, 2576
Customs drawbacks, 2655, 3502

Sugar—*Con.*
Customs duty, 2820, 2825, 2981, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3060, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping clause, 2646, 3046
Reduction of, 2645, 2646, 2744, 2968, 3049
Refiners' protection, 2987
Gambling in, 3058
Jam manufacturers, 3477
Price, increase of, 2646, 2734, 2889, 2933

Sullivan, Mr. Arthur W., 381

Superannuation. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities, Civil Service; Judges; Pensions

Supplementary Estimates. *See* Estimates

Supreme Court, general rules and orders, 1659

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 456, 575, 668, 859, 941, 993, 1082, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1538, 1619, 1637, 1668, 1694, 1740, 1764, 1811, 1837, 1873, 2017, 2124, 2145, 2392, 2489, 2494, 2610, 2671, 3160, 3272, 3330, 3406, 3610, 3706, 3760, 3798, 3824, 3830, 3938, 3985, 4554, 4594, 4638

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, Committee of
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 4732, 4735
Estimates. *See that title*
Subjects and items discussed:
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Cattle
Shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Embargo, expenses, 3989
Dairying, 609, 3283
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 595, 3988
Experimental farms, 456
Fruit, 598
Health of animals, 575, 587, 3989, 4675
International Institute of, 599
Publications, 598
Salaries and contingencies, 610, 3303, 4674
Stockgrowers' Protective Association grant, 587
Suppression of foul brood in bees, 4675
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Auditor General, 3897, 4003

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Air Force. *See under this title,* National Defence
Annuities. *See under this title,* Labour
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4676. *See also under this title,* Insulin
British and Foreign news service, 4712
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 4708
Business Profits War Tax Act, 3949
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 2035, 4709
Canada Highways Commission, 2489, 3173
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Athletic Team, Olympic games, 4706
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788
Canadian Forestry Association, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3798, 3824-30
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3938, 3948,
Canadian National Railways, 1764
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3676, 3789
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 3376
$ 1,700,000, 3376
$ 1,550,000, 4692
Branch lines, purchase of, 3646
Peace river railway survey, 4698
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Transcontinental, Fortin & Moffat claim 3646
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Canadian representative in United States, 4001
Canadian Press, Limited, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727
Canals. *See also under this title,* Railways and Canals
Isle Perrot bridge, St. Anne's lock, 3646
Rideau, 4691
Trent, improvement, 3647, 4691
Welland, construction, 3760, 4690
Chief electoral officer, 4001
Civil Service
Bonus, 1664, 1811
Commission, salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Commissioner of Taxation, 3949
Customs and Excise, 3272
Debates, Official Report of, 2691

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4667
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion lands and parks, 3406, 3938, 4702
Dominion lands, contingencies, 3408
Outside service, salaries, 3249
Dominion Power Board, expenses, 3427
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Empire Forestry Convention, 3410
Exhibitions, 1910, 1454
British Empire, 3949, 4704
Canadian traveling exhibition in France, 811, 4711
External Affairs, salaries, 3987
Finance, charges of management, 3987
Fuel supply
Advisory fuel committee, 4691
Fuel and power resources, investigation, 3427
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey, 2504
Government publications, 1712
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Gratuities to Grand Trunk officials, 1664
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Harbours and rivers, 941, 993
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 1002, 2671
Manitoba, 993, 4589
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
St. John, 2676, 4610
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4722
Ontario, 981, 2690, 4588, 4594
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675, 4610
Toronto harbour improvements, 2678, 4610
Prince Edward island, 945, 4586
Quebec, 950, 4588
Champlain dock, 2675
Health, department of, 697, 2167
Marine hospitals, 701
Medical examination of immigrants, 702
Medical research laboratories, 703
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Hector celebration, 4705
Highways. *See under this title,* Canada Highways
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 4680

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Company, refund, 3647, 4686, 4689
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration and Colonization, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Imperial Conference, 4638
Imperial Economic Conference, 4638
Expenses of delegation, 4666
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3949
Indians, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Insulin, discovery and supply, 703
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interior, department, 4702
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, 4667
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dominion observatory, 3242
Engraving maps, etc., 3443
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3428
Ordnance lands, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands by drainage, 3430
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 1909, 3949
Interim Supply. *See that title*
Justice, department, 4667
Administration, 705, 4674
Bankruptcy Act, administration, 780
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Salaries, 780
Labour, 1621
Annuities Act, administration, 1639
Canada Gazette, 1707
Employment offices, 1630
Industrial Disputes Act, 1627, 1702, 1716
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Salaries, etc., 1668, 1694
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 4001
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, monument, 1017
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, Canadian delegates, 3989
Legislation
House of Commons, 4674
Committees, expenses, 2691, 4674
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Senate, salaries, etc. 2694, 3949
Library of Parliament, 2691
Lord Selkirk Association, grant, 4704

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Mackenzie river district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marine and Fisheries
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3364
Detroit river traffic regulation, 3357
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
False Creek bridge, 3375
Fish culture, 3367
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Fisheries protection service, 3361
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, salaries, 3351
Live Stock inspection, 3334
Maintenance and repairs of lighthouses, 3353
Marine biological board, 3371
Marine signal service, 3358
Meteorological service, 3360
Navigation
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Obstructions, navigable waters, 3332
Schools, 3331
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Maintenance of steamers, 3160
Wrecks, investigation, 3160, 3330
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
River St. Lawrence ship channel, 3375
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Sorel shipyard, 3343, 3374
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334
Merchants Bank inquiry, expenses, 3990
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Mines and Minerals
Assay office, Vancouver, 3207
Explosives division, 2514
Mines and Geological Survey, 2504, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
National Defence, 1740
Ammunition, 884
Annual drill, 4635
Arsenals
Lindsay, 803
Quebec, 884
Bonus, 1751, 1772
Cadet service, 877
Canadian air service, 1748, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Engineer services and works, 4638
Grants to associations, 889
May, Miss H. M., grant, 900
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia services, annual drill, 859
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
Northover, Major, H. R., 4635
Ordnance lands, arms, etc., 890
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Schools of instruction, 900
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1745
Warlike stores, 900
National Gallery of Canada, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020, 2685
Naturalization Act, administration, 2495
Northwest territories
Administration, wireless, etc., 3449, 3948
Wireless station, Mayo, 4702
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Paris agency, expenses, 4001
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Pensions
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3706
Fenian raid, 3742
Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 2168, 3742
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Post office
Mail service, 1778
Miscellaneous, 1832
Salaries and contingencies, 1814
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Printing, publications, 811
Printing bureau, 1710, 1730
Miscellaneous printing, 1716

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Public printing and stationery, retiring allowances, 3949
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, 1022
Archives, 1730
Law, late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Manitoba, 4628
Maritime provinces, 4614
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario, 1022, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, 1729
Architects, compensation, 4633
Parliament buildings, 1716
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Printing bureau, new building, 1730
Quebec, 4614
St. John immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021
Water supply, 1022
Saskatchewan, 4629
Terrebonne, Quebec, 2690
Public Works, 4594
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Graving docks, locks, etc. 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See under this title,* Harbours and Rivers
Roads and bridges, 1014, 4589
Salaries, 2684
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682, 4590
Pulpwood Commission, 4709
Purchases, government, supervision of, 3950, 4001
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, wireless stations, 3374
Railway Commissioners, Board of, 3188
Railways and Canals, 3650. *See also under this title,* Canals
Arbitration, litigation, etc. 3195
Contingencies, 3377
Intercolonial pension allowances, 3195
Printing and stationery, 3197
Prince Edward Island railway, pensions, 3195
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648, 4691
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, 1163
Royal Canadian Navy, 900-2

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374,
Surveys and investigations, 3647
Secretary of State
Public archives, 3985
Salaries, 2392, 2494
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board, 1910
Advances and salaries, 2017
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668, 4703
Department, salaries, 687
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 696
Medical examination of pensioners, 670
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pensions, European war and active militia, 2166
Sheltered employment, burial expenses, etc., 693
Treatment, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 2168
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701.
Topographical surveys, 3244
Trade and Commerce, 3377, 4701
Bounties, petroleum, 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171
Patent and Copyright branch, 2035
O'Halloran, Mr. G. F., salary increase, 4673
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Steamship services. *See under this title,* Steamship Services
Terminal elevators, maintenance, 810
Treaties, negotiation of, expenses, 3989
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Water powers, surveys, etc. 3420
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Yukon territory, government of, 3943

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic Survey; Water Powers
Base lines, townships, lakes, rivers, qu. 1866
Prairie provinces in, qu. 1866
Public works, 1020
Railway, 4691. *See also* Railways
Peace River district, 4698

Surveys—*Con.*
Topographical, 2509, 3244
Boundary posts and towers, 2512
Expenditure, qu. 1865

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agriculture department
Deputy minister's salary, 611
Estimates, 3284
Salaries and contingencies, 611
Agricultural conditions com. 3271
Agricultural instruction grant, 607-8
Administration, 3284
Agricultural products, imports, qu, 617, 1426
Alderson claim, 584
Ammunition, 887
Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426
Bacon, grades of, 593
Bayfield harbour, 981
Business of the House
Chair, ruling of, 4720
Questions passed as orders for returns, 940
Canada Grain Act, administration, 785
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3693
Cattle. *See also under this title,* Live Stock
Embargo, removal, correspondence, 4133
Shipment, 3317
Civil Service
Hours, 1427
Reduction of expenditure in Great Britain, 1803
Political partisanship, 286
Cold storage, 188
Warehouses, 191
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Dairying industry, 609
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Restrictions, 3153
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3153
M. to discharge order, 3325
Daylight saving, farmers and, 1427
Debates, official report of
Missing pages, 887-8, 1081
Supply, undiscussed items, 3292
Emigration to the United States, 1431
Exhibitions, 1468
Experimental farms, 464-486
Ontario, 465
Farm labour, 1427
Feeding stuffs
Adulteration, 604
Conference, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Halifax grain elevator, 4716
Hamilton-Brantford highway, 2494

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Health of animals, 584
Compensation for slaughter, 486
Hog grading, 593
Government publications, agriculture, 1428
Grain, dockage, 785
Group government, 1427
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1102, 1104, 1428, 1478
Financial support, 1429
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Child, 1472-5
Domestic servants, and, 1100
Empire settlement scheme, 1474
Literature, 1428
Ontario, 1098, 1428, 1475
Policy, 1425
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1630, 1716
Labour
Department, statistics, 1682, 1684
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Live stock. *See also* Cattle
Breeding at experimental farms, 465
Export trade, 193
Visit of Canadian commissioners to South America, 1213
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, qu. 384
Activities of, 3292, 3308
Address to South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Appointment, 3308
Order in council, 3294
Political patronage, 3316
Salary, 3286
Trips
Florida, 3309
Great Britain, 3308
Matane harbour improvements, 972
Mill feeds, adulteration, legislation, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs
National Defence, ammunition, 1744
Naval service, 909, 1744
Nova Scotia miners' strike, 84, 1716
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Butter and, 386
Manufacture of, 3153
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3575
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good), 3572
Ontario grain elevators, 4716-20

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Order in council, P.C. 223, 815
Peat experiments, 790
Penitentiaries, 772
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Dredging, 1012
Post office
Political patronage, 3316
Rural mail delivery, 1803
Remuneration, competitive system, 1803
Privilege, Redistribution Com. 1660
Pulpwood, export, royal commission, 4709
Quebec arsenal, 887
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2975
Redistribution, special committee, 1660
Privilege, 1660
Report, 4740
Welland, Lincoln and Haldimand, 667
Sales tax, 1427
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 927
Tariff changes, 1427
Tuberculin test, 3302
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Warner, Mr., reference to, 1425

Swan, Mr. E. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Sweden
Immigration from, 1095, 1191, 1216
Senate, constitution of, 1373

Switzerland
French treaty, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Immigration, 3591
National Council, constitution of, 1373
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Trade with, 2397
Watches and clocks, imports from, 2214

Sydenham Hospital. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sydney Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2178

Taché, Mr. J. de L., General Librarian, Debates, missing pages, 1081

Taché, Sir E. P., Senate, elective, 1367

Tadoussac, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157

Tagore, Mr. Rabindranath, civilization, 2729

Talbot, Mr. Onésiphore. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Tampa Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Tank Cars, transportation of, qu. 1361

Tariff. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty; United States. *For items discussed see* Customs Tariff Items
Aggregate tax paid in 50 years, 2793
Agricultural implements, 2743, 2756, 2975. *See also that title*
Industry, cost per employee, 2975
Agricultural conditions and, 1355, 1907
All countries increasing, 2819
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Amdts. of Liberal opposition 1920 and 1921, 3020
Average rate, 22, 89, 2838
Bituminous coal, duty on, 1275-8
British preference. *See also that title*
Increase, 2718
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Budget of 1922, net increase of duty, 3034
Canada not self-contained country, 3061
Canadian and United States, duties, comparison, 2958. *See also* United States
Changes in, 2702, 2853, 3488, 3895
Date on which effective, 3504
Under pressure of organized effort, 1427
Class privilege, 2728, 3069, 3074
Combines and, 2533, 2586, 2714
Anti-combine clause, 2534
Reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561, 2583
Commission of 1920, 3028
Report voluminous, 3024, 3028
Conservative policy appropriated by Liberals, 2974
Consistency, 3072
Copper and creosoting industry, discrimination, 3231
Downward revision, 2786, 2831, 2945, 2907, 2968
Drawbacks, raw material, qu. 1864
Dumping clause, 2535, 3072
Duties, combines and, 2608
East and West, 2753
Economic warfare, 3053
Emigration and, 1093, 1440, 2737, 2823. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Equal to that of United States, 1246
Farmers, difficulties and, 2916, 3065
Favoured nation treatment. *See* Treaties, French, Italian
Finality, 2648, 2772, 2799, 2841, 2912, 3052. *See also under this title,* Stability
Fordney-McCumber. *See* United States
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519

Tariff—*Con.*
High, 2924, 2980
Revolt against, 1859
Home markets, 2849
Immigration, effect on, 1113-4, 1119, 1133, 1222, 1413, 1416, 1424. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Implements of production, reduction, 2718, 2858, 2951, 2955. *See also under this title,* Agricultural Implements
Industries and, 3024
Intermediate and preferential. *See* Treaties, French
Investigation of industries, 2955
"Invisible tariff" 3000
Issue from 1878 to 1896, 2974
Items. *See* Customs Tariff Items
"Jacking-up," 3074, 3907
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Laurier-Fielding, 3030
Liberal party and, 2221, 3008. *See also that title*
Budget, protective, 2818
Platform, 1919, 2872
Pledges, 2951, 2952, 2994
Policy, 3007
Liberal and Conservative parties 2854
Joint product of, 2852
Not much difference between, 3018
Limitation to tariff income and turnover, 2859
Lower, competition, 2861
Luxuries, 2015
Macdonald, Sir John, of, 2756
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufacturers and, 2812
Minimum, 440
Minister of Finance, attitude on, 2838
Moderate, 2856, 2857
More equitable to producers, 1252
National policy, 2786. *See also that title*
Necessaries of life, 2955
Reduction of duties, 2718
No relief from, 2835
No surrender of Canadian markets, 2746
Not political but economic question, 2818
Oleomargarine, 3529
Ontario and, 1240
Other matters of greater importance, 2959
Parliamentary committee, 3028
Patents, Trade Marks and Copyright Act, 2293, 2294
Per capita tax, 3026
Permanent tariff commission, 2754, 2980, 2955, 3028, 3069
Portage la Prairie, district board, res., 3039

Tariff—*Con.*
Preferential. *See* British Preference; Imperial Conference; Treaties, French, Italian
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Production costs, 1394
Progressive party and, 2745
Prohibitive, 2850
Prosperity and, 2398
Protection, 2787, 2854. *See also that title*
Revenue and, 2778, 2835, 2957, 3048, 3063
Public ownership, 2905
"Purely and simply protective", 2908
Railway deficit and, 2905
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
Reciprocity, 3080. *See also that title*
Reductions, 38, 100, 1420, 2813, 2944, 2972, 2976, 3048, 3066, 3077, 3082
Liberal party and, 2847
Recent, 3010
Resolutions, 2650, 3454, 3895, 3963
Changes in, 3046, 3082
McMaster, Mr., free food and implements of production, 2996
Revenue, 2839, 2850, 2854, 2905, 3063, 3069
"Same old", 2981
"Say-so" of beneficiaries, 2956
"Scientific" 3069
Seward, late William Henry, speech, 2916
Special committee, 2955
Special privileges, 2786
Specific duties, 2215
Stability, 2648, 2657, 2703, 2717, 2718, 2741, 2755, 2772, 2775, 2787, 2799, 2806, 2809, 2819, 2835, 2841, 2853, 2912, 2966, 3011, 3028, 3052, 3053, 3064, 3066, 3068, 3071, 3303, 4031
Genoa Conference, res. 3053
League of Nations, res. 3054
Steamship subsidies and, 2923
Substantial reduction in, amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Tariff act of 1897, 3014
Tariff Commission, evidence, 2296
Tinplate industry, 2400
Trade commissioners and, 1840, 2923
United States and, 3010. *See also* United States
Unjust tax, 3062
Valuation of goods for customs, 90
War taxation, 2985
Weapon, 3477, 3907. *See also* Treaties, French
Western Canada and, 1887, 2747, 3062
Undue burden, 2781
Who pays? 2839
Tariff—*Con.*
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion, 2853. *See also* Budget
Wool, 2866
Woollen goods, reduction, 2990
Woollen industry, 3458
Protection, M. (Drummond) 928

Taxation. *See also* Agriculture; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff; Customs and Excise; Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill; Inland Revenue; Protection; Special War Revenue; Tariff
Agricultural implements, 1850. *See also that title*
Apportionment of, burdensome to poor, 2789
Automobile, qu. 1993, 2841. *See also that title*
Banff hotel, 3435
Bank drafts, 3925, 3928
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and Beverages
Bill of exchange, 3923
Budget, failure to balance, 2831
Building prices and, 2165
Burden of, 1348, 1355, 1394, 1403, 1880, 2831. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Business profits, 2786, 2789, 2998. *See also* Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill
Notes given in payment, 4489
Riordan Pulp & Paper Company, arrears, qu. 1974, 4490
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Unpaid, 4440, 4489
Business Profits War Tax Act 1916, administration, 3949
Cheque tax, 23, 121, 332, 2706, 2859, 2948, 3034, 3929, 4409, 4423
Embossed cheques regulations, qu. 492
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequality of, 3063
Maximum
Limitation of, 2847, 2877, 2979, 3922
Reduced to $1, 2656
Passed back to farmers, 3039
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927
Responsibility for payment, 2877
Who pays? 3039
Cigarettes. *See* Customs and Excise
Collection, 89. *See also under this title* Income; Sales Tax
Methods, 2213, 2786
Commission, 4039
Commissioner of, salary, 3949, 4669
Confectionery and beverages, 2644, 2656, 2707, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Confectionery and beverages—*Con.*
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 3938, 4182
Soft drinks, tax on, qu. 624
Tax, revenue, qu. 624
Consumer, 2789. *See also that title*
Consumption tax. *See under this title,* Sales tax
Cost of living and, 2839. *See also that title*
Crude, 2788
Debt and, 2964
Depreciation and renewal allowance, 1711
Difficult and irritating, 2804, 2859
Direct, 2836, 2956, 3000, 3010, 3035
Results, qu. 281
Dominion lands, taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion, provincial and municipal, 2641
"Enormous" 2963
"Excessive" 1345, 1391, 1394, 2712
Excise. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue
Use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Exemptions. *See under this title,* Income, Children; Sales Tax; Receipt Tax
Experiments in, 2788
Express money orders, 3923
Extravagance and, 2785
Farmers paying taxes, 4224. *See also that title*
Four cardinal principles of, 66-67
Granville island, qu. 1485
Great Britain in, 1854
Reduction of, 2712
High, 2583, 2747, 2857, 3010
Exodus to United States, 2823
Implements of production, 2718. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Income, qu. 281, 1195, 2859. *See also* Income War Tax Act. Amdt. bill
Agricultural forms, 4498
Based on fallacious doctrine, 2913
Bonds exempt from, qu. 342
Bonds, interest rate and, 4494
Burdensome to urban tax-payer, 2745
Capital, 3027
Diverted from industry by, 2914
Children, exemption for, 2128, 2880, 3038, 4502
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1382
Collections, 2658, 2998
Cost of, qu. 733
Total, 2825
Community of property, 2880, 3038
Convictions, qu. 3582
Deductions, for educational and charitable donations, 3954
Dividends, 2881
Duplication, 2859

Taxation—*Con.*
Income—*Con.*
Exemption. *See also under this title,* Children
Small incomes, 2728, 4493
Up to $5,000 for head of family, 3038
Widows, 2934
Farmers, payments by, qu. 1259, 1486, 2845
Federal, provincial and municipal, 2825, 2859
Fines, qu. 2180, 3507
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Graduated, 2706, 2788, 2837, 2914, 3073
Great Britain, 2788
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Income and investment discouraged, 2914
Incomes earned and unearned, 2745, 2788
Unearned, 2718, 2858, 2880, 2954, 2967, 3026
Dividends, 3038
Increase, 2658, 3010
"Intolerable nuisance," 2914
Moose Jaw office, qu. 2699
Penalties, 2979
Protest from people who do not pay, 2786
Revenue and production, lessening of, 2913
Revenue, cost of collection, farmers, qu. 1259, 4224
Rich not bearing fair share, 2788
Scale of, 2985
Steeply graded, 2728
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Total assesment, qu. 2393
United States, reduction, 2913
Vancouver offices, qu. 912
Western farmers, 1889
Western provinces, collections, qu. 2206
Yorkton office, qu. 384
Income War Tax Act, administration, 3949
Increase of, 1121, 1822, 1854, 2712, 2784, 2987, 2997
Indirect, 1440, 2789, 3027, 4423
Inequitable, 2728, 2788
Inheritance, 1383, 2728, 2788, 2792, 2802, 2803, 2810, 2825, 2837, 2909, 3026, 3073
Inland revenue, use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Land values, 1105, 1118, 1178, 1344, 2728, 2745, 2778, 2803
Unearned increment, 3016
Liberal platform, 2003
London Spectator, statement of, 1122
Luxuries, 915, 2003, 2706, 2710, 2718, 2742, 2745, 2789, 2853, 2858, 2989, 2997, 2999, 3073, 3910
Excise tax on, 2779
Tax collections, qu. 2393

Taxation—*Con.*
Manitoba
Agricultural production and, 1404
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Municipal, 426, 2641, 3445
Burdensome, 2836
Unpaid, 2768, 2769, 2953, 2961
Natural resources, 2729
Necessaries of life, on, 2710, 2728, 2736, 2754, 2789, 2999
New, 2857, 2997, 3078
Not wanted, 2914
Per capita, 1121, 3026
Post office money orders, 3923
Postal rates, 1780
War rate, 2745
Postage stamps, use for excise taxes, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3938, 4435
Prices, increase of, 2716. *See also* Prices
Promissory notes, 3063, 3923
Provincial amusement tax, 2826
Railway deficits and, 2905, 3006
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2643, 2656, 2705, 3034, 3923, 3934, 3935, 3938, 4423
Evasion of, 2706, 2826
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequity of, 2826
Payment in postage stamps, 1815
Revison of, 4409
Reduction of, 2749
Relief from, 3038
Responsibility for, 2920
Revenue, 2745
Revenue and postage stamps, 1815, 1818
Revenue stamps, selling cost, 1819
Sales tax, qu. 281, 1427, 2656, 2742, 2789, 4181 4183, 4425. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alberta collections, qu. 2417
Amendment, 3031
Automobiles, qu. 1993
Books and book bindings 1870
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1157
Carbonic acid gas, 3938, 4182
Collection, qu. 285, qu. 938, 2840
At source, 2643, 2656, 2840, 2998, 3031, 3038, 3938, 4181
Change in method, 2734
Domestic goods, 2840
Foreign goods, 2840
Complexity of, 2642
Confectionery and beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery
Contracts affected, 2750
Cost of living, 2839
Increase, 1813
Date of taking effect, 2657, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Sales tax—*Con.*
Domestic and foreign goods, 2804
Drain tiles, 2742, 3046, 3063, 4183
Duty-free goods, 2979
Exemptions, qu. 491, 2643, 2998, 3031, 3063, 4431
Drain tiles, 3046. *See also under this sub-title,* Drain Tiles
Newsprint, 2999, 3046
Raw wool, 2998
Rulings as to, qu. 708
Tomato plants, 4432
Exports, 4364
French treaty, 2279, 2280, 2299
Furs, 2742
Imports, 4409
Increase in, 2213, 2804, 3033, 3066, 3078
Jobbers, 4410, 4433
Licensed manufacturer or producer, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Manufacturers, licensed, 4410, 4433
Michigan Central bridge, remission, qu. 1257
Middleman, encouragement, 2805
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 915
Necessaries of life, 2999
Newsprint, 2979, 2999, 3046
Nursery stock, 4432
Origin of finished articles, 2840
Passing on, 2750, 2912, 4411, 4416
Prime Minister's speech in 1921, 2997
Profiteering, 2997
Proposed change, petition against, 2958
Public libraries, 1870
Pyramiding, 915, 2823, 2859, 2912, 2998, 3036, 3031, 3033, 4423
Regina Photo Supply Company, qu. 518
Simplification, 3082
Suggested abolition of, 1230
Summer trade, 2912
Tomato plants, 4432
Union Jack, 4514
Wool, 2742
Workability, 2786
School land taxes, 3445
Schools closed from inability to pay, 1388
Unpaid, 4205
Single tax on vacant land, 1105, 1344. *See also under this title,* Land
Sixty-seven per cent paid by consumer, 2789
Suggested conference on, 67
Tariff and, 2859, 2839, 3068
"Taxed to death," 2826, 4493
Taxes, banks' refusal to pay, 4099

Taxation—*Con.*
Tax reductions, 2642
Tax sales,
Alberta, 4062
Manitoba, 2961
Travellers' cheques, 3923
Turnover tax, 2841, 2859, 2916
Unpaid, 637, 1388, 3257, 3445, 4205
Unimproved land. *See under this title,* Land
War, 2788, 2985, 3028
War profits, 2788, 2985
War taxes, collection by Post Office dept. 1815
Western farmers unable to meet, 1202, 2781

Tax-Exempt Bonds. *See* Bonds

Technical Education Act. *See* Labour

Technical Positions. *See* Civil Service

Telegraphs and Telephones. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Wireless
Battleford-Isle la Crosse, 1017
British cable service, Canadian Press, 4727
British Columbia-mainland, 1017
Canadian National Telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Fort Qu'Appelle-Humboldt, qu. 383
Great North Western Telegraph Company, qu. 707, 2471
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Manitoba, 2285
Northwest territories, 3944
Nova Scotia, 4590
Prince Edward Island, 2682
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph lines, qu. 3138, qu. 3262
St. Charles-Peribonka telegraph line, qu. 3262
Vancouver island district, 1017
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal, qu. 3140
Wireless stations, 3337
Yukon telegraph system, 150, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206, qu. 2417

Temiscouata forest fires, 4010

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Temporary Employees. *See* Civil Service

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* Canadian National Railways; St. John

Terrebonne public building, 2690, 4614

Territories Act Amdt. *See* Northwest Territories

Testing of Seed. *See* Seed Inspection

Textiles. *See also* British Preference; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty
Clothing, British preference, 3032
Collars and cuffs, duties 3048
Cottons
British preference, 3463
Cotton manufacturers, combine, 2534
Duty, 3035, 3048. *See also* Treaties, French
For manufacture of pneumatic tires, duty, 2654, 3487
French treaty, 1987
Dominion Textile Company
Combine, 2563
McSweeney, late Senator, statement, 3464
Securities and dividends, 3463
Stock, 1853
Embroideries. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates, 1964
Knitting industry, artificial silk and, 2958
Laces, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Linen, 3897
Profits, 3464
Silks. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Artificial silk
Duty, 2820, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3489
Industry, 2658, 2703, 2798, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 3069, 3075, 3492
Knitting industry and, 2958
Tops or waste or artificial fibre silk, drawbacks, 3896
Yarns and fabrics, 2654
Duty, 2704, 3046, 3488, 3489
Imports of, 445, 2397
Silk cloth woven in the gum, duty, 3489
Silk industry, 2397, 2853
Canadian, 2397
French treaty and, 1977
Textile industry, 3466
Velvets and velveteens, duty, 3035, 3488
Woollen industry, 3458. *See also* Wool
Blankets, duty, 3048
British preference, 2958, 2989, 3034, 3458, 3459
Clothing, 3048
Competition from Great Britain and France, 2958
Duties, 3048
Drawbacks and, qu. 1994
Legislation to assist, qu. 4184
Marking of, 2973
Penmans, stock quotations and dividends, 3463
Preferential tariff and, 3458
Prices, 2990, 3459

Textiles—*Con.*
Woollen industry—*Con.*
Protection of, M. (Mr. Drummond) 928
Woollen goods, manufacture of 2866
Yarn, 3489, 3896

Thetford Mines, strike, 2207

Thomas, Mr. A. J. *See* Canadian National Railways

Thomas, Mr. J. H., 46

Thomson Line, ocean freight rates, 2127

Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856

Thompson, the late Right Hon. Sir John, copyrights, 2140

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Cold storage companies, 191
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2055
Field crop competitions, 600, 602
Montreal cold storage, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204
Welland canal construction contracts, qu. 1489

Thornton, Sir Henry Worth, 103, 126, 284. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Cattle shipments, space, 3040
West Indian service, 3379
Capital expenditure, 3811
Criticism of, 3640
Fuel supply, evidence, Senate com., 1919
Hudson Bay railway, 4683
Immigration, 1167
Reported statement, 2795, 2844
Western provinces, conditions, 2962

Thoroughbred horses. *See* Race Track Betting

Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Improvement and management of harbour)
Res. 3399, 3963; 1r., 2r., com., 3965; com., 3r., 4207

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1752
Lindsay market scales, 208

Tidal and Current Survey. *See* Marine

Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C.
Grand Trunk arbitration, qu. 730, qu. 1029
Payments to, 1154, qu, 1661

Timber. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lumber
Areas, limits of, 4206
Available supplies, 818
Creosoted, qu. 813, qu. 1137
Permits to cut on Dominion Lands, qu. 203, 3398, 4206. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Shortage, 2711

Timber Wolves, destruction of live stock, 597

Times, The, London, Hudson Bay railway, 1059

Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, 1071, 3056

Tinplate Industry, 2751
Establishment in Toronto, 2819
Sales tax, 4418
Tariff uncertainty, 2819

Titles, Honours and Decorations
Abolition of, 210
Banting, Dr., 4645
M. (Mr. Ladner) 1285, neg. on div. 1299
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1292
Nickle resolution, 1286-98

Tobacco. *See also* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Bootlegging in, 2989
Cigarettes
Bootlegging, 3230
Consumption, qu. 516
Customs duty, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 4392
Excise duty, 2655, 2825, 3229
Tax on, 2657
Cigars, consumption, qu. 517
Duty, 2913, 2988
Experimental stations, 459, 465
Harrow, 466
Home-grown, 4209. *See also* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Imports, qu. 1258
Revenue, loss of, 2913

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Accredited herd system, qu. 206
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Canadian National railways, mileage and cost 914
Haney, Mr. M. J., 3355
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Public debt, 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914
Public expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913

Tobin, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement
Farms in Richmond county, qu. 913
Wolfe county, qu. 913
War expenditure, 1914-1922, qu. 914

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. Walter, decision, question not referred to com. 3267

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd, system, 578, 3302
Animal diseases, inspection, 2202
British Columbia liquor laws, 2411
Prices, 2411
British Empire exhibition, 1873
Budget 2861. Congratulations to Finance Minister; government coming round to protection; unfair to Canada to cut down tariff; United States and oriental competition; copper bounty; Trail smelter; amendment; inclusion of planks from Liberal platform of 1919; agricultural conditions; disorganized markets, 2861; profitable and unprofitable lines of agriculture; single-crop farming; mixed farming with live stock as basis; prices low and crops high; plugging up the leaks; marketing of live stock; policy and prices; no advantage in breeding scrub stock, 2862; dairying industry; unprofitable herds; yield and cost; Nappan experimental station; experiment with scrub cows; value of industry to country; export markets; Canadian butter in Great Britain, 2863; competition of Denmark, Holland and New Zealand, 2863; butter grading; hog and export bacon industry; types and weights; Wiltshire sides; Danish bacon, competition of, 2864; prices at Chicago and Toronto; bacon from corn-fed hogs; breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865; sheep and wool industry; woollen manufacturing industry; marketing of lambs, 2866; wheat screenings as feed for lambs; inferior stock, loss from; animal contagious diseases; tuberculosis; hog cholera; research work; internal parasites; tuberculin test, 2867; immunization from tuberculosis; human tuberculosis; work of Dr. Watson; glanders; agricultural products, distribution; cheaper transportation and equalization of freight rates; Pacific coast trade; Panama canal, 2868; export

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
markets; oriental trade; co-operative selling; farm credits; agricultural education; better farming methods; Central experimental farm; immigration, exclusion of Asiatics; better understanding between farmer and city-man, 2869; no time for pessimism; pioneering; Bruce county in early days; summary of proposed policy
Buffalo
Slaughter of, 3440
Tuberculosis 3440
Business of the House, supply, relevancy, 4719
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2411
Chinese immigration bill, 2316
Merchants, 2316
Cold storage, 186
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 485
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Butter substitutes, 3151
"Manna" 3152
Renovated butter, 4251, 4255
Dairying industry, 2864, 3296
Butter, pasteurization 3298
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4672
Destructive Insects and Pests Act, 595
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms, 476-485
Fishery cruiser, Victoria, 4708
Freight rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1922
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, registration, 2397
Health of animals, 578
Tuberculin test, 578, 2867
Tuberculosis eradication, 3989
Indians cattle, 2159
Iron deposits, Vancouver island, 2514
Liquor
British Columbia plebiscite, 2441
Prices, 2441
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 193, 2202, 2292
Live stock industry, 476, 589. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Masters and mates, examination, 2610
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Nicomen island, protection, 626
Oleomargarine
Dairying industry and, 3296
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3510
Manufacture 3152
Paternal legislation, 727

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3707
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 723
Renovated butter, 3151, 4255
Seed testing bill, 278, 2305
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, Agriculture dept., 579, 2868

Tomato Plants. *See* Customs; Taxation

Topographical Surveys. *See* Surveys

Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Canadian National Railways
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4198
Electric lines, 2393
King and Yonge streets property, qu. 814, qu. 1663, qu. 1994, 2819, 2481, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Casualty clearing building, 4621
Customs house building, 3277, 4621, 4624
Fuel supply, 3200
Harbour improvements, 984, 985, 1011, 2678, 3076, 3774, 4444, 4445, 4562, 4578, 4610
Level crossings, 2477
Penny bank of. *See* Penny Bank
Post office building, 1780, 3277
Postal receipts, increase, 2819
Postal revenue, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Restaurants, profiteering, 2586
Seed branch offices, 4621
Soldiers' Comfort branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Soldier Settlement board, 2029
Street railway system, 2475, 3056
Tin-plate industry, 2819
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Toronto Transportation Commission, 1703
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4335, 4442
University of, scholarships, 878
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 517, 2477, qu. 4011, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442, 4447

Toronto Eastern Railway, 2475

Toronto Suburban Railway, qu. 280, 2181, 2475, qu. 2612, 3324

Tourist Traffic. *See* Canadian National Parks

Tower. *See* Parliament buildings

Tracadie Lazaretto, 702

Trade. *See also* Address; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; speeches on Budget; Tariff; Trade and Commerce; Treaties, French, Italian
Anglo-Canadian, fostering of, qu. 284
Annual report, 1910
Australia, with, 1848, 2964, 3476
Balance of, 2922
Bankruptcy, 648. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill
Canadian representative at Washington, 2735
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
China and India with, 1840
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717
Competition, Great Britain and Germany, 2752
Conditions, analysis, 2984
Cuba with, 308, 1840
Enlarged, advantages of, 2910
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Fiji islands, 1848
France with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, with, 437. *See also* British Preference
Increase in, 2784
International 2923
Interprovincial, 2177, 2748
Italy with, 2395. *See also* Treaties, Italian
Japan with, 1449
Pacific coast, 2868
Percentage of imports and exports, 2843
Oriental, 507. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Potatoes in, 308. *See also* Vegetables
Reciprocity with United States, 2650. *See also that title*
Russian trade mission, 986
Spain with, 2397
Steamship services. *See that title*
Switzerland, with 2397
Trade commissioners, 1837
Tariff and, 2923
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269, 2301
United States with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
West Indies, 3382
World competition, 2799

Trade and Commerce Department
Bounties, administration 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Trade commissioners, 1840
Commissioner of patents, duties, 2065
Consular and commercial agents qu. 284
Elevators, terminal, maintenance, 810

Trade and Commerce Department—*Con.*
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 3377, 4003, 4701
Exhibitions, 1467
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171. *See also* Steamship Services
O'Halloran, Mr. George F., Commissioner of Patents, 4673
Patent and Copyright branch, salaries, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 1837, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade, annual report, 1910
Trade commissioners and agents, 856, 1837
Weights and measures, inspection, 810

Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill
(Registration of industrial designs)
1r., 331; 2r., 2063; com., 2293; 3r., 2294

Trades and Labour Council. *See* Labour

Trades Union Congress. *See* Labour

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Resignation of, 2178

Trail, B.C., smelter, 2861, 2944

Transportation. *See also* Canadian National Railway; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Coal, 1247. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Equalization of rates, 1253. *See also* Freight Rates
Gaspe, 1243
Improvement of, 2745
Inadequate. *See* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Peace river district, 1433, 1440
Problems, 126. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Reduction, cost of, 1400
Shipping combine, 1134
Steamship companies, immigration and, 1193, 1201. *See also* Immigration
Water, 2979
Western Canada, 1440
Wheat, cost of, qu. 385. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Travellers' Cheques, tax. *See* Taxation, Cheque

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449, 2399
Australia, with, 245, 1848. *See also* Australia
Belgium, 246
Canada-West Indies, 3378
French Treaty, 9, 97, 436, 2657, 2815, 2832, 2964, 4457
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2001
Agricultural products, 1978, 2210, 2235
Aluminum, 1989
Analysis of, Mr. Chaplin, 1978
Anchovies and sardines, 2008
Automobiles, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Bacon, ham and pork products 1978
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Boots and shoes, 1990
Bottles, 2218
Braids and cords, 2213
Brandies, 2643, 2742, 2999, 3478
Brass and copper ware, 1981
British preference, 2005
Bronze powder, 1979, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2016, 2270
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998, 2017
Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217
Brushes, 2214
Building materials, 1982
Butter, 2273
Buttons, 2214, 2234
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Canadian ports. *See under this title,* Direct Importation
Cement, 1984
Cereals, 1984, 2006
Chemicals, 1980-5
Coal tar derivatives, 1986
Cobalt products, 2263, 2300
Competition, unfair, 2300
Condensed milk, 1984
Consumer, relief to, 3049
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Convention approved, 2255
Cotton manufactures, 1987, 2218, 2263
Cutlery, 1988
Dairy products, 1984
Direct importation, through Canadian ports, 1772, 2303, 2949
Duty, reductions in, 438, 2710
Eggs, 1978
Electrical apparatus, telephones, 2214
Electric lamps, incandescent, 1980
Embroideries, 2008, 2211, 2214, 2999
Engines and machinery, 1981-8
Favoured nation, 439, 443, 2005, 2007, 2014, 2210, 2213, 2219, 2232, 2234, 2241, 2271, 2395, 3035
Feathers and ornaments for hats, 3035
Fish, fresh and preserved, 1978, 2006, 2235

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Flour, 1978
France
Exports to, 2213
Friendly relations with, 2216
Trade with, 2209, 2255
French Consul General and, 2229
Furniture, 1982-9
Furs, 1981
Handkerchiefs, 2214, 3035
Hen feathers, 1978
Horses, 1978
Household necessaries, 441
Imports and exports, 1977, 2230
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Iron and steel, 1985-8, 2001
Japan, 2214
Trade concessions to, 450
Laces, 3035
Lard, 1978
Liberal platform, 2211
Linen yarns and thread, 1981
Live stock, 1983, 2211
Luxuries, 444, 450, 2003, 2011, 2014, 2213, 2221, 2259, 2742, 2989, 2999, 3035, 3910
Machinery and parts, 441
Manufacturers and, 2236. *See also under this title,* Canadian Manufacturers
Meats
Cured, 1978
Fresh, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978
Millinery, 3035
Minimum tariff, 440
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2218
Musical instruments 1982
Pianos and organs, 1990, 2237
Neighbouring countries, concessions to, 450, 2131, 2215, 2219, 2273
Oleomargarine, 1984
Paper and paper products, 1987
Paper board, 1981
Perfumery, 3035
Potatoes, 1984
Poultry, 1983
Revenue, loss of, 2014, 2209, 2235
Ribbons, 3035
Rubber, manufactures of, 1990, 2237
Sales tax, 2279, 2299
Sewing machines, 2237
Silks, 448, 2209, 2215, 2221, 2255, 2264, 2266, 2300, 2397, 2398, 2742, 3035
Specific duties, 2215
Spelter, 1979
Summary of, 2232
Switzerland, imports from, 2213, 2255

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Tabled, 54
Tariff and, 438, 2710, 4074
Tariff weapon, 3907-10
Treaty of 1907, 2004-29
United States, 2011
Concessions to, 449
Trade with France, 1991, 1997, 2213, 2218, 2229, 2276, 2396
Treatment, Unnited States and Canada, 441
Velvets and velveteens, 3488
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wheat, 1978
Wines, 438, 442, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225, 2302, 2643, 2710, 2999, 3035, 3937
Wood, manufactures of, 1982-9
Zinc, 1979
French Treaty Bill, res. 331, 436-456; 1r., 456; M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., 1910; withdrawn 1911; renewed 1977; discussion, 1977, 1995; 2r., on div. 2250-51; com. 2251-55-90-99; 3r., 2347
Halibut Fisheries Treaty with United States. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill
Approval of, res. 4440, 4455; agreed to, 4480
Correspondence, 1032, 1212
Tabled, 1256
Joint res. of parliament, transmission, 4736
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857-8
Procedure, 4437
Inquiry as to, 4132
Rider inserted by United States senate, 1308
Signing of, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664
Italian Treaty, 9, 2394, 2701, 2815, 2832
Consideration postponed, 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401, 2949
Favoured nation treatment, 2394
Border states, 2395
France, 2395
Italy, trade with, 2395
Relief to consumers, 3049
Signing of, 2403
Tabled, 89
Italian Treaty Bill, res. 331, 2394; 1r., 2395; 2r., com., 2395; 3r., 2437, 2701
Negotiatiton of, expenses, 3989
Peace treaty
Enemy property custodian, qu. 1486
International Labour Conference, 1441
Light thrown on causes of war, 2725
Orders in council, 767
Postal Treaty with the United States, 2, 4529

Treaties—*Con.*
Rush-Bagot, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Germain, 653
Switzerland, 2398
Trade, 437. *See also under this titlte,* Australia, French, Italian
United States. *See also* Reciprocity, United States
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Reciprocity treaty of 1854, 2910
Versailles, qu. 279, 1631-2, 3994. *See also* Germany, Reparations; War Claims
Labour, right to organize, 2889, 2895
Modification of, 4653

Tree Planting. *See* Forests and Forestry

Tremblay, General. *See* Quebec Harbour Commission

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton
Emigration from, 2823
Wool-combing industry, 2823, 2827, 3461

Trial by Jury. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Yukon Act Amdt.

Trials. *See* Justice
Eskimos, Hershell Island. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Troops. *See* National Defence
Use of in labour troubles. *See* Labour

Trout-Fishing. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868

Truro park, 3440

Trustees. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Trusts. *See* Combines

Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1447. *See also* Immigration, Chinese

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals; Live Stock; Pensions
Animals, 462-486. *See also* Live Stock; Animal Contagious Diseases
Tuberculin test, 2867, 3284, 3300
Attributable to military service, 3850
Bovine and human, 2868
Buffalo, 3439
Cattle, 2131-38. *See also* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Eradication, 3989
Dairy products, 3299

Tuberculosis—*Con.*
Immunization from, 2868
Indians, 2152
Live stock, 2867
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Military hospitals, 670
Pension obligation and, 3850
Returned soldiers, deaths from, qu. 3134
Serum, 2868
Tuberculous Veterans Association, petition, 4536

Tugboats. *See* Vessels

Tupper, Sir Charles
French treaty, 1991
Title, 1295

Turkey, threatened war with, 2815. *See also* Near East Crisis

Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Turnover Tax. *See* Taxation

Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Tutankhamen, King, 755, 1761
Inheritance tax, 2788

Two Months' Supply. *See* Interim Supply

Typewriters. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Tyrrell, Mr. J. W., Hudson Bay region, 1072

Ukrainians. *See also* West Ukrainian Republic
Immigration, 1396, 1883
Settlement of, 1341

Uncleaned Screenings. *See* Grain, Elevators

Undesirable Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Unearned Income. *See* Taxation

Unemployment. *See* Labour; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Unification. *See* Canadian National Railways

Unimproved Land. *See* Land; Taxation

Union Act, 1364, 1365

Union Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Union Label. *See* Labour

Union Nationale Française, immigration, 1877

Union of South Africa. *See* South Africa

Unions. *See* Labour

Unit of Representation. *See* Redistribution

United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 81, 1440

United Farmers of Manitoba, 1462

United Farmers of Ontario
Combines and trusts, 2584
Immigration, 1191
Proportional representation, 425

United Mines Workers of America. *See* Labour; Howat

United States. *See also* Reciprocity; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration, cost of, 1155
Agriculture
Economic organization, 1857
Encouragement of, 1390
Agricultural conditions, 642, 2829
Agricultural implements, duty free, 3017, 3062
Agricultural products, 2751
Markets for, 2810, 2869
Alien enemy property, custodian, 2496, 3823
American Expeditionary Force, mental tests, 1219
American legion, 2444
Annexation, 93
Asiatic immigration, exclusion, 1194
Banking system, 4083
Bankruptcy law, 3092
Bean-growing industry, 2981
Boots and shoes, duty, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499
Borrowings from, 93-94
British debt, 2879, 2918
Budget, 3341
Building boom, 1129, 3004, 3017
Cabinet officers, number of, 3043
Canadian exhibitions in, 1454
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3649
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361, 4480
Canadian railways, ocean ports in, 1754-5
Canadian representation, 4001, 4664. *See also that title*
Canadian tariff policy and, 3010
Canadians in, 43. *See also* Emigration
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cattle, export to, 1410, 2871
Chinese immigration, 2313, 4349
Coal, 3203. *See also that title*
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Embargo on, 1265, 1279
Exports from. *See* Coal
Purchased for railways, 1277
Strikes and labour unions, 2786
Supplies from, 1262

United States—*Con.*
Coloured population, 2316
Combines, grand jury system, 2585
Competition from, 2861. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Conditions following Civil War, 1122, 1232
Congressional library, 2693
Copyright, 2140. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Cost of living, 1812
Customs duties, per capita, 2738
Debt, per capita, 2956
Duties against, reduction by order in council, 2649
Emergency tariff, 2847. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Effect upon Canadian export, 2847
Emigration of Canadians to, 21, 1082, 1085, 1975. *See also* Emigration
European reconstruction, 4654
Exports, 1838
Pulpwood to, 4347. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Fair Tariff League, 3070
Farmers' bloc, 2791
Federal Reserve Bank, 3059, 4124, 4407
Federal reserve system, 4069
Fishing industry, 2940
Fish, market for, 2906, 2946, 3002
Fishing schooner, Siloam, capture, 2207
Fishing vesels, purchase of bait, 3705
Halibut fishery treaty with. *See* Treaties, Halibut
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Use of Canadian ports by, 3361, 4480
Flour, ocean rates, 2127
Ford, Henry, presidential candidate, 2908
Fordney-McCumber tariff, 172, 2649, 2708, 2748, 2818, 2823, 2857, 2869, 2909, 2919, 2940, 2946, 2958, 2977, 2993, 2997, 3011, 3013, 3035, 3052, 3061, 3098
Cattle, 3293
Coal, 1275
Farmers' gains and losses, 3070
Pacific coast fisheries, 2734
Power of president to vary, 3902
France, trade with, 1991, 1997, 2011, 2209, 2213, 2222, 2276, 2396. *See also* Treaties, French
Free list, agricultural products, 2910
Free trade, 1403, 2738, 2746, 3013
Freight cars, interchange, 4697
French Canadians in, repatriation, 1462
French treaty. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Grand Trunk lines, 3197
Grain prices, 297-8. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

United States—*Con.*
Grain shipments through United States ports, 3763
Great Lakes disarmament, correspondence, 1307
Harding, late President, world peace, 2911
Highways, 3437
Hirtle, Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Hogs, corn-fed, 2865
Immigration and, 1248
After Civil War, 1885
Agencies in, 1875
Obstacles to,, 1416
Policy, 1885
Imports and exports, 2821, 2928, 3061
Income tax, 2986, 4503
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reductions, 2913
Industrial development, 2751
Industrial organization and competition, 2992
Inflation, 2800, 3004
Influence in Canada, 2934. *See also* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
Fuel investigation, 1279
Internationl boundaries, survey and demarcation, 3248
Japanese organizations, 2444
Labour delegates, detention at border, 2296, 2419, 2469, 2347, 2393
Labour demand, 1129. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Lake of the Woods water powers. *See that title*
Levels, qu. 2700
Liquor laws, 4295
Illicit traffic, alleged, 2208
McKinley tariff, 2910
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufactured products, 2751
Market for, 2856
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Movement of population to. *See* Emigration
National Reserve bank, 4145
Naturalization, 2443
Oriental problem, 2443
Oriental propaganda in, 1896
Pecuniary Clains Convention, 779
People from, stopped at border, 1167. *See also under this title* Labour delegates
Ports
Adulteration of Canadian grain, 3649, 3961
Competition. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Ocean, 2898
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Postal treaty, 4529
Potatoes, export to, qu. 621

United States—*Con.*
Prices, comparison of, 2742, 2916
Prosperity, 2657
Protection and, 2751
Pulpwood, export to, 3413, 3416. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Railway system, 3057
Unification, 1618
Railways
Earnings, flour transportation, 2960
Grain shipments, diversion to, 2898
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2707, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2843, 3847, 2905, 2917, 3454, 3473
Chicago Tribune, comment, 2733
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718
Standing offer, 3016
Relations with, 2905
Rural credit system, 642, 2829, 2930, 4043, 4046, 4130, 4298
Rural depopulation, 2829
Rural mail delivery, 1781
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3208, 3705, 3762, 4513. *See also that title*
Self-interest, 2918
Senate, constitution of, 1373, 1378
Silk industry, 2397, 2400
Strikes, 1629
Sugar boycott, 2734
Surplus, 2823
Tariff 1113, 1119. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Change of sentiment, 3013
Emigration and, 1093
Tinplate industry, 2400, 2751
Trade relations with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
Agents in Canada, qu. 284
Negotiations with, 3074
Revival, 2650
Unemployment, decrease of, 2650
Wages in, 1165. *See also under this title,* Emigration; Labour
War and, 2918
Washington, Canadian representative at, 2735. *See also* Canadian Representation
Welland canal construction, 3762
Wharves, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wheat, duty, 2993

Universities. *See also* Education
Bank directors and, 4025, 4073
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Graduates emigrating to the United States, 2732
Independent thought stifled, 3074

Universities—*Con.*
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Toronto, 878

Unopposed Motions for Paper
Accredited herds (Mr. Caldwell) 626
Agriculture dept. employees (Mr. Bouchard) 815
Alberta Drainage Company (Mr. Kellner) 3144
Arctic islands and northern Quebec (Mr. Parent) 814
Banff park, power rights (Mr. Shaw) 496
Banff springs and cave (Mr. Shaw) 496
Bank returns (Mr. Coote) 3264
British Columbia claims (Mr. Stevens) 708
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, (Sir Henry Drayton) 3705, 3822
Canadian National Railways
Equipment orders, (Mr. Meighen) 2701
Grand Trunk, United States terminals (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Lifting of steel, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1664
Orders in council (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Regulations (Mr. MacLaren) 496
Canadian Pacific Railway, Quebec terminals (Mr. Parent) 815
Cattle trade with Great Britain (Mr. Meighen) 208
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions (Mr. Manion) 330; (Mr. Meighen) 208
Dismissals (Mr. Hanson) 856
Positions exempted (Mr. Irvine) 914
Customs and Excise, legal work (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Disallowance of Nova Scotia legislation (Mr. Hanson) 208; (Sir Henry Drayton) 249, 208
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs. (Mr. Maybee) 3705
Eastern Lands Development Company, (Mr. Lapierre) 626, (Mr. Carruthers) 1635
Euclid Hall and Brant House, closing (Mr. Church) 4303
Export liquor warehouse licenses (Mr. Stevens) 3144
Freight rates, shipping, coastal regulations (Mr. Coote) 2613
Government printing, Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) 3144
Grand Trunk arbitration (Mr. d'Anjou) 1307
Halibut fishery treaty (Mr. Meighen) 1032

Unopposed Motions for Paper—*Con.*
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal (Mr. Irvine) 1868
Hudson Bay railway (Mr. Meighen) 208
Immigrant supplies, Quebec (Mr. Charters) 496
Lewis, John L., correspondence (Mr. Meighen) 250
Liquor, export, revenue, etc. (Mr. Good) 3704
Lindsay market scales (Mr. Thurston) 208
Margaree river salmon fisheries, (Mr. Hanson) 2700
New Brunswick export houses (Mr. Caldwell) 815
Newspapers and printing companies, contracts, (Mr. Black, Yukon) 1974
Nicomen island, protection (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Nipissing Indian reserve (Mr. Lapierre) 1307
North Oakville post office (Mr. Anderson) 914
Nova Scotia miners' strike (Sir Henry Drayton) 914
Orders in council
Canadian National Railways (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
P. C. 223 (Mr. Sutherland) 815
P. C. 1566 (Mr. Black, Yukon) 249
Oriental immigration (Mr. McQuarrie) 1307
Ottawa river water storage (Mr. Parent) 815
Printing contracts, newspapers, etc. (Mr. d'Anjou) 2298
Purchase of bait for fishing vessels (Mr. Forke) 3705
Railway lands, purchase or sales (Mr. Boys) 1739
St. Lawrence river waterway (Mr. Church) 3705
Sardine herring fishery (Mr. Duff) 2518
Six Nations Indian reserve (Mr. Senn) 1307
Soldier settlers, fire insurance (Mr. McMurray) 496
Sporting Mountain mail contract (Mr. Hanson) 856
Sydenham hospital (Mr. Ross, Kingston) 626
Technical and professional officials (Mr. Martell) 815
Testing of dairy cattle (Mr. Caldwell) 1307
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Toronto Suburban railway (Mr. Church) 2181
Trade commissioners (Mr. Putnam) 856
Vermilion town lots (Mr. Spencer) 1307
Wheat board, correspondence (Mr. McConica) 626
Winnipeg coal purchases (Mr. McMurray) 496

Unrest, Industrial. *See* Labour

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Emigration; Population

Vacancies. *See* Auditor General; House of Commons

Valcartier Camp Ground. *See* National Defence

Valleyfield, Canadian Bronze Powder Works, 1998, 2017

Valuation for Duty. *See* Customs

Vancouver (city)
Assay office, 3207
Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Board of Trade,
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 1869, 1910, 3189
Freight rates, equalization, 1953
Bridge, 1008
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 3272
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Granville island taxation, qu. 1485
Immigration
Chinese, 1444. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Immigration sheds, 1447, 1896
Income tax offices, qu. 912
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1451
Labour department, 1678
Orientals, business competition, 504, 1902, 2311
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Producers' Dairy Company, 2526
Proportional representation, 401
Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association 4266

Vancouver (port). *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Ballantyne pier, 257, 258
Dry dock, 1002, 2671
Elevator, 1057, qu. 1487, 3769
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Improvements, 2033
Grain shipments, 69, 1034, 3769
Harbour, 83, 110, 1002
Harbour commission, 387, qu. 912
Kitsilano reserve and, 383
Vacancies, 1372
Port development, 1051

Vancouver Harbour Advances Bill
Res. 198, 255; 1r., 269-270; 2r., com., 3r., 332

Vancouver Island, iron deposits, 2514

Van Koughnet, Mrs., Soldiers' Comfort Branch, Toronto, 4727

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables; Treaties, French Treaty
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canned, imports, 445
Competition from United States, 2977
Dehydration of, 4674
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Potatoes
Acreage and production, 2934
Diseases, 595
Duty, 2651, 2707, 2959, 2980, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Free trade in, 2820
Freight rates, 137-138
French treaty, 1984
Grading, 598. *See also* Root Vegetables
Growers, 137
Imports, qu. 617, 2820, 2959
Inspection, 598
New Brunswick, 2763
Potato-growing industry, 308
Prices, 2820
Prince Edward Island, 131, 2763
Reciprocity in, 2993
Seed, inspection of, 2306
United States
Competition, 2977
Exports, qu. 621
Wharfage tolls, 975
Root vegetables, sale and inspection, 937
Tomato plants, customs duty, 4432

Velvets. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty

Veniot, Premier, St. John river wharves, qu. 1488

Vermilion, Alberta, town lots, 1307
Purchases, 489
Rental by government, qu. 2417

Verret, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826

Versailles, Treaty of, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Treaties
International Labour Conference, 1631

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine; Shipping
Acadia, 1044, 3336
Alaskan wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160
Algerine, qu. 1763

Vessels—*Con.*
Arctic, 3944, 4012
Bayfield, 3336
Bonaventure, 1044
Boethic, 1044
Canadian, Chinese sailors on, 2334
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cartier, 3336
Challenger, 1742
Crews, 2670. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
Eureka, 1364
Fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Foreign. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Gleeful, tug, qu. 1763
John D. Hazen, 3160
Lady Grey, 3160
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Lillooet, 3336
Llandovery Castle, loss of, 1745
Malaspina, 2207
Marvale, wreck, 3333
Mikula, icebreaker, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Minto, 1044
Montcalm, 2614, 3160
Monte Grappa, foundering, qu. 912
Murray Stewart, tug, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354
Reliance, qu. 812
Restless, 3336
Siloam, seizure, 2207
Space for cattle. *See* Live Stock, Shipments
Stanley, 2614
Taibu Maru, 859
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Tuscan Prince, wreck of, qu. 1763
Wireless equipment, 3355

Vetcraft Shops. *See* Soldiers

Veterans' Associations. *See* Pensions

Veterinary Surgeons, drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Veto. *See* Disallowance

Vickers Company
Cancellation of contract, 1746
Hydro-planes, 1748
War claim, 1745
Canadian Vickers, qu. 2205
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3780
Hopper barge construction, contract, 3350

Victoria, B.C.
Dominion astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dry dock, 1002

Victoria, B.C.—*Con.*
Harbour, dredging, 110, 1014
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, qu. 3137

Victoria, vacancy. *See* Cape Breton North and Victoria

Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Ammunition, 886
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079-4124
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087, 3089
Business of the House, Speaker's rulings, 4076
Canadian National Railways, deficits, 4190
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Copper bounty bill, 4375
Editorial Committee, French publications, 1670
French translation and printing, 1489, 1670
Halibut fishery treaty, 4467
Imperial Conference, 4639
Indemnity of members, 4237
Labour, right to organize, 2894
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4237
Petition of right, fiats, 3222
Powell River Paper Company, 2894
Public ownership of railways, 4191
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 713, 716, 737
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4237-46

Ville Marie wharf, 981

Vimy Ridge Memorial Site, 2, 3, 12
Gift of by France, 65, 2832
Accepted, 180
Agreement, 181
Joint res. of parliament, 811, 3819
Message from his Ecellency the Governor General, 1631
President, French Republic
Letter from, 1538
Joint res. to, 811

Vincent, Mr. J. U., 1806

Vocational Training. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Vote, Lack of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence

Voting in Divisions. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Wages. *See* Cost of Living; Labour

Wainwright Buffalo Herd, 2773, 3407, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 4702

Waldron, Mr. Gordon, United Farmers of Ontario, 425

Walker, Sir Edmund, immigration, 1343

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2133
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2056-9
Health of animals, 581
Historic sites, 3432
Port Dover, Ont., Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Income tax, revenue, cost, etc. qu. 1259
Life-saving station, Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Oleomargarine, drawback on materials, 3503
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Radiotelegraph stations, lake Erie, 3338

Want of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Wanipigow River dam, 1000

War. *See also* Germany, Reparations; National Defence
British expeditionary force 3885
Burdens, 2967, 2981. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canada's participation in, 4655. *See also that title;* Imperial Conference
Canadian expeditionary force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Causes of, 2725
Claims. *See* War Claims
Conditions following, 1231. *See also* Immigration
Debt, 2797. *See also* Pubic Debt
Capital levy 2722-28
Expenditure 2915, 2920
Naval 110
Responsibility for 3078
1914-1922, qu. 914
French-Canadians, bravery 2935
Glorification of, 2686
League of Nations and, 3993
Loans. *See that title*
Material, sale of, 2986
Medals 1743
Medical supplies, purchase of, 2921
Middlemen, 2921
Monuments and Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge
Pensions. *See that title*

War—*Con.*
Profiteering, 2585, 2981
Profits, taxation of, 2788, 2985
Reparations. *See* Germany
Responsibility for. *See* Germany
Retired officers, serving in. *See* Militia Pension Act Amdt.
Revenues collected during, 2985
Rhineland occupation, cost of, qu. 2696
Scandals, 2815
Davidson commission, qu. 812
Taxation, 2788, 3028. *See also that title*
War profits tax, 2788, 2985
United States and, 2918

War Claims. *See also* Alien Enemy Property; Germany, Reparations
Adjustment of, qu. 1486, 1745
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, qu. 3142
Canadian claims against Germany, 2496
Canadian Pacific Railway shares, 2496
German claims against Canadians, 2496
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500
Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745
Massey-Harris Company, settlement of, 2497
Militia services, 900
Statement of expenditure, 1747
Naval service, 900
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment as commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Secretary of State, 2495
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce vote, 2502, neg. 2504
Statement of, 2496
Vickers, contract, cancellation, 1746

War Measures Act, Oleomargarine, 3528. *See also* Oleomargarine; M. (Mr. Carroll)

War Revenue Act. *See* Special War Revenue

War Service, Repatriation. *See* Naturalization Act

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Budget, 2959. "Annual family squabble"; zigzag course of debate; arguments for and against protection; more important matters than the tariff; freight rates; suspension of coasting regulations, 2959; increase of lake grain rates; the "shipping barons"; discrimination by Canadian boats in favour of United States lake ports; milling in bond; United States railway earnings from transportation of flour, 2960; Crowsnest pass agreement; saving in railway rates absorbed by shipping

Ward, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
companies; western agricultural conditions and demands; talk of secession; tax sales in Manitoba, 2961; conditions in Saskatchewan; what is the matter with western Canada? mortgaged farms; remoteness from tidewater; high interest rates; increased dependence upon agricultural prosperity; gratuities to Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern directors and officials, 2962; cattle shipments to Great Britain, space and rates; public debt; taxation; interest payments; New York loan, April 1922; the spectre of debt; doing business with borrowed money, 2963
Canadian National Railways, retiring gratuities, 1483, qu. 1632, 1687, 2962
Unorganized districts, road-building, 3258
Welland canal construction, 3789

Warehouses. *See* Canada Temperance; Customs; Grain; Liquor

Warlike Stores. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Agricultural conditions, 1423
Alberta coal
Freight rates, 3009
Resources, 1282
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 549, 555
Climatic conditions of West, 1423
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Edmonton Indian school, 2165
Emigration to the United States, 1422
Experimental farms, 467
Farm labour, 1424
Forest protection, 3418
M. (Mr. Michaud) 825
Fuel supply, 795
M. (Mr. Church) 1282
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1055
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1425
Policy, 1421
Speeches, adverse effect of, 1423
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3513, 3516, 3519, 3539
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 758
Reference to, 1425
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1151

Warner, Mr. D. W.—*Con.*
Rural mail delivery, western provinces, 1791
Tariff, immigration and, 1424
Tree-planting, 3418
Vancouver harbour bill, 266
Wheat-growing, 1423

Washington. *See also* United States
British Ambassador at, 858, 4457. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
Canadian representative at, 2735, 3017, 3085, 4001, 4664
Congressional library, 2693
Disarmament conference, 2911, 4000
Visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823

Waste Paper, disposal by government departments, qu. 1028, 1713

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers. *See also* Fuel Supply; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration of, 3420
Alienation of, 3422
Canadian national parks, 3442, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Forest Reserves
Banff, 3750, 3939
Carillon rapids, 659
Cedar rapids, 659
Development of, 3422
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Dominion Power Board, 3427
Eastern townships, 1248
Electric power, exportation, 658
Export duty, 2828
Suggested prohibition, 1272
United States to, 1266
Fuel supply, 3203. *See also that title*
Hudson Bay railway, 1040, 1065
Hudson Bay region, 1072
Grass river, 1065
Jurisdiction, 665
Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods
Lake of the Woods, 3421, 3425, 4163. *See also that title*
Control Board, expenses, 4001
Leases, 3421
United States citizens to, 3426
National policy, development of, 1270
Nelson river, 3421
Niagara district, 3782
Niagara falls, 3940
Ottawa river, qu. 1974
Peace river district, 1433

Water Powers—*Con.*
Provincial ownership and jurisdiction, 3421
Railway electrification, 3422
Resources, 2750
Revenue, 2969
Rideau canal, qu. 622
St. Lawrence 2682
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3782
Surveys and investigations, 3203, 3420
Expenditure, 2969
Water Powers board, 3420
Water powers of the world estimated, 1270
Winnipeg river, 1214, 3421. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Waterhen Lakes, drainage, 3431, qu. 4303

Waterton Lakes
Highway, qu. 2085
Park, 3435

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways and, 3057
St. Lawrence river. *See that title*

Watson, Dr. glanders, treatment of, 579, 2868

Ways and Means, Committee of, 2640, 3084, 3229, 3231, 3454, 3705, 3895, 3963, 4162, 4181
Bounties on manila fibre and copper bars or rods, 3231
British preference, 3454
Budget speech, 2640
Customs tariff resolutions, 3454-74
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3229
Interim supply, 1539, 3705
Motion for, discussion, 3222
Notice of, 179
Supply bill, 4735
United States, reciprocity, 3454

Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145, 3995

Wealth of Canada
Estimated, 2719
History of, 2728

Webb, Sydney, report, 2545
Sydney and Beatrice, Decay of Capital and Civilization, 2726

Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Weed Seeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill; Seed

Weekly Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Weights and Measures
Cartage charge 810
Inspection 810
Peterborough district, qu. 492, 810

Welland Canal. *See* Canals

Welland, Haldimand, Lincoln Counties. *See* Redistribution

Wells, Mr. H. G., Civilization and the War, 2722

Well-Drilling Machinery. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Welsh Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

West Indies
Fish markets, 3002
Steamship service with, 3377
Trade, 3382. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
West Indies delegates, 3392

West Ukrainian Republic. *See also* Ukrainians
M. (Mr. Campbell) 651, withdrawn, 658

Western Canada. *See* Western Provinces

Western Canada Colonization Association. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Western Grain Standards Board. *See* Grain, Marketing

Western Provinces. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration; Natural Resources. For individual provinces. *See their respective titles*
Agricultural conditions, 1196, 1201, 1439, 1880, 1889, 2766. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Banks and Banking; Budget; Immigration; Railways; *and under this title,* Conditions
Examples of successes and failures, 2767
Questionnaire and answer, 2772
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, administration, 2132
Bad farming, 1889, 2781, 2812
Branch lines construction, 4185
Conditions in, 1213, 1221, 1246, 1347, 1349, 1352, 1388, 1396, 1398, 1402, 1415, 1854, 1883, 1890, 2747, 2811, 2845, 2961, 2977, 3002, 4038, 4062, 4222

Western Provinces—*Con.*
Conditions in—*Con.*
"Calamity howlers", 2811, 2977
Christison, Mr. J. N., 1891
Goosen, Mr. Peter, 1892
Spence, Mr. George, 1891
Winter trips to British Columbia and California, 1252
Extravagance, 1889
Farm mortgages, 2962
Farmers' earnings, 2813
Field crops, 2846
Financial distress, 1890
Freight rates, 3190
Grain shipments. *See* Freight Rates; Grain; Vancouver Harbour Bill
Grievances, 3056-62
Immigration. *See that title*
Industries, 1889
Lack of, 4047
Interest rates, 1088. *See also* Banks and Banking
Mixed farming, 2772
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Municipal and provincial extravagance in building, 1890
Natural resources, 1121, 2782, 2836, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Petroleum bounties, 2648
Redistribution, 4738
Remoteness from tidewater, 2962
Representation on Railway Commission, 3192
Ridicule and intimidation, 2813
Rural income tax-payers, 2845
Rural mail delivery, 1790
Rural shareholders of banks, 2846
Saline lake deposits, 3198
Secession talk, 2808, 2814, 2961, 2977, 3067
Settlement of due to railways, 2833
Solidarity, 3062
Surveys in, qu. 1866
Tariff and, 1424, 2747
Taxation, undue burden on, 2781. *See also* Taxation
Thornton, Sir Henry, statement, 2962
Transportation, 4222. *See also* Freight Rates; Grain
Treatment, 4191
Understanding with manufacturers, 3023
Unrest, alleged condition of, 4514
Wealth "stream drying up" 2757

Weyburn Security Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Interest on investment, 976

Wharves—*Con.*
New Brunswick, transfer to federal government, 946
Revenue, 976
United States, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wharfage tolls, 975

Wheat. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Stem Saw-Fly. *See* Agriculture; Insect Pests

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, 278

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Agricultural implements, standardization, 809
British preference, woollen goods, 3470
Budget, 2964. Debt and taxation; expenditure; retrenchment in civil government; raisins and dried currants; duty; Australia, trade with; French treaty; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty; binder twine, discrimination against manufacturer, 2964; history of binder twine industry; price advance following abolition of duty; production, imports and exports, 2965; home and export prices; tariff stability; knowledge as to conditions of investment; reciprocity proposals; amendment, 2966; income tax; unearned income; indemnity of members; socialistic doctrine; Abraham Lincoln on rights of capital, 2967
Firebrick duty, 3482
Fuel supply, 809
Old age annuities, 1639
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Penitentiaries, 771
Pensions, disability entitling to, 679
Post offices, grade 3, qu. 4300
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3781
Tobacco imports, duties, qu. 1258
Unemployment relief, 690
Welland canal construction, 3781

White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

White, Sir Thomas, Reciprocity, "Noble Eighteen", 2908

White Mud River, fishway, 3362

White Star Dominion Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Whitley Councils. *See* Civil Service

Whitney, Sir James, hydro-electric development, 1267

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Combines Bill

Widows, Pensions. *See* Pensions

Wild Life Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations Bill

Wiley Estate. *See* Yukon

Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Willison, Sir John. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Canada Colonization Association, 1323, 1328, 1429
Retirement from, 1164
Reminiscences, quotation from, 1182

Wilson, Mr. G. C. (Wentworth)
Hamilton-Brantford highway, qu. 624, 2492
Ontario projected highways, qu. 624

Windermere Highway. *See* Banff-Windermere

Windsor, N.S.
Dredging, 1010
Historic sites, 3406

Windsor, Ont., emigration, 1404

Wines. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Winnipeg
Coal purchases for public buildings, 496
Elmwood postal station, 4628
Emigration from, to United States, 1975
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Government printing, 3144
Winnipeg Saturday Post, qu. 3323
Grain sample market, qu. 345
Institutions and services of, 1214
Liberal Association, immigration, 1429
Lord Shaw, statement on immigration, 2833
Minto street armoury, qu. 2084
Proportional representation, 392, 411, 412, 433. *See also that title*
Stockyards, 2762
Ukrainians, resolution. *See* West Ukrainian Republic
Unemployment, 41-42, 435, 1124, 1215, 1644, 1883
Mayor, representations from, 1658

Winnipeg—*Con.*
Water powers, 3421, 3425. *See also* Lake of the Woods
Winnipeg Free Press, emigration, 2790

Winnipeg-St. Croix projected railway, 2898

Winnipeg River, 1214. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Wireless Telegraphy, 3337. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Telegraphs and Telephones
Hudson Bay route, 1046
Industrial Group, Great Britain, message from, 4436
Navigation and, 3333
Northwest territories, 3944-5
Vessels, equipment, 3355-6
Wireless stations, 3374
Mayo, 4702

Wolves. *See* Animals, Wild

Wolvin, Mr. Lee H., 4281. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Women
Civil Service, in, 1772
Dominion Council of Health, representation, 3649
Farm, 1844
Pensions, 1651. *See also that title*
Representation in parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Women's Labour League, 2718

Wood, Mr. E. R., 60

Wood, Mr. H. W., statement on budget, 2771, 2853, 2946

Wood, Mr. W. F., income tax conviction, qu. 3582

Wood. *See also* Lumber
Staves, duty, 3487

Woodbridge, Ont., postmaster, 1821, 1828

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Bacon, grading, 593
Budget, 2846. A dual policy, 2846; tariff; slow movement of Liberal party toward reduction; reciprocity; market for agricultural products; effect of United States emergency tariff on Canadian exports; cheque tax; limitation, inequitable, 2847; agricultural

Woods, Mr. R. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
implements, tariff; speech of Mr. Meighen session of 1910-1911, "ramparts of gold"; protection increased by rise in price, 2848; boots and shoes, duty on; Canadian manufacturers, monopoly of home market and free access to United States; agricultural conditions, home markets practically worthless to farmers; world competition in agricultural products, 2849; tariff for revenue; duties too high to produce revenue; cigarettes; industrial centralization; disappearance of small manufacturing establishments, 2850; manufacturers, beneficiaries of cheaper production; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberals who opposed reciprocity, the "Noble Eighteen"; Sir Thomas White; manufacturers support government that will protect them; class legislation; Progressive group out for equal rights; tariff joint product of Liberal and Conservative parties, 2851
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 740
Rural mail carriers, 1789
Seed inspection, 197
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Wines native, prohibition of manufacture, 2411
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Woods, Lake of. *See* Lake of the Woods

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 41. Omissions in speech from Throne; no lessening of burden of taxation; unemployment situation, 41; statements from organizations and municipalities, 41-42; immigration scheme; land settlement plan; past immigration policy, 43; financial condition; commercial treaties, 44; Near East crisis; Canada's national status; Mr. J. A. Hobson on imperialism, 45; British policy in foreign affairs; Lloyd George; ex-Premier Nitti of Italy, 46; Trades Union Congress at the Hague, 46-47; necessity for permanent peace, 47
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Annual drill, 866, 4636
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 994,999
Autonomy, Canadian, 45, 4651

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4018, 4084-87, 4144-61
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Lawful association, amdt. 4084, neg. 4085
Officials, right of organization, amdt.. 4161, neg. 4161
Shareholders' audit, amdt. 4087, neg. 4090
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Belle River harbour, 4608
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British and foreign news service, 4712
Budget, 2718; amendment, Mr. Forke; free trade; greater economy in public administration; social readjustment; perpetuation of National Policy; tariff on implements of production, 2718; Liberal party promises forgotten; taxation of necessaries of life; raisins; Women's Labour League, telegram, 2718; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, statement; legislative and administrative machinery; over-organization; economic resources; estimated wealth of Canada, 2719; natural resources; gold, one per cent of national wealth; annual production; manufacturing industries, production costs and profit; capital invested; provincial and municipal debts, 2720; per capita debt; unemployment, anxiety and general dissatisfaction; labour, viewpoint of; doctrine of free trade; industrial and economic changes; free trade England; unemployment and social difficulties; labour and socialism; British National Labour party, policy, 2721; suppression of capitalistic system; resolution introduced in British House of Commons; Lloyd George and British socialism; H. G. Wells, sinking of ship of civilization; Dr. J. J. Tompkins of St. Francis Xavier University, Catholic social principles, 2722; face to face with serious crisis; industrial revolution; individualistic production; the farmer; transportation systems; internationalism, 2723; thinking in terms of the parish rather than of the world; status of the worker; freedom and the introduction of the taxing system; agricultural and industrial workers; concentration of capital; John Maynard Keynes, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace"; markets, 2724; buying power; war, causes of; combinations and trusts;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
financial control; monopoly of credits; economic and social consequences of capitalism; control of educational agencies, 2725; Upton Sinclair, Capitalistic Control of the Press; control of government; federation of British industries; Canadian Manufacturers' Association; Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Decay of Capital and Civilization; wealth and poverty; privileges and monopolies, 2726; wage slavery; serious economic conditions; industrial democracy; socialism and state socialism; railways; spheres of federal and provincial control; coal mines; production for the use and not for profit, 2727; financial systems; labour platform; natural resources; public ownership and operation of public utilities and large scale industries; nationalization of banking system; abolition of class privilege; capital levy for war debt; taxation inequalities; History of Canadian Wealth; private property; natural resources; ownership and taxation of, 2728; conscription of men and wealth; new epoch in history; Rabindranath Tagore on civilization; radical changes necessary, 2729
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Supply, relevancy, 4602
Canada Gazette, 1709
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada-West Indies
Steamship service, 3378
Treaty, 3379
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3844
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3384
Vessels, sale of, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Board, labour representation, 3636
Coal, Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027
Management, responsibility and powers, 3635, 3699
Paris offices, 3699
Shopmen, resolution, 1338
Capital levy, 2728, 2909
Capital for settlers, 1089
China, civilization of, 2486

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration bill, 2338, 2485
Children, 2484
Merchants, 2484
Wives, 2484
Civil Service
Bonus, employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Salary revision, 1793-4
Underpaid, 4672
Combines
Coal situation, 254
Legislation inquiry, 254
Combines bill, 2551
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 2282
Sedition, 616
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2389
Doukhobors, 1340
Eight-hour day, 1643
English and French-speaking people harmony, 1341
External Affairs department, 3588
False Creek bridge, 4708
Farm labourers Winnipeg, 1976
Farm lands, prices, 1087
Freight rates on coal, 1345
Fuel supply, exploitation, 1344
German reparations, M. 280, 311
Governor General
Cars, repairs, 4691
Expenditure, 4627
Hansard, distribution of, 1715
Hector celebration, 4636, 4706
Hemp bounty bill, 4377, 4380
Hindu franchise, 4650-1
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Restaurant, 2692
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2347, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3155
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1336, 3637
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Child, 1342
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Exclusion, 2485
Students, 2485
Naturalization, 2196
Policy, 1336
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2433
Deportation without trial, 2433
Imperial Conference, 4650
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 3453

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Imperial Economic Conference, agenda, 3453
Imperial federation, 4651
International Labour Conference, 1643
Joint control of industry, 1655
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1704-6
Control, etc, 1655
Delegates from United States detention. *See under this title,* Howat
Estimates, reasons for decrease, 1638
Immigration and, 1339
Industrial councils, 1654
Industrial disputes, public utilities, 1703
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Organizations, federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2892
Right to organize, 2891
Bank officers and employees, 4084, 4161
Penitentiaries and, 772
Representation in parliament, 397, 3555
Strikes and unemployment, 1631
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4176
Land policy, 1344
Land tax, 1344
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1212, 1309
Lausanne Conference, 54
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
League of Nations, 3993
Library of Parliament, 2693
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 844
Mennonites, 1341
Meyerscough, Thomas, detention at border. *See under this title,* Howat
Military expenditure, 866
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2686
National Policy, permanency, 4652
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2195, 2455-57
Naturalization, Mounted Police and, 779
Nova Scotia steel workers, strike, 1643
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3871
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3716
Old age, inquiry, 733, 1646
Royal commission, interim report, 2167
Post office employees, salaries, 1794
Powell River Paper Company, 2891
Printing bureau employees, 1623
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 396, 419
Railway electrification, 3425
Rideau hall expenditure, 4627
Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duties, seven-day week, 4514
M. for disbandment, 816, 1139, 1151
Naturalization, and, 779
Reorganization, 776
Rural credits, 4146
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Russia, relations with, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986
Saar Valley Commission, 4652
Settlers' relief, 3448
Singapore naval base, 2469
Sydney steel strike, 287, 1643
Taxation, excessive, 1345
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Trial by jury, 2433
Ukrainians, 1341
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Labour
Insurance, 1638
Provision for, qu. 732
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Relief, foreigners, 1883
Value of time lost, 1685
Winnipeg, 1124-5, 1644
Conference on, 1659
Union label on Labour Gazette, 1623
United States industries and Canada, 4380
Vickers, qu. 2205
War, glorification of, 2686
Water powers
Lake the Woods, 3425
Policy, 3424
Publicity, 3421
Public and private ownership, 3425
Winnipeg, 3421
Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145
Winnipeg, Minto street armoury, qu. 2084

Wool, 2866. *See also* Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Live Stock; Textiles
Bounty on, 2866
Duty on, 447, 2866
Imports, qu. 617
Raw wool, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Sales tax, 2742
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973, 2823, 2827, 2866
Trenton mill, 3461

Woollen Industry. *See* Textiles

Workmen. *See* Labour

World's Moral Ideas, International conference, 1205

Wrangel Island, ownership, 3360, 3948

Wrecking Plants, Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763

Wrecks. *See* Marine; Vessels

Writers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Yarmouth, N.S., dredging, 944, 1011

York, Duke and Duchess, Congratulations on wedding, 2251, 2338

Yorkton Income tax office, qu. 384

Yorkton Enterprise, emigration to United States, 1404

Young, Arthur and Company. *See* Civil Service

Yukon Territory
Administration
Congdon, Mr. F. T., qu. 3131
Correspondence, 2299
Justice, 705
Road construction, 3943
British Empire exhibition, mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Council, 3943
Indemnity, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516

Yukon Territory—*Con.*
Extent of, 87
Gold output, 88
Governor General, visit of, 85
History, 85-89
Klondike, 86
Mineral resources, 85-86
Mining fees, 1636
Quartz-mining, 249
Naturalization, 2459
Population, 3943
Telegraph system, qu. 1662, qu. 2417, 2683, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Trial of Eskimos. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Wiley estate, administration, qu. 3131

Yukon Act Amdt. Bill
(Right to appeal from interlocutory judgement; jury trial; mining claims, property or location)
1r., 767-8; 2r., 4247; com., 4247; 3r., 4248

Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Zavitz, Dr., introduction of Mandeschuri barley, 483

Zinc. *See* Treaties, French Treaty